

Y4
.P 84/10

1022

9344
P 84/10
93-152

93-52 ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

GOVERNMENT

Storage

OCT 29 1975

KANSAS

UNIVERSITY



966641 009174

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON

OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

USE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.J. Res. 406

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE PUBLICATION OF
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING
AMERICANS

MAY 28, JUNE 11, AND 12, 1974

Serial No. 93-52

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



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1974

35-149

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION



78
01/489.
52-89

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York, *Chairman*

DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina, *Vice Chairman*

MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania
JAMES M. HANLEY, New York
CHARLES H. WILSON, California
JEROME R. WALDIE, California
RICHARD C. WHITE, Texas
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
FRANK J. BRASCO, New York
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado
JOE MOAKLEY, Massachusetts
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
BOB TRAXLER, Michigan

H. R. GROSS, Iowa
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Pennsylvania
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Maryland
JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California
WALTER E. POWELL, Ohio
RICHARD W. MALLARY, Vermont
ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California
L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS, Florida
JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Missouri

JOHN H. MARTINY, *Chief Counsel*

VICTOR C. SMIROLDO, *Staff Director and Counsel*

THEODORE J. KAZY, *Assistant Staff Director*

ROBERT E. LOCKHART, *Assistant Counsel*

ROY C. MESKER, *Staff Assistant*

FRANCIS C. FORTUNE, *Coordinator*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS

RICHARD C. WHITE, Texas, *Chairman*

JAMES M. HANLEY, New York
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
CHARLES H. WILSON, California

JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California
ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California
L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS, Florida

Ex Officio Voting Members

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York

H. R. GROSS, Iowa

(RICHARD BULLOCK, *Staff Assistant*, Room B-345(b), Rayburn Building—Ext. 56741)

93d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 406

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 5, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

JOINT RESOLUTION

Relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Spanish-speaking Americans.

Whereas more than twelve million Americans identify themselves as Spanish speaking and trace their origins from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Central and South America, and other Spanish-speaking countries; and

Whereas the Spanish speaking in America have made significant contributions to enrich American culture and have served their Nation well in times of war and peace; and

Whereas a large number of Spanish-speaking Americans suffer from racial, social, economic, and political discrimination and are denied the basic opportunities they deserve as American citizens and which would enable them to begin to lift themselves out of the poverty that they now endure; and

I

(III)

Whereas State and Federal Governments and private organizations are now unable to determine accurately the urgent and special needs of the Spanish speaking in the United States because there is not a regular, nationwide evaluation of the economic and social status of Spanish-speaking Americans; and

Whereas the provision and commitment of State, Federal, and private resources can only occur when there is an accurate and precise assessment of need: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Department of Labor in cooperation with the
4 Bureau of the Census immediately begin to undertake the
5 collection and compilation of data in order to provide for the
6 monthly publication by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, beginning not later than July 1973, of the nationwide unemployment rate among Spanish-speaking Americans; and that
7 the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor and
8 the Department of Agriculture undertake further efforts to
9 collect and publish regularly statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic condition of Spanish-speaking citizens in urban and rural America.

CONTENTS

Testimony of—

Barabba, Hon. Vincent P., Director, Bureau of the Census, accompanied by Daniel Levine and Edward Fernandez-----	Page 2
Landeros, Ms. Delfina-----	134
Maduro, Reynaldo, executive director, Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People, appearing on behalf of Henry M. Ramirez, chairman, CCOSSP-----	101
Motes, William C., Director of the Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, accompanied by J. Richard Grant, Statistical Reporting Service, and Vera J. Banks and Robert C. McElroy, Economic Research Service-----	50
Nunez, Louis, Deputy Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, accompanied by Cynthia Graae, Associate Director of the Office of Federal Civil Rights Evaluation, and Jaime Taronji, Jr., special assistant-----	86
Obledo, Mario G., Mexican-American Legislation and Education Fund, San Antonio, Tex., accompanied by Joe Benitez, president, League of United Latin American Citizens, and Manuel D. Fierro, president, Raza Association of Spanish Surnamed Americans-----	58
Roybal, Hon. Edward R., a Representative in Congress from the 30th District of California-----	79
Stark, Hon. Fortney H., Representative in Congress of the United States from the Ninth District of the State of California-----	28
Steglich, Prof. G. W., University of Texas at El Paso-----	45
Van Deerlin, Hon. Lionel, Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 37th District of the State of California-----	34
Wetzel, James R., Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor-----	37
Zaueta, Richardo, national director, Operation SER—Jobs for Progress, accompanied by Narcisco Cano, assistant national director, Operation SER—Jobs for Progress-----	94
Zermeno, Alex, national director, National Counsel de la Raza, accompanied by Klaus May, research analyst-----	120

Statements submitted by—

Badillo, Hon. Herman, Member of Congress from the State of New York-----	144
Barabba, Vincent P., Director, Bureau of the Census-----	139
Boggs, Hon. Lindy (Mrs. Hale), Member of Congress from the State of Louisiana-----	147
Edwards, Hon. Don, Member of Congress from the State of California-----	142
Gonzalez, Hon. Henry B., Member of Congress from the State of Texas-----	146
McNeill, Mrs. Mary Ann Marquez, president, Amigas de la Raza, Sparks, Nev-----	149
Pepper, Hon. Claude, Member of Congress from the State of Florida-----	142
Pickle, Hon. J. J., Member of Congress from the State of Texas-----	143
Rodriguez, Armando M., president, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, Calif-----	151
Roy, Hon. William R., Member of Congress from the State of Kansas-----	149
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia, Member of Congress from the State of Colorado-----	140
Tucker, Mrs. Rosemary G., coordinator of the Concilio Hispanis American of Nevada, Reno, Nev-----	150
Waldie, Hon. Jerome P., Member of Congress from the State of California-----	141

Additional material submitted—

Findings and recommendations from the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, entitled "To Know or Not To Know," February 1973-----	152
National Council of La Raza report on "Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans, June 1974"-----	156

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

TUESDAY, MAY 28, 1974

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:30 a.m., in room 210 of the Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Richard C. White (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. WHITE. The Subcommittee on Census and Statistics will come to order.

We are meeting today to hear testimony on House Joint Resolution 406 introduced by Congressman Edward Roybal of California.

The purpose of this resolution is to encourage greater efforts within the Federal Government on the economic and social status of Spanish-speaking Americans.

It is estimated that there are now approximately 12 million Spanish-speaking Americans in this country. A large proportion of these persons experience major social, economic, and political problems which tend to diminish the basic opportunities they are entitled to as American citizens.

If effective programs are to be established to meet these problems, it is essential that accurate, comprehensive, and up-to-date information on the Spanish-speaking population be produced on a continuing basis.

In these hearings today we intend to find out whether present Federal statistical programs provide such information.

Before calling our first witness to testify, I would like to announce that further hearings on this matter are scheduled for June 11 and 12, and to advise persons who may wish to attend such hearings to carefully note the scheduled room numbers, for some will be held in this room and some will be held in room 219 of this building.

Mr. Barabba, will you come forward, please, to the witness stand?

STATEMENT OF HON. VINCENT P. BARABBA, DIRECTOR, BUREAU
OF THE CENSUS, ACCOMPANIED BY DANIEL LEVINE AND
EDWARD FERNANDEZ

Mr. BARABBA. Good morning.

Mr. WHITE. Good morning.

Mr. Barabba, as you know, our procedure is to permit you to summarize your statement and put the full statement, in full in the record.

Mr. BARABBA. Since it is brief, I would like to read the whole statement.

I also have with us Mr. Levine, our Associate Director, and Mr. Ed Fernandez, who is chief of our Spanish population staff.

We appreciate this invitation to appear before the committee to provide you with the Census Bureau's views concerning H.J. Res. 40 on the collection and publication of economic and social statistics for Spanish-speaking Americans.

The Census Bureau welcomes the interest of the Congress in the collection and presentation of statistical information on this major population group. Recognizing several years ago the vital need for current and continuing statistical series on the social and economic conditions of the population of Spanish ancestry, the Census Bureau developed and implemented a major program of providing current statistical data to accurately measure the socioeconomic status of the Spanish origin population.

Specifically, through the current population survey, which the Bureau conducts monthly to obtain current demographic and socioeconomic information on the population, we now collect a vast array of statistics on the population of Spanish origin.

The data are collected on persons who report that they are of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish origin rather than on persons who speak Spanish, since many persons who are of Spanish origin no longer speak Spanish in their homes.

Beginning with data collected in November 1969, and continuing in March 1971, 1972, and 1973, the Census Bureau has published annual reports on the population of Spanish origin.

The Census Bureau plans to continue the publication of this annual statistical portrait of the current status of the Spanish population in America, based on data collected each year in the March "Current Population Survey."

In addition to these annual reports, which provide vital data on the demographic, educational, and economic characteristics of persons and families of Spanish heritage, the Census Bureau also regularly publishes data on the Spanish origin population collected in other months of the year.

We have begun the regular publication of statistics on the school and college enrollment of persons of Spanish origin based on data collected in the October survey, on birth expectations and number of children ever born collected in the June survey, and on the voter participation and registration of the Spanish origin population collected in November of election years. Copies of these current

reports and a list of some of our recent meetings with Spanish organizations are attached as an appendix to my testimony.

The Current Population Survey conducted monthly by the Bureau of the Census is the largest continuous household survey in the Nation. Approximately 50,000 households are included in the survey each and every month. From this survey we are able to provide a considerable amount of statistical detail on the socioeconomic characteristics of the Spanish origin population and its major components.

However, even with a survey of this size, because of sampling variability, it is not possible to provide reliable characteristics for State and local areas. Nor is it possible to provide reliable statistical detail in as full an array for the components of the Spanish origin population, that is, those of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish origin, as it is for the total population of Spanish origin.

The total Spanish origin population comprises about 5 percent of the total population in the Nation and its major component, persons of Mexican origin, about 3 percent. The other components comprise somewhat smaller proportions.

The provision of State or local data and of very detailed cross-classifications of statistical detail for the components of the Spanish origin population would require the creation of a new, very large-scale sample survey.

The proposed resolution calls for the Bureau of the Census to undertake further efforts to collect and publish regularly statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic condition of Spanish-speaking citizens in urban and rural America.

The Census Bureau certainly endorses the spirit and intent of the resolution.

I might note, however, that most of the organizations and individuals that we have conferred with who are concerned about the current status of the Spanish ancestry population—and we have met and conferred with many groups and individuals concerning Spanish statistics in the recent past—have indicated to us that they prefer that statistical information be presented for the population that is of Spanish origin or descent rather than Spanish-speaking since, as I noted earlier, a considerable number of persons of Spanish origin may no longer regularly use the Spanish language.

Further, I might note that the proper identification of the urban population would actually call for a complete enumeration of the population, since the urbanized areas around large cities continue to grow and sample surveys are not adequate to indicate the limits of this growth.

However, the Census Bureau can, and does, identify separately in its "Current Population Survey" the population living in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas, since the metropolitan areas are comprised of whole counties, and also separately identifies the farm and nonfarm population, since these components can be identified through direct questions.

In addition to the current statistical data on the Spanish origin population which the Census Bureau provides at the national level,

the Census Bureau has also provided a wealth of valuable statistical data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the Spanish ancestry population at the State and local level in the reports of the "1970 Census of Population."

In the "1970 Census of Population," persons of Spanish ancestry were identified through questions on birthplace and parentage, mother tongue, Spanish surname, and Spanish origin. The Spanish origin identifier classified the Spanish ancestry population separately by Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuba, Central or South American, or other Spanish origin.

In the 1970 census reports presenting socioeconomic characteristics, data for persons of Spanish heritage were included in comparable format to that presented for all whites and Negroes whenever there were enough persons of Spanish heritage in the area for which the statistics were being presented.

In addition, separate 1970 census reports were published on "Persons of Spanish Origin," "Persons of Spanish Surname," and "Puerto Ricans in the United States."

We are now planning the 1980 census of population. As a part of the planning process, we are making intensive efforts to learn about the use of the 1970 data we have already published and about future data needs of the Spanish ancestry population.

In addition, we are making a concerted effort to elicit the active and continuing cooperation of the Spanish community and of Spanish organizations in the conduct of the 1980 census.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, whose representative is also to testify before this committee, has the primary responsibility for the publication of national employment and unemployment data.

The Bureau of the Census actively cooperates with the Bureau of Labor Statistics in this endeavor by using the Current Population Survey to collect monthly employment and unemployment statistics on the Spanish origin population.

These data are tabulated by the Census Bureau, and then provided to the Bureau of Labor Statistics for their analysis and publication.

A major concern of both our organizations is that only reliable data be published. Because of this concern, the Bureau of Labor Statistics at present publishes a quarterly average estimate of the unemployment rate for the Spanish origin population, rather than monthly data. The use of a quarterly average reduces the sampling variability that is associated with just a 1-month estimate on a population of this size, and thereby increases the reliability of the unemployment data presented for persons of Spanish origin.

Providing current and reliable data on the Spanish ancestry population in the United States is a vital and continuing concern of the Bureau of the Census. In both our current surveys and decennial census, the Census Bureau will continue to provide statistical measures on the social and economic condition of the Spanish origin population and we welcome your support and cooperation in this endeavor.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to present this statement. I will be happy to answer any questions.

[The attachments follow:]

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS—CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS CONTAINING DATA
ON PERSONS OF SPANISH ORIGIN—(SERIES P-20)

NUMBER AND TITLE

- 264—Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1973.
260—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students, October 1972.
257—Undergraduate Enrollment in 2-year and 4-year Colleges: October 1972.
254—Birth Expectations of American Wives: June 1973.
253—Voting and Registration in the Election of November 1972.
250—Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1972 and 1971.
249—Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin: March 1972 and 1971.
238—Selected Characteristics of Persons and Families of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Other Spanish Origin: March 1972.
226—Fertility Variations by Ethnic Origin: November 1969.
224—Selected Characteristics of Persons and Families of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Other Spanish Origin: March 1971.
221—Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin, November 1969.
220—Ethnic Origin and Educational Attainment, November 1969.
213—Persons of Spanish in the United States: November 1969.
91—Characteristics of the Low-Income Population 1972.

CENSUS BUREAU STAFF MET WITH THE FOLLOWING SPANISH ORGANIZATIONS TO DISCUSS PROGRAM ON STATISTICS ON PERSONS OF SPANISH ANCESTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Meeting	Place	Date
LULAC Convention (League of United Latin American Citizens).....	Beaumont, Tex.	June and July 1972.
American GI Forum Convention.....	Washington, D.C.	July 1972.
Staff meeting with Mr. Alvarez, Mr. Estrada, and Mr. Hernandez, American Spanish sociologists—members of the Census Ad- visory Committee on Population Statistics.	San Antonio, Tex.	February 1973
Educational Organization for United Latin Americans.....	Washington, D.C.	March 1973.
Mexican-American Population Commission.....	Austin, Tex.	May 1973.
Democratic National Committee—Spanish Office.....	Washington, D.C.	June 1973.
44th Annual Convention of LULAC (League of United Latin Ameri- can Citizens).	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	Do.
District of Columbia Spanish Community Advisory Committee.....	Washington, D.C.	August 1973.
IMAGE (National Spanish Organization concerned with Govern- ment employment).	do.	October 1973.
Mexican-American population Commission.....	San Francisco, Calif.	Do.
Meeting of the supreme council of LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens).	Washington, D.C.	Do.
Meeting with Spanish community representatives in the office of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund.	San Antonio, Tex.	November 1973
Meeting with Spanish community leaders in Tucson, Ariz.....	Tucson, Ariz.	January 1974.
LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration)/IAHORA (International Association of Human Rights Agencies) Con- ference.	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	Do.
Azteca Mexican Community Organization.....	Chicago, Ill.	Do.
Spanish American Society.....	Detroit, Mich.	Do.
Joint press conference with Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking on March 1973 CPS Spanish Advance Report.	Washington, D.C.	Do.
2 meetings with the statistical staff of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking (Mr. Degado and Mr. Molina).	do.	Do.
Spanish Neighborhood Resource Center.....	Chicago, Ill.	February 1974.
Spanish International Network.....	do.	Do.
LEAA (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration)/LAHORA (International Association of Human Rights Agencies) Con- ference.	Denver, Colo.	March 1974.
Southwest Sociological Conference.....	Dallas, Tex.	Do.
Mexican American Business and Professional Women's Club.....	San Antonio, Tex.	Do.
Meeting of Census Bureau Staff with Spanish Organization repre- sentatives.	Washington, D.C.	Do.
Puerto Rican Research and Development Center.....	do.	Do.
Council of Latin American Agencies.....	Chicago, Ill.	Do.
Puerto Rican Action Organization.....	do.	Do.
HOPE (Hispanic Organization of Professionals and Executives).....	Washington, D.C.	Do.
White House meeting with the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking and members of Vice-President Ford's staff.	do.	April 1974.
Rassa Association of Spanish-Speaking Americans.....	do.	Do.
Chicana Services Action Center.....	Los Angeles, Calif.	Do.
Operation SER.....	do.	Do.
Joint press conference with Mexican-American Population Com- mission concerning March 1973 CPS Spanish final report.	do.	May 1974.
Annual International Conference on Bilingual Bicultural Educa- tion.	New York, N.Y.	Do.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT MEETING OF SPANISH-AMERICAN PERSONS REGARDING
PREPARATIONS FOR THE 1980 CENSUS—MARCH 1, 1974

- Ms. Raquel Creitoff,
director, community relations program,
Department of Labor,
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,
322 West 45th St.,
New York, N.Y.
- Ms. Lila Dominguez,
4905 Klinge Road NW.,
Washington, D.C.
- Dr. Leobardo Estrada,
assistant professor,
Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Tex.
- Ms. Gloria Fresquez,
staff attorney,
Mexican American Legal Defense
and Educational Fund,
201 North St. Marys St.,
San Antonio, Tex.
- Mr. Antonio Gallegos,
president, GI Forum,
7149 Pico Vista Rd.,
Pico Rivera, Calif.
- Mr. Luis Garcia,
Mexican American Population
Commission of California,
433 Turk St.,
San Francisco, Calif.
- Dr. Julian Samora,
Mexican American Studies,
University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Ind.
- Mr. Robert L. Gnaizda,
Public Advocates, Inc.,
433 Turk St.,
San Francisco, Calif.
- Ms. Rhea Mojica Hammer,
3827 West Jackson,
Chicago, Ill.
- Dr. Arturo P. Hevia,
director, Accion Community Center,
2411 Southwest 83d Court,
Miami, Fla.
- Ms. Ada Pena,
League of United Latin American
Citizens,
Washington, D.C.
- Mr. Cesar Perales,
Puerto Rican Legal Defense
and Education Fund,
815 2d Ave.,
New York, N.Y.
- Dr. Manolo Reyes,
WTVJ Channel 3,
316 N. Miami Ave.,
Miami, Fla.
- Mr. Arthur Velasquez, Sr.,
4539 Ashland Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH SPEAKING PEOPLE

Mr. John Woods and Mr. Charles Delgado.

CENSUS BUREAU

Mr. Vincent P. Barabba, Director.
 Mr. Daniel B. Levine, Associate Director.
 Mr. Paul R. Squires, Associate Director.
 Mr. Richard C. Burt, Chief, Field Division.
 Mr. Arthur Cresce, Statistician, Population Division.
 Mr. Edward W. Fernandez, Special Assistant, Population Division.
 Mr. David Kaplan, Chief, Demographic Census Staff.
 Ms. Delfina Landeros, Statistician, Population Division.
 Ms. Emma Moreno, Community Relations Specialist, Field Division.
 Mr. Henry H. Smith, Acting Chief, Public Information Office.
 Mr. Arthur F. Young, Chief, Housing Division.
 Mr. Meyer Zitter, Chief, Population Division.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Barabba.

Do you and your colleagues today have samples of the questions asked on the 1970 census that related to persons of Spanish origin?

Mr. BARABBA. We don't have them here, Mr. Chairman, but we can get them for you.

Mr. WHITE. Can you recite the formal questions at least?

Mr. LEVINE. Mr. Chairman, the question asked on Spanish origin in the 1970 census was:

Is this person's origin or descent (fill one circle) Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, other Spanish, no, none of these.

This was the specific question asked to identify Spanish origin.

In addition, as indicated, we had other identifiers, birthplace, and parentage, where we asked questions relating to where were the parents born and "where were you born."

We also used the Spanish surnames, and we have a list of certain names that have been agreed upon as identifying Spanish surname population.

Mr. WHITE. That is a judgment matter, and your computer could not pick that up, I presume. That is, in collating this information, you have to have individuals who identify the Spanish surnames.

Mr. LEVINE. Yes. That was done by a hand-coding operation.

Mr. WHITE. Was this a rather tedious operation?

Mr. LEVINE. I am not sure exactly what you mean by "tedious operation." Any repetitive operation becomes tedious, and you try to arrange it in such a way that you minimize the problem of error or the problems that may relate to the tediousness of doing it.

Mr. WHITE. How much of the questionnaire is done by hand and tabulated? Is there a certain percentage that you do by hand and a certain percentage that you do by machine?

Mr. LEVINE. Eventually the entire operation is tabulated by machine, but there are some hand-coding operations that take place before you reach the machine stage. There is a check-in operation, there is an operation to scan the questionnaires to assure the completeness of entry, to assure no problem relating to the types of entries that appear, there is a coding operation for occupation and industry, and there is a check on some of the income items.

There are a variety of activities, and some of them are sequential, done by the same people, and others were done by different groups at different points in time.

Codes are put in the questionnaire, and the entire operation ends up being a mechanical or electronic operation.

Mr. WHITE. What part of the operation was done on an individual basis? In other words, for this recognition of Spanish surnames, you had to have some specialists, I presume.

Mr. LEVINE. The first thing you do is develop a major list of the names you obtain over historical periods dealing with Spanish organizations to obtain those names which are best considered to represent the Spanish surname population.

Having obtained that list, you obviously have a staff of people who look at the names and questionnaires and provide the codes.

You also have, as you indicate, several—I don't know the number at this point—of specialists who, when there are problems relating to the names, would then go beyond what the clerical staff did in insuring that the quality was there.

Second, you would have a quality control operation to assure the accuracy of the coding operation itself.

Mr. WHITE. I don't think you are seeing what I am talking about, sir. Maybe I am not expressing it well.

In order to recognize the Spanish surname, in general, you would have to have people who are particularly familiar with this one particular area. Am I correct on that? Because an average person cannot come in and recognize a Spanish name with accuracy.

Mr. LEVINE. No, I don't think I agree with that, Mr. Chairman, for this reason.

In trying to provide a coding operation, you prepare what you would call a coding guide, which contains the full panoply or as full as you can make it, using all the expertise available to you prior to the actual operation to develop the list of Spanish surnames.

Once you have a so-called registry of Spanish surnames, then it is a matter of a very well organized and well controlled clerical operation to insure that someone looking at a questionnaire and seeing a certain name, checking against the alphabetical index of Spanish surnames, recognizes the name in that form or its variants.

Mr. WHITE. This is the average employee for tabulation purposes that you are using there, with a coded list of Spanish surnames?

Mr. LEVINE. That's correct.

Mr. WHITE. All right.

Do they try to identify Polish names?

Mr. LEVINE. No.

Mr. WHITE. Just Spanish surnames?

Mr. LEVINE. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. How would they know whether to look on the sheet or not?

Mr. LEVINE. Because this is in the five Southwestern States only, and all the questionnaires from the five Southwestern States are completely checked against the list of previously developed surnames to be sure the name of the questionnaire does or does not agree with that predetermined list.

Mr. WHITE. All right, sir.

Then I presume you know there is a large Mexican-American population in the Chicago area. How do you check those?

Mr. LEVINE. We did not use Spanish surname in the Chicago area. There we used the Spanish origin question, which I read to you a

moment ago. Spanish surnames was only used in the five Southwestern States.

Mr. WHITE. Suppose they are second- or third-generation persons. Then you wouldn't pick up that Spanish origin.

Mr. LEVINE. In using the question which I read to you, I think we would have the most complete identifier in our view at the moment, because that is the only question, the only technique which we feel at the moment will indeed not only pick up people of Spanish surname, or Spanish birth or parentage, but also second, third and previous generations.

Mr. WHITE. Read that question again to me. I am sorry. Read that part where you think you identify third and fourth generations.

Mr. LEVINE. There was asked for each individual in the household who received this particular questionnaire:

Is this person's origin or descent, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, other Spanish; no, none of these.

Mr. WHITE. I don't know your racial background or national origin background, but if you were asked if your origin were French or English or something like that, would you answer that, three generations back?

Mr. LEVINE. Yes, I believe that our experience to date where we have asked the Spanish origin question—I am sorry—an origin or ethnicity question of the entire population, we think this is the best way we know at the moment of identifying the ethnic origin or descent of the total population and particularly of the Spanish origin population.

Mr. WHITE. We have established right now that you are only identifying the names as Spanish surnames in the five Southwestern States.

Mr. LEVINE. That's correct.

Mr. WHITE. I presume you are talking about Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Nevada?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No, it is Colorado rather than Nevada.

Mr. WHITE. You rely on the Spanish origin for the purposes of identifying the Spanish surnames in any other area of the country?

Mr. LEVINE. No, but identifying Spanish origin or descent throughout the entire population. As indicated in Mr. Barabba's testimony, we had a series of identifiers in 1970. Spanish surname was one; Spanish origin was another; Spanish language, and the birthplace and parentage questions were the others.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Nothing on the census said anything about Spanish language?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This was gotten from the question on mother tongue. If the householder or his wife reported the Spanish tongue, then everyone related to the household or his wife was classified under the identifier "Spanish language."

In the five Southwestern States, of course, there are persons of Mexican-American descent, Mexican-American origin who are beyond, let's say, mother tongue. We added to the identifier "Spanish surname."

Persons who could not come under the identifier in the Southwestern States, they would be included by their Spanish surname.

Mr. WHITE. How accurate do you feel that your survey is outside the five Southwestern States? Have you done any spot checking or have you tested yourself in any manner to determine the efficiency of your survey?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think we have gone rather far in making innovations and getting the population of Spanish origin. In March 1973, there were several innovations that we feel give us the population that we are searching for.

Mr. WHITE. I am talking now about the 1970 census. Has that been compared in, say, the Chicago area, the Illinois area, against voter registrations?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No. There was no comparison with voter registration. But there was a post-census evaluation of the response to Spanish origin, if that is what you mean.

Mr. WHITE. I would judge that the system you have may be missing second and third generation Spanish-surnamed people, quite a few of them.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I can't agree with that. The Spanish-origin question covers all generations. However, it is a subjective question. It is a completely voluntary response. If the person is a fifth generation, let's say, Spanish-origin person, of course, he could opt to say he is Spanish or is not. It is purely voluntary, the response.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Barabba, you have spoken in terms of opting for quarterly surveys rather than monthly surveys. I did not have the opportunity to read your testimony in advance, but do you feel that monthly surveys called for in the joint resolution, or monthly reports, I think it was, would be too burdensome and not accurate enough?

Mr. BARABBA. Well, given our current size of our sample and our current population survey, it would clearly not be sufficiently accurate.

It could be increased if the size of the survey was increased, but at this point in time, we are not aware of funding, although as it relates to the unemployment side of that question, whether it is needed or not, I think the gentlemen who will follow us, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, can address themselves more specifically to that question.

As our current population survey stands now, we are not satisfied that we can give a monthly report.

Mr. WHITE. You spoke of being able to put your finger at least in counting 50,000 Spanish-surname people. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. BARABBA. That was the size of our full survey. We interviewed approximately 50,000 households.

Mr. WHITE. Are 50,000 households the Spanish-surname people?

Mr. BARABBA. No, that is 50,000 of the total households in the United States.

Mr. WHITE. For what, the sample survey?

Mr. BARABBA. It is used primarily to identify the unemployment rate in the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel the 50,000 survey you made now for other purposes will give an appraisal of the percentage of population of Spanish origin in this country?

Mr. BARABBA. Yes it provides reliable data for the percent of Spanish origin. But unemployment data are more reliable on a quarterly basis. That is one of the reasons why the Bureau of Labor Statistics gets the information on a quarterly basis and then releases the figure on a quarterly period.

Mr. WHITE. I will have more questions for you shortly, but I will turn it over to counsel at this point.

Mr. BULLOCK. My first question relates to page 3 of your statement, Mr. Barabba, and on that page you indicate that because of sampling variability, it isn't possible to provide accurate CPS data on the components of the Spanish-surname people.

How accurate are you at the national level on CPS?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In a population of 10 million, one standard error, would be 300,000.

Mr. BULLOCK. You are talking in terms, now, of the total number of Spanish-origin persons?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That's correct.

Mr. BULLOCK. Would it be possible for you to submit for the record selected examples of standard errors for characteristics data which is published for the Spanish population as well?

Mr. LEVINE. That is contained in the reports. We can separate them, if you would like. They have been appended to Mr. Barabba's statement.

Mr. BULLOCK. It will be appreciated.

Mr. LEVINE. Fine.

[The information follows:]

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS OF ONE STANDARD ERROR FOR SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SPANISH ORIGIN POPULATION: MARCH 1973¹

Subject	Value	Confidence interval (one standard error)
Total persons of Spanish origin in the United States.....	10,577,000	10,278,000 to 10,876,000.
Total persons of Spanish origin in the 5 Southwestern States ²	6,273,000	5,840,000 to 6,706,000.
Percent Spanish origin persons 25 years old and over with completed 4 years of high school or more.....	35.0	33.9 to 36.1.
Median income of families of Spanish origin.....	\$8,183	\$8,000 to \$8,388.
Percent Spanish origin families living in metropolitan areas.....	83.1	82.2 to 84.0.

¹ In the March 1973 CPS the sample of Spanish persons was doubled to reduce the sampling variability on the estimated number and characteristics of persons of Spanish origin.

² Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.

Mr. BULLOCK. One of the publications cited in your testimony is the 1970 census report, "Persons of Spanish Origin."

In the introduction of that report, under the heading of the limitations of the data, it states:

For certain areas the number of persons of Spanish origin is overstated because some of the respondents apparently misunderstood the question and interpreted the category "Central or South American" to mean "Central or Southern United States." Available evidence suggested this misinterpretation resulted in a substantial percentage of overstatement in some Southern States and may have occurred to a lesser extent in States of the central area of the country.

That is the end of the quote.

Despite the demonstrated potential for misinterpretation, the term "Central or South American" as far as I can tell has been retained in the Current Population Survey. What steps are you making to make sure this term is clearly understood by the survey respondents?

Mr. BARABBA. The Current Population Survey is administered by trained interviewers, who have much more expertise in identifying the information, rather than the self-identification technique used in the 1970 census.

Mr. BULLOCK. I realize that. It should be clear, however, in the minds of the people what is meant. The potential, if you just read it, there, is still present.

Mr. LEVINE. You are correct, sir. We have modified the instructions we had developed for our 1969 survey. We now have a rather extensive training program as part of this, as you very carefully point out, the possibility of confusion might exist, but this is a personal interview survey which is a direct confrontation between the interviewer and the respondent, which puts it in a different framework.

So I think we have a different care of the concern you express.

Mr. BULLOCK. In the question with regard to Spanish origin in the 1970 census. I think it speaks of this person being of Spanish origin or descent. It seems to me that it would be altogether impossible that a person with limited command of the English language reading the terms "origin" and "descent" might not understand them that well. I would like to know what evidence you have of the extent of understanding of that question and what exactly it implied to the people who were enumerated who were of Spanish origin, or would have classified themselves to be so, if they understood the question?

Mr. LEVINE. I think there are two answers to that question.

The first is that we conducted an evaluation of response in the 1970 census. Moreover, in the census itself, when people had no answer to that question, interviewers went out and attempted to obtain the information directly.

I think more importantly the population survey results which we obtained in March of each year for the last several years, the consistency of estimates—we are using an interviewer, who is very highly skilled, who is trained at some great expense and a great length of time—suggests that the 1970 census question was not misunderstood.

I think the level we have now is consistent with the 1970 census, it shows the growth which has occurred over that period of time.

Therefore, we feel although it is true we did not have the full amount of time we would have liked in developing the questions for the 1970 census, yet I think we could still say today that the Spanish origin concept as we have it now is better than 1970, and the 1970 census question was not badly misunderstood.

Mr. BULLOCK. On that same point, I recall reading in the U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report—and I don't have the page number now—on the enumeration of Spanish-speaking or Spanish origin

persons in America. A statement was made there to the effect, as I recall, that the Current Population Survey showed a very sizable increase in the Spanish origin population, and that they suspected—at least I got the clear implication that the Bureau had given them some reason to suspect this—was that this occurred because there was more complete coverage in the Current Population Survey.

Mr. BARABBA. When we released the March 1973 population estimates, there were four items which we identified which we felt contributed to the increase of the population from 1970 to 1973. The following is the actual language used in the report which noted the change in Spanish-origin population between 1970-73.

Mexican Origin Categories.—The 1970 census question on Spanish origin had only one category denoting Mexican origin, whereas the March 1973 CPS questionnaire had four categories denoting Mexican origin.

Method of Assigning Origin to Children Under 14 Years Old.—In the 1970 census the respondents themselves determined whether their children under 14 years old were of Spanish origin or not, and of those children whose mothers were of Spanish origin but whose fathers were not of Spanish origin 230,000 were classified by their parents as not of Spanish origin and 148,000 as of Spanish origin. In the March 1973 CPS all of the children under 14 years of age were classified as Spanish origin if either the head or his wife was of Spanish origin. As indicated earlier, about 400,000 children in 1973 were classified as of Spanish origin where only the wife, but not the head, was of Spanish origin.

Sample Size and Variability.—The 1970 census data on persons of Spanish origin were based on a 5-percent sample of the population, and the March 1973 CPS data on persons of Spanish origin were based on a sample of about 1 in 800 persons; hence, sampling variability also affects comparability between these data.

Population Growth.—One of the reasons that the March 1973 estimate of the population of Spanish origin differs from the 1970 figure is because of population growth. Birth, death, and migration data, specifically for persons of Spanish origin, are not available, therefore, population growth in the Spanish origin population cannot be precisely estimated. However, rough computations suggest an approximate rate of natural increase (excess of birth over deaths) of about 1.8 percent per year or 5.5 percent for the period between 1970 and 1973. In addition, net immigration from abroad could have contributed significant numbers. For example, in the three year period ending June 30, 1972, about one-half million (490,000) immigrants were admitted to the United States from all Spanish-speaking countries (including 159,000 from Mexico) as permanent residents. Thus, all told, population growth for the period from April 1970 to March 1973 may account to close to two-thirds of the difference between the 1970 census and the March 1973 figures. The balance is accounted for by the other factors noted.

Mr. BULLOCK. I have a list of the criticisms, major criticisms, of the Bureau's methods and operations with regard to the Spanish-speaking population during the 1970 census that are contained in the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report, and if I might, rather than take the time here, I will submit those to you, and maybe you can submit comments for the record, if you will.

Mr. BARABBA. We will do that, and we will present to you the document we presented to them before the publication of their document, which answered most of the criticisms they have voiced.

Mr. BULLOCK. I would be happy to have that.

[The letter which follows was furnished in response to the question:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1974.

Mr. JOHN A. BUGGS,
Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUGGS: We have reviewed your report concerning the 1970 census count of persons of Spanish-speaking background in the United States, with the exception of the conclusion, findings, and recommendations which were not provided for our review, and our comments are enclosed.

We find that your report contains numerous misleading and inaccurate statements that should be corrected before you publish your report. Among the major areas that need to be revised are:

(1) The section dealing with indications of a Spanish-speaking undercount as based on independent reports and surveys, which fails to provide a reasoned review of the Census Bureau's data, and compounds its errors by accepting uncritically and as valid impressionistic population estimates made by persons and organizations not trained in census and demographic techniques.

(2) The section dealing with the Bureau's field collection techniques and methodology, which does not provide an accurate description of the enumeration method used in the 1970 census nor of the employment of minorities.

(3) The sections throughout the report purporting to be based on an interview with Daniel B. Levine, Joseph Waksberg, and Meyer Zitter of the Census Bureau staff, which do not accurately reflect their statements concerning the Census Bureau's concern and efforts in regard to the collection and presentation of data on persons of Spanish background.

(4) The descriptions of Census Bureau data on persons of Spanish origin contained in various places throughout the report, which fails to adequately indicate the wealth of demographic and socioeconomic data available.

We also take strong exception to the title of the report. To suggest the Bureau's actions and attitudes are correctly reflected in the phrase "Uncounted and Forgotten" does a deliberate disservice to the efforts to the Bureau and casts serious doubt on the report's objectivity!

More specific details concerning these inaccuracies and inadequacies are included in the enclosed comments.

We share with you a mutual concern that the Nation have accurate statistical data on the social and economic status of persons of Spanish origin. We have participated in a series of meetings with various Spanish organizations since 1970 to discuss appropriate uses of our data, to ascertain future data needs, and to obtain maximum cooperation in the conduct of future censuses and surveys. The issuance of your report with its unfairly critical statements of Census Bureau activities in relation to the collection and publication of data on persons of Spanish ancestry would tend to undermine our efforts.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BARABBA,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

Enclosure.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS COMMENTS CONCERNING A DRAFT OF THE REPORT OF
THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS ENTITLED "UNCOUNTED AND FORGOTTEN:
THE 1970 CENSUS COUNT OF PERSONS OF SPANISH SPEAKING BACKGROUND
IN THE UNITED STATES"

The Bureau of the Census staff has reviewed the report of the Commission on Civil Rights concerning the 1970 census count of persons of Spanish speaking background and have listed below some of the misleading and inaccurate statements contained in the body of the report that should be corrected. The Census Bureau was not provided a review copy of the sections of the report relating to the conclusion, findings and recommendations.

1. The report's title of "Uncounted and Forgotten" is not an accurate description of the Census Bureau's count of Spanish Americans in the 1970 Census of Population. A more comprehensive set of identifiers were used in this census than in any previous census in history and more complete and

voluminous statistical data were published on persons of Spanish ancestry than in any previous census in history. Persons of Spanish background were identified through four separate means, including information on the foreign born and those who were native of foreign born parents, persons of Spanish mother tongue, persons of Spanish surname, and persons of Spanish origin.

2. The report's statement on page 9 "the 80, 15 and 5 percent questionnaires all contained a question asking respondents to identify themselves, and members of their household from a list of racial/ethnic groups [but] Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish origin groups were not on that list" gives the misleading impression that questions identifying persons of Spanish ancestry were not included in the census. It is true that the 100 percent race question did not include the categories for Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and other Spanish origin, but Spanish heritage groups were identified through questions on the 15- and 5- percent sample questionnaires.

3. The report's statement on page 9 that "there is strong indication that the Bureau intends to substantially repeat in 1980 the methodology that evolved in 1970" based on interviews with staff members Daniel B. Levine, Joseph Waksberg, and Meyer Zitter is a completely inaccurate description of their statements to your staff member and of the Census Bureau's plans. The Census Bureau is constantly striving to provide the best methodology for the conduct of a decennial census. Each census builds on knowledge gained in the previous one. The methodology and content of the 1980 census are subjects of serious concern that are receiving and will continue to receive our most considered study. Nineteen-eighty census planning began in 1973, not in 1976 or 1977 as the report asserts. A meeting was held this month with representatives of numerous Spanish organizations to help in planning the 1980 census.

4. The report's statement on page 11 erroneously implies that being identified through questions on 15- and 5-percent samples led to a distinct undercount problem for persons of Spanish ancestry. Population samples covering 15 and 5 percent of the population, within the framework of a census enumeration, provide completely reliable data of total population counts. The standard error due to sampling variability on a sample of this magnitude is quite small.

5. The report's statement on page 12 that "persons of Spanish speaking background and all minorities are entitled to the same consideration given to the white majority in the Bureau's data methodology and collection techniques" is completely erroneous and distorted in implying that the Bureau collects data for whites only. The decennial census collects data on all persons residing in the United States. There is absolutely no racial or ethnic bias in our statistical work. Whenever the Census Bureau's reports present data for the white population in the United States, and 98 percent of the population of Spanish origin are classified as white, corresponding data are presented for Negroes. The 1970 census reports also included corresponding data for persons of Spanish heritage whenever the population base was large enough. Moreover, the Census Bureau published separate volumes of 1970 census publications on Negroes; Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos, Persons of Spanish Origin; Persons of Spanish Surname; and Puerto Ricans in the United States.

6. The report's statement on page 12 that "The Bureau's collection and tabulation of data on women is deficient . . . largely because much of the census data is collected and compiled for heads of households, who, by the Bureau's definition are generally male: only where adult males are not found in a household are women considered as heads of households regardless of the contribution of the woman to the household" is completely erroneous. The same statistical data was collected from both men and women in the 1970 census, separate data were not collected for men who were household heads. In tabulation in cases where both a husband and wife were present in the household, the husband was counted as the household head. However, in tabulation of the data, husband-wife households were also separately identified as were those with a male head but no wife present, and those with a female head, with no husband present.

7. The report's statement on page 12 that "very little data are tabulated separately for female-headed households" is inaccurate. A wealth of statistical detail on the characteristics of female-headed households are included in the census volumes.

8. The report's statement on page 12 that it is not possible to compare earnings by occupation for males and females from the 1970 census as the

occupational categories listed differ for men and women is inaccurate. Statistical data on the numbers and earnings of men and women in the same occupational categories are included in the census volumes, including earnings of women employed as engineers, physicians, and architects, and of men employed as librarians, registered nurses, and dietitians, among others in the census report on "Occupational Characteristics." In some State tables abbreviated data were included because of the relatively few women or men in some occupations.

9. The report's statement on page 13 that the "Bureau's collection of Spanish origin data only as an afterthought to the . . . 1970 census illustrates its failure to be aware of the myriad of important uses of data on persons of Spanish origin" is misleading. The Bureau is fully aware of the important uses of data on Spanish origin. The 1970 census, as the 1960 census, included questions on birthplace of each person and his parents, Spanish mother tongue, and Spanish surname; in addition, the Bureau readily responded to the request of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs to include a question on Spanish origin in the census. In addition, the Bureau has continued since the 1970 census to provide current data on the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of the population of Spanish origin. The Bureau has conducted numerous workshops on the use of census data and met with a wide variety of users of Census Bureau data.

10. The report's statement on page 13 that "Bureau officials maintain that the decision to collect data on persons of Spanish speaking background is largely out of their control [since] the Bureau itself does not decide what data to collect but merely executes the will of Congress and the Executive branch" is not an accurate report of the interview by your staff member with Daniel B. Levine, Joseph Waksberg, and Meyer Zitter of the Census Bureau staff. Numerous meetings were held throughout the country before the 1970 census to determine data needs. By law, the determination of decennial census content is the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce who delegates this authority to the Director of the Bureau of the Census. Certainly, the recommendations of the Congress and the Executive Branch are carefully weighed and considered in determining questionnaire content.

11. The report's statements on page 14 that "In preparation for the 1970 census, the Bureau did not use this [Federal] task force to ensure that it acquired information on needs for data on persons of Spanish-speaking background" is incorrect. Both the Bureau and OMB, for both the 1960 and 1970 censuses, invited all relevant (in the broadest sense) agencies to participate when the Council was established and as it operated over time. For example, at the first meeting of the 1970 Council in August 1965, among the agencies represented were the Office of Economic Opportunity, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

12. The report's statement on page 15 that "Bureau officials believe that the Bureau should not make a commitment to collect data [on persons of Spanish-speaking background] in the 1980 census [since] it may no longer be in vogue by 1980 [and] the Bureau cannot be concerned with collecting data which is of only temporary interest to its users" is a wholly inaccurate report of the interview of your staff member with Daniel B. Levine, Joseph Waksberg, and Meyer Zitter of the Census Bureau staff. As they stated at that interview, statistical data on persons of Spanish ancestry in the United States will be collected in the 1980 census. The exact format is still to be determined, for data are great and the census must serve a multitude of purposes in providing the Nation's benchmark data on the population and their demographic family, educational, occupational, income, and other characteristics. The census serves the vital needs of the Nation. These are changing needs and necessarily preclude making final commitment of the 1980 census content this far in advance. What the future holds in terms of data needs is still to be determined. Not every question proposed can be included on the census document. The 1980 census will include questions to identify persons of Spanish background. The format is still to be determined.

13. The report's statements in footnote 14 on page 18 are not entirely correct. The plaintiffs changed their request on the day before the hearing. Instead of asking for a preliminary injunction to enjoin the Bureau from publishing the reports, the plaintiffs sought relief by requesting that a special statement be inserted in the census reports indicating the possibility of an

undercount of the Spanish group. It was the latter point that was denied by the court.

14. The report's statement on page 24 that "A 25 percent undercount in such census tracts could make the difference between falling within the provisions of the court decision or being excluded" is misleading. It implies that there was such an undercount, but there is no evidence of a 25-percent undercount. In fact, the Census Bureau's estimate of undercount in the 1970 census was 1.9 percent for whites and 7.7 percent for blacks, an improvement in population coverage over 1950 and 1960.

15. The report's statement on page 27 that since the higher undercount rate for blacks than whites may result in a higher undercount for cities with large black populations, therefore, the same rationale would equally apply to cities with large Spanish speaking populations is fallacious reasoning. There is no evidence that a city with a large Spanish population is more or less likely to be counted accurately than a city with a large black population.

16. The report's statement on page 35 that "In a report prepared under the auspices of EEOC, employment data [for persons of Spanish surname in the Southwest] collected by the Bureau of the Census were found to be deficient" is misleading. No indication is given of to what extent or in what manner the data might be deficient. Rather than being deficient, 1970 census data on persons of Spanish surname in the Southwest include full detail on their labor force status, occupation, industry, and income. The 1970 census provides virtually the same amount of socioeconomic data for the Negro and Spanish groups.

17. The report's statement on page 36 that "a national undercount for persons of Spanish speaking background of 25 percent could mean the loss of thousands of possible Federal jobs" is misleading. There is no evidence of a 25-percent undercount of the population of Spanish speaking background. The Census Bureau's estimate of undercount of the total population in the 1970 census was 1.9 percent for whites and 7.7 percent for blacks.

18. The methods suggested by the report on pages 38-42 for evaluating the completion of coverage of the population of Spanish speaking background in the 1970 census would not provide the necessary, reliable data to measure undercount, nor would they account for internal migration. In spite of our serious reservations regarding the possibility of arriving at reliable estimates of the understatement of the Spanish origin population at the National level for 1970, we have been investigating the available materials in the hope of arriving at some approximation of the coverage error.

Although the statement at the top of page 43 indicating that we do not have formal evidence of an undercount of the Spanish origin population is true, it is misleading. It would be more appropriate to say that "they have not yet been able to measure with acceptable accuracy the degree of underenumeration of persons of Spanish background." Demographic analysis is being tried in this connection, so that the second paragraph of footnote 1 on page 43 is a misquote, and furthermore, it is contradicted by the very next paragraph.

It is unsound to suggest that it should be readily possible to arrive at reliable estimates if the avenues of investigation mentioned in the report are pursued. Even though data on births and deaths can be computed for some local areas, for example, we still need data on internal migration.

19. The report's statement on page 43 that the Bureau's estimate of the population of Spanish origin "reflects a correction for an undercount in the 1970 census" is not correct. The differences between the 1970 census figure and the March 1973 figure occurred because of population growth, change in the method used to classify the origin of children under 14 years old living in households where the head or wife of the head was of Spanish origin; change in the categories in which persons were asked to identify whether they were of Mexican origin; change in collection methods; and because of sampling variability.

20. The report's statement on page 44 that "there are three additional reasons to believe that there was a significant undercount of the Spanish speaking background population of the United States in the 1970 census: (1) The Bureau's own estimate of the black undercount in the 1970 census; (2) privately sponsored reports and surveys of the Spanish speaking background population; and (3) the insensitivity to Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and

Cuban communities of the methodology used by the Bureau in the 1970 census" is misleading. There is no evidence that there is a direct relationship between the undercount for blacks and the undercount for Spanish. The Bureau's estimate for undercount of the white population (and 98 percent of the population of Spanish origin is classified as white) is 1.9 percent. Almost all of the privately sponsored reports and surveys of the Spanish population cited in your report are either impressionistic estimates or estimates obtained without the required quality control measures needed to prevent double counting, to completely cover the universe, and to adequately represent the population being measured. The Bureau's methodology in the 1970 census was not insensitive to Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and Cuban communities. Everyone in the field organization, both permanent and temporary was aware of the importance of recruiting minority enumerators to work in communities with heavy concentrations of minorities and worked toward that end. In selected areas where many of the residents speak and read Spanish, instruction sheets in Spanish were included with the English questionnaires. Spanish language questionnaires were available for the enumerators to refer to. During the final stages of the enumeration, many newspapers printed "Were You Counted?" forms in Spanish. And "Were You Counted?" cards were also printed in Spanish and special campaigns conducted to locate individuals who might have been missed by the census.

21. The report's description of the 1970 census methodology in page 45 and 46 noting that mail delivery is often poor in areas of low socioeconomic, high density environments and that this may have caused census forms not to reach all households, and stating that the census questions may have been too complex thereby leading to failure to complete the entire census questionnaire is an inadequate description of the census methodology and the control procedures used to assure completeness of coverage and completeness of the census questionnaires. In the major urban areas and some adjacent counties, a mail-out/mail-back method was used. Preaddressed census questionnaires were delivered to the housing units and householders were asked to fill in their questionnaires and mail them to the local census office. Census personnel then visited those who did not respond, and telephones or visited those who returned a questionnaire with incomplete or obviously inconsistent answers. In the remainder of the Country, the data on persons of Spanish background were collected by enumerators during a house-to-house canvass by direct interview. The address register used for mailing census questionnaires was corrected during three different post office reviews to be sure that all addresses were updated and missing addresses added. Census district office personnel also conducted a "precanvass" in the inner-city areas of 21 cities in a special effort to locate and add to the address lists any housing units that might have been inadvertently omitted in these difficult-to-enumerate locations.

22. The report's statements on pages 45 and 47 quoting the National Urban League and the Mexican American Population Commission of California as believing that the census count of Spanish Americans is misleading since only their belief is stated and no evidence of the amount of undercount is presented. The Census Bureau has provided the Mexican American Population Commission of California with a careful review of their report on the "Mexican-American Population in California" which contained numerous methodological and interpretive errors concerning the Mexican American population in California. A copy of our review can be made available for your use.

23. The report's description of independent reports and surveys estimating the population of Spanish background on pages 47-53 is misleading in uncritically accepting estimates that are impressionistic, unscientific, and based on sheer guesswork. The estimates cited are not based on an enumeration of the population, as was the 1970 census, but rather are based on a miscellaneous collection of unassimilated data, including such sources as onsite visits, direct contact with local governments, among others. The statement that Edward Fernandez, Bureau of the Census, agrees that there has been a significant undercount of the Spanish speaking population in the United States is not true. The statement on page 49 that estimates of the New York City Puerto Rican population are up to 50 percent higher than the Bureau's estimates is misleading. The estimates of the Department of Labor of Commonwealth of Puerto Rico based on public school and welfare statistics do not provide accurate measures of the population. The other estimates included in

Table 1 prepared by the Department of Labor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for cities in New England are also not reliable estimates, collected with a uniform set of questions, time reference, and geographic coverage, but rather are rough approximations based on information obtained from welfare agencies, police departments, and schools.

There is no evidence to support the report's statement on page 51 that the difference between the number of first and second generation Puerto Ricans in New York City obtained by the Population Health Survey of the City University of New York and the Census Bureau's estimate "is undoubtedly a conservative measure of the undercount of Puerto Ricans in New York City." The estimates obtained from the Population Health Survey differ from those obtained by the Bureau of the Census. The Population Health Survey estimated a larger number of persons of Puerto Rican birth and parentage and a smaller number of Negroes. It should be noted that the Census Bureau estimate was based on enumeration in 400,000 households whereas the Population Health Survey was conducted in only 5,000 households.

The report's statement on page 53 that the Action for Boston Community Development's survey estimate of the Puerto Rican population of Boston was 79 percent higher than the 1970 census figures is inaccurate. Their estimate of Puerto Rican birth or parentage for the 2,249 persons of Spanish language they interviewed may be higher than the Census Bureau estimates. But their survey was conducted only in the Spanish speaking community, according to your report, whereas the Census Bureau's collection was throughout the city. Moreover, your report states in footnote 25 that the authors of the ABCD report "believed that the 1970 census count of the total number of persons of Spanish speaking background in Boston was statistically reliable."

24. The report's inclusion of a statement on page 54 from a report by Prohias and Casal on "The Cuban Minority in the U.S.," asserting that there was a large census undercount of Cubans and that the only plausible explanation is "the Census 'missed' a considerable number of Cubans in Florida in 1970" is inaccurate and misleading. A review of the Prohias and Casal report suggests that they made numerous methodological errors, such as assuming that the 1970 census date was September 1, 1970 rather than April 1, 1970, and making adjustments to the census count for Cuban arrivals between September 1, 1970 and January 1971 rather than between April 1970 and January 1971; assuming an unsubstantiated underregistration of aliens; and making comparisons by States for differing periods of time, thereby minimizing the possible number of relocations during 1970.

25. The report's statements on pages 56 and 60 that the Bureau's methodology for the distribution and collection of questionnaires contributed to the likelihood of a significant undercount of persons of Spanish and that the commercial mailing lists used for preparing address registers were prepared from lists of applicants for credit cards, buyers of new cars, and persons opening bank accounts are not correct. Nor is the implication on page 60 that migrant farm workers would have been missed because they had not resided long enough in one place to establish credit.

The commercial mailing list contained house number and street name addresses only, not names of occupants as might be indicated here. The mailing list was developed by a commercial company for the universal mailing of coupons, etc. and was subjected to three post office reviews. The list was developed through many vehicles, including property tax records, building permits, canvasses, post office checks, telephone directory reformat, etc., and was not prepared on the basis cited on page 60.

There could not have been very many migrant farm workers living in areas where mail-out/mail-back procedures were used. In areas where these workers were most numerous, the mail-out only procedure (conventional census) was used and the areas were canvassed for housing units at the time the questionnaires were picked up.

Census district office personnel also conducted a "precanvas" in the inner-city areas of 21 cities in a special effort to locate and add to the address lists any housing units that might have been inadvertently omitted in these difficult-to-enumerate locations. If a unit received a questionnaire and failed to complete it, enumerators followed up, usually by personal visit to the unit. The Bureau tried diligently to identify persons of Spanish speaking background.

The data collected were extensively tabulated. The data-collection techniques employed were designed to minimize, to the extent possible, undercounts of all persons and housing units: 1) the mail-out/mail-back procedure, which helped improve census coverage, utilized a comprehensive address register to provide the control necessary to assure coverage of all addresses in the area, while in the nonmail areas, a traditional house-to-house canvass was conducted; 2) easy access to a "Spanish census form" by the respondent was secondary since nonresponse cases were followed up by an enumerator, and where necessary, the Bureau provided a Spanish speaking enumerator, and 3) the sample size used in the census for the identification of the Spanish group is not relevant to coverage.

26. The report's statement on page 56 that the questions used to identify persons of Spanish speaking background were largely inadequate is not correct. Persons of Spanish speaking background were identified in the 1970 census through questions on place of birth of each person and his parents to identify first and second generation Americans from Spanish speaking countries, a question on the language spoken in the home when the respondent was a child to identify persons of Spanish mother tongue, a question asking the respondent, if he were of Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, Central or South American, or other Spanish origin to identify persons of Spanish origin of all generations including those who might not have had Spanish as their mother tongue, and in the Southwest through classifying respondents on the basis of Spanish surname.

27. The report's statements on page 64 concerning the need for a bilingual questionnaire based on the interview of your staff member with Danial B. Levine, Joseph Waksberg, and Meyer Zitter of the Census Bureau staff has completely misquoted the Bureau staff. The tone of the entire discussion on pages 64 to 66 is objectionable, consisting of misinterpretations, hindsight, and refusal to recognize virtually any validity to the Bureau's position.

28. The report's opening phrases in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) on page 67 would be better stated as follows:

(1) Short-form questionnaire (80 percent of the households) which requested the basic set of questions such as name, age.

(2) 15-percent long-form questionnaire (15 percent of the households) which requested, in addition to the basic set of questions, information on such topics as employment, education, income, and selected housing items.

(3) 5-percent long-form questionnaire (5 percent of the households) which requested, in addition to the basic set of questions, information on some of the sample topics in the 15-percent form and on such other subjects as vocational training, marital history, and work disability.

The last sentence beginning "Thus, the census" should be deleted.

29. The report's statement on page 67 that the questions included on the 5-percent sample of the 1970 census "were the questions the Bureau treated as least important and included such inquiries as whether or not there was a dishwasher in the home or whether the respondent was of Spanish origin" is completely incorrect. The Bureau did not consider the 5-percent sample questions the least important. The unique questions included on the 5-percent questionnaires were questions on marital history, citizenship, year of immigration, Spanish origin or descent, vocational training, and disability. The questions all are vitally important. In addition, questions were included asking for age, race, sex, marital status, place of birth, educational attainment, occupation, industry, income, among others. It is not a question of relative importance as to whether an item is collected on a 100-, 20-, or 5-percent basis. Rather it is a question of how the data are to be used in terms of geographic presentation and cross-tabulations. Any item which appears on a census form is considered important or it would not be there. The fact that the Spanish origin question appears on the 5-percent form is a result of circumstances previously explained on page 8 of this report.

30. In the report's first full paragraph on page 68 the distinction offered between direct and indirect measures seems questionable because the Spanish origin question is measuring a subjective evaluation of one's background and the response could well differ for a significant number of people depending on whether one used a limited set of response categories all aimed at the Spanish group, as in the 1970 census, as compared with an expanded list of perhaps a couple of dozen categories covering other ethnic groups.

The last sentence might better begin "As part of its overall tabulations on country of origin for the foreign stock."

31. The report's statement concerning birth and parentage data on page 69 is misleading. The Bureau has never said that birth and parentage data provide a measure of the total Mexican-American population nor has the Bureau ever treated the count of first and second generation immigrants as a measure of the total Spanish speaking background population.

32. The report's statements on pages 69-72 concerning the 1970 census count of Puerto Ricans in the United States are misleading and incorrect. In all the major Census Bureau reports of the 1970 census, definitions are always included clearly defining the universe covered. In press releases and reports not including a definitions section, the correct universe has always been clearly specified in the text or tables, except in the one Note to Correspondents of March 9, 1972. Our press release of May 23, 1973 did not "fail to specify that the data upon which they were based were limited to first and second generation Puerto Ricans" but clearly stated that the count was for persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage, that is, first and second generation Puerto Ricans.

Two other totals—Spanish language and Spanish origin—were provided in exactly the same State reports as the birth and parentage figures. Table 49 (referenced at the end of footnote 33) shows the following two figures immediately above the figure of 872,471: Persons of Spanish language, 1,455,941; persons of Spanish origin or descent, 1,351,982.

As indicated by this comment, the statement in footnote 34 is incorrect in suggesting that the origin totals were published later.

Regarding the fourth line on page 72, the Bureau does not recognize any of the different figures as the "official census total."

33. The report's statements in footnote 52 illustrate a shortcoming of this entire section. Data on the social and economic characteristics of Puerto Ricans for Massachusetts, etc. etc., have been published in PC(2)-1E. There is a lack of understanding on the part of the author of the report that everything cannot be published at the same time, nor can every possible cross-tabulation be undertaken. There was a very specific reason for focusing on Puerto Ricans in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; namely that, in the judgment of those we heard, the need for cross-classification data related specifically to Puerto Ricans rather than to the Spanish language group.

34. The report's statement on pages 78 and 78 that the Census Bureau's "Spanish heritage data were released under the general classification of Spanish language" is incorrect. These data were published in the 1970 census volumes as Spanish heritage data and correctly defined as to their constituent parts. On the first line of footnote 55, why say "only limited steps"? All regular reports contain full definitions of the several groups of Spanish background and the PC(S1)-30 (available also in Spanish as PC(S1)-30S) lays it all out in summary fashion.

35. The report's statement on pages 80 and 81 that the "Commission staff recommended that Spanish origin be used as the measure to identify persons of Spanish speaking background [but] the former Director of the Census, George Hay Brown, responded that the Bureau used various approaches because there was no consensus by social demographers" is misleading. It implies that no data were published on persons of Spanish origin from the 1970 census, when in actuality there was a wealth of statistical data published on the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of the population of Spanish origin. Moreover, there was a need for the statistical information presented in the census volumes for each of the Spanish identifiers, including data on the foreign stock, persons of Spanish mother tongue, and persons of Spanish surname, as well as data on persons of Spanish origin.

36. The report's statement in the last line in footnote 73 on page 85 that data were only published for persons of Spanish origin for places of 100,000 or more is incorrect. Counts were published for places with 10,000 or more population in PC(1)-C, "General Social and Economic Characteristics"; data were also published for places with 25,000 or more persons of Spanish origin in PC(2)-1C, "Persons of Spanish Origin." Counts for persons of Spanish origin were tabulated at the enumeration district (and block group) level. Data were also tabulated for the Spanish origin population for census tracts.

37. The report's statement on pages 90 and 91 that the "Bureau's hiring practices appears to have been extremely deficient and that there was an insufficient number of bilingual (English-Spanish) census enumerators to collect, edit, and follow-up questionnaires from persons of Spanish speaking background [that] the Bureau did not make a special attempt to recruit Spanish speaking or other minority group enumerators, rather its focus in the recruitment process tended to exclude them" is inaccurate. Every effort was made to recruit minority enumerators, clerks, crew leaders, and other supervisory personnel. Special attempts were made to recruit minority personnel through newspaper ads, contacts with community organizations, and other means. The Bureau recruited by every possible method, including radio and newspaper advertising, as well as publicity through community organizations. The recruitment process did not exclude minorities, but, in fact, employed numerous techniques devised to attract them.

38. The report's statement on page 90 that the Bureau does not know how many of the 173,676 persons hired as temporary enumerators for the 1970 census were of Spanish origin and that "This failure in record keeping tends to indicate a lack of affirmative action for hiring persons of Spanish speaking background, as well as other minorities" is unjustified. There is a count of the number of temporary employees who were from minority groups, although there are no separate figures for the Spanish speaking or other segments of minority employees. The information was obtained by surveying the District offices. It was not then and still is not permissible to ask questions regarding religion, race, ethnic origin, etc., of applicants. In view of the compressed time span during which recruitment had to be accomplished and the extremely short duration of enumerators' employment, the fact that we were able to get a minority account at all is indicative of our interest in being sure that such persons were employed.

39. The report uses November 1972 SESA employment figures on page 92. November 1973 figures have been available for some time but we have no record of the Commission contacting the Personnel Division for them. In this connection, it should be noted that SESA employment figures, as of November 1973, show the employment of 63 persons of Spanish origin. This is an increase from 35 persons the previous year. It is a percentage increase from .6 percent to 1.3 percent. The grade distribution now shows: GS-15 and above—none. GS-11 through 14—fifteen (an increase from 10 the previous year); and GS-10 and below—48 (an increase from 29 the previous year). We continue to make progress in this area.

40. The report's statement on page 93 that the Affirmative Action Plan of the Social and Economic Statistics Administration "did not set specific goals and timetables for the recruitment, hiring, and upward mobility of Spanish origin or other minorities" should be revised. SESA's 1974 Affirmative Action Plan (not available at the time the draft report was written, according to footnote 26, page 95) sets definite goals for adding members of minority groups to the staff of SESA. While separate goals are not established for those of Spanish origin, the listings of colleges, universities, and community organizations in the plan include a goodly number from which one would expect to get candidates of Spanish origin.

41. The report's statement on page 95 that SESA's Sixteen Point Program is excluded "from its equal employment opportunity program" [and] does not address the need for implementing any elements of the President's Sixteen Point Program" is not supported by the facts. The Sixteen Point Program Coordinator has historically been an active member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee at SESA which advises the Administrator on the overall operation of the program. This committee contributes heavily in the formulation of SESA's annual Affirmative Action Plans and in monitoring these plans throughout the year. In addition, the Sixteen Point Coordinator consults with, and is consulted by, those persons who are designated "responsible officials" for carrying out specific action items of the Affirmative Action Plan. In fact, the Sixteen Point Coordinator is specifically designated among those "responsible officials" in such undertakings as developing special recruitment literature designed to attract minority persons and for establishing and maintaining effective relationships with the appropriate community and other organizations.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Lehman?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am looking at it from the viewpoint of Dade County, Fla. We have a large number of Spanish origin population. You are thinking in terms of the questions, and the things seem to be slanted toward the fact that they are minority. Yet the success-oriented Cuban culture—they have a work ethic more than the average American does—should make them a different category. The mayor of Miami is Spanish origin. Some of the largest factories are now Spanish-owned and operated. Probably the largest labor organization in Dade County, the hotel and restaurant workers, is Spanish-American controlled, or Cuban-American controlled.

So it is a little different in our area. Some of the native Americans feel like they are the minority in Miami. What I am trying to say is that if you look at all Spanish surnames as a monolithic thing, there is more difference between the Cubans and the Mexicans or the Puerto Ricans and the Cubans than there is between the Anglos and the Cubans, or the blacks and Mexicans, and so forth.

So I wonder whether we are really finding out what we want to find out when we look at Spanish surnames or Spanish origin as a kind of a block group, when there are important variations.

I had a meeting Saturday morning of Spanish-origin leadership in Hialeah, Fla., and there were persons of Columbian, Panamanian, and Cuban origin. They were all middle class, or better. So I wonder whether we are looking at it as a block group rather than a group that is so entirely variable in large quantity, that they are really as different from each other as other segments of American society.

Mr. BARABBA. I have to agree to you that there are several groups within the Spanish origin population. We set up our meetings in preparation for the 1980 census with several different Spanish origin groups. For example, we have had Dr. Reyes of WBJ in Miami, Fla., who has attended these meetings, and we have found that these groups are quite disparate, and they have different needs.

As we move forward in this area, we are working hard in trying to identify the differences, and in our reports and some of the reports that I believe the gentlemen from the Bureau of Labor Statistics will show you, you will be able to tell the differences among the various subpopulations of Spanish origin.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is so much difference between Mr. Reyes and others of Spanish-origin, that I wonder if the category itself has viability, except from the standpoint of language. I wonder whether this is a viable category under the circumstance of the mobility of people, mobility of class, and so forth, and whether you can really give us something to work with that has any value to help us solve our problem.

Mr. BARABBA. Those Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican categories are all broken out at the national level, and in the census they are given great detail, by specific origin.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is one other question I would like to ask, especially with respect to Cuban-born Americans. You are getting more and more people from South America coming into this country, and a lot of them are coming from Cuba on parole status. Do you

have any figures on what portion of these people are on parole status and others who are now American citizens?

I think that is important and it should be determined.

Mr. BARABBA. When we do the count, it is of all persons residing in the United States. We don't limit it just to citizens. We have not felt at this point that it was needed.

Mr. LEHMAN. However, the census does include a citizenship question. And the same thing, I think, is true if you deal with the white population or the black population. You have a range of different experiences.

Mr. BARABBA. The census gives you the ability to look at it by small geographical area, so you can isolate groups you are interested in, in Florida, or Chicago, or elsewhere. And you do get the characteristics in the census.

In the intercensus period, we provide estimates for the national level, and we do show distribution, but we can't identify the geographic piece which might be Dade County or something else, because the reliability would be too inaccurate, inadequate to do the type of balance you are talking about.

However, the 1980 census again will provide the details in which you are interested.

Mr. LEHMAN. We are also getting an influx of Haitians.

Mr. LEVINE. That would be South American, also.

Mr. LEHMAN. How about the French-speaking?

Mr. BARABBA. That is one reason we thought Spanish-speaking would not be a good point.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Lehman, some of the statements you have made certainly bear examination. I think that probably this resolution is designed to first determine if full enumeration is being made now, and then we can go from there to see what use we are making of statistics, because there are so many programs that are tied for minority groups to this, and it is possible these groups are not being allotted their share in order to give them the full opportunity necessary to the equal enjoyment of our society.

I would like to know in following up one of Mr. Lehman's questions: He spoke of people who are on parole, and I am not certain what is meant by that, but I am going to ask you about how do you enumerate those who are here illegally? Their children become American citizens, and therefore are in the total legal position as a class in this country. How do you enumerate those? Didn't your mailout in 1970 miss those who were here illegally?

Mr. LEHMAN. Parole doesn't mean out of prison.

Mr. WHITE. I assume you mean by parole, the sufferance of the United States—

Mr. LEHMAN. Beyond the categories—political refugees.

Mr. WHITE. Oh. I am speaking of those here not prior to any law.

Mr. LEVINE. I would say in my view we did rather poorly with illegal immigrants. It is rather important to remember that we rely very heavily on the voluntary cooperation of the population of the United States.

If people don't tell us that they exist one way or another—I am not specifically referring solely to the use of mail for the

moment—there is no way we can go in and find people who refuse or who are unwilling, or who for one reason or another have no desire to be counted; and I would frankly guesstimate that we missed a very large proportion of the illegal immigrants.

However, I don't want to leave you with the feeling that we just sent out a mail questionnaire, and that was a census operation. In many parts of the country where we use mail, approximately 70 percent of the country, we have a master list, and if the questionnaire was not returned, an interviewer subsequently went to that address and conducted the interview in person and obtained the information which we wanted.

Nevertheless, I still have to come back to the point that if we went to a household and there were illegal immigrants there and the people who did report or the entire household refused for one reason or another to admit to the fact that there were members of the unit who were illegal immigrants, there is no way we can get it.

All we can do is indicate the confidential aspect of the census, the importance of it, the utility of the statistics in providing the benefits which you and Mr. Lehman have referred to, and do everything in our power to obtain the cooperation of the Spanish communities to try to instill in people the need to participate.

The ultimate answer is that we probably did rather poorly with illegal immigrants.

Mr. WHITE. May I make a suggestion at this juncture? Insofar as those who immigrate from Spanish-speaking communities are not conversant with our language and therefore immediately resist answering questions coming from officialdom—there may be a latent fear of officialdom in these people—and insofar as low income areas could house some illegal aliens, wouldn't it be wise to target those areas for enumerators in the first instance, to go in and interview these people and thereby hopefully raise your percentage that you would have?

Mr. LEVINE. In some cases that might be true. In those cases where we thought it was necessary, we did use different techniques of having a much higher proportion of interviewing staff, but in all cases where we used mail or personal interview, we did try to use indigenous interviewing staff, people from the community.

We tried to get the participation of the local community structure. The publicity was trying to give the people the confidential nature of the census, the fact that the information could not be used to send anyone away or used for taxation, and the importance of the statistics.

We did make every effort we knew about at that time. We will continue to make more efforts as we understand the problem, as we become conversant with the situation in different areas. We will try to improve in 1980. That is the only answer I can give you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. The spot-checks of 50,000 households that you spoke of, were they conducted by personal enumerators, or by mail?

Mr. LEVINE. That is personal enumerators. That is a service that the Bureau has operated since 1942 on a monthly basis, whose primary objective is to collect statistics on employment and unemployment.

Mr. WHITE. Are some of those enumerators specifically hired for their Spanish-speaking abilities? Is that a prerequisite?

Mr. LEVINE. In those areas in which there are high concentrations of Spanish-speaking or Spanish origin population, we make every attempt to hire Spanish-speaking interviewers.

Mr. WHITE. Would this include the Chicago area?

Mr. LEVINE. I cannot tell you at this point specifically the number of interviewers nor their physical location.

Mr. WHITE. Do you know whether it includes the New York area?

Mr. LEVINE. Yes, the New York area, and the Texas and California area. I am not sure about the Chicago area. I know we have been making attempts to hire and train people of Spanish origin to undertake this work.

Mr. WHITE. How about the Miami area?

Mr. LEVINE. I believe we do have interviewers in the Miami area who are Spanish-speaking.

Mr. WHITE. Can you tell me about Chicago?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Not specifically in Chicago, but in Florida and in the five Southwestern States, and in New York also. I can't give you the exact figure, but we have a proportion.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is California, New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. What is the fifth one?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Colorado.

Mr. WHITE. Is it possible to crank into the computers Spanish surnames that you would use in surveying the returns on the regular census, and thereby eliminate the need for individuals to try to identify these persons?

Mr. BARABBA. The technology exists at this point. One of the things that happens is that we would then have to key the name into the record, and right now the Census Bureau is using optical scanning devices. One of the things we have hesitated to do in the past is to take the name and put in on the computer record, because of the implications of confidentiality.

Mr. WHITE. The machine scan has a name "Rodriguez."

Mr. BARABBA. It scans now and looks for filled-in circles.

Mr. WHITE. It cannot identify names as such?

Mr. BARABBA. No.

Mr. WHITE. Would it be any great technological construction to be able to read a name that would be printed in blocks, and recognize that by machine?

Mr. BARABBA. It is within the capability of the organization at this point, Mr. Chairman, but would require a greater budget.

Mr. WHITE. That would be one way to insure a higher percent of accuracy.

Mr. BARABBA. The computer is literal. If it looks at "Martin," it will read it as "Martin."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Barabba, do you generally approve the resolution?

Mr. BARABBA. We think it is fine. The reason we think it is fine is that we are moving in that direction. We would probably proceed along those lines whether the resolution passed or not, but I think it is worthwhile from the point of view of that community and their

interest in this area. There are certain specifics that we identified as needing changes in our testimony. These relate to terminology issues—metropolitan versus urban, and Spanish origin rather than Spanish-speaking—but other than that, we have no problems with the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. In 1970, were questionnaires sent out published in Spanish?

Mr. BARABBA. No questions were in Spanish, but instructions in Spanish were.

Mr. WHITE. If they could read the instructions, but couldn't read the question—

Mr. BARABBA. That is when the follow-up took place, in which we sent in Spanish-speaking enumerators.

Mr. WHITE. How many people were asked the question on Spanish origin? On how many questionnaires did it appear?

Mr. BARABBA. On a 5 percent sampling.

Mr. WHITE. You sent a questionnaire to everybody, did you not?

Mr. BARABBA. But not every person is asked every question in the census. I point out one of the other kinds of questions that were on that 5 percent dealt with citizenship.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Citizenship was one.

Mr. BARABBA. Disability and vocational training were included as well as many basic demographic and socioeconomic questions. That questionnaire really gets quite large, Mr. Chairman, if you cover the whole socioeconomic characteristics of the total population.

This is one of the reasons you sample.

Mr. WHITE. If you only had a 5 percent sampling and you have got a concentration in five States, but you are not too clear about the Chicago area, and you have some knowledge about the New York area, and how many other areas of this country, you may end up with a very poor picture, total picture, in the United States.

Mr. BARABBA. A 5-percent sampling of the total population of the United States is a very large sample, Mr. Chairman. I point out the mid-decade survey we were planning which was generally agreed to was a percent and a half sample.

Mr. WHITE. We were looking for economic indications in that particular questionnaire. You also have the problem of reluctance by reason of unfamiliarity with the language and the possible fear of officialdom, and the possible fear because of illegal position in the country.

Do you worry that your 5 percent figure is not accurate?

Mr. BARABBA. I was not involved in the planning of the 1970 census, but I should point out that in the last year, the Bureau of the Census has had 21 different meetings with Spanish organizations in an attempt to reconcile these differences.

One thing I can assure you on is that the 1980 census, the matter in which the Spanish questions will be dealt with, will be significantly different.

Mr. WHITE. Will it be asked of everybody?

Mr. BARABBA. We can't answer that, Mr. Chairman, because we haven't gone through the budget process, and we don't know how much it will cost. Our intention is to do a much better job. We will

research our ability to do things, and then we will come forth to the community and advise them of our plans.

But for us to say now that there will be a 100 percent question, that assumes we know what our budget will look like.

Mr. WHITE. It seems you not only have dangers of missing so many by taking 5 percent, but you have people who are not trained to recognize Spanish names, and that leads me to believe you have some very inaccurate results on your surveys in this particular area, and if it is important to the country to know where the Spanish-speaking people are, and how many there are, it would seem to me a very fitting question to ask everybody.

Mr. BARABBA. I think we have to be careful in our terminology, Mr. Chairman. When we say surveys, the interviewers used there are highly trained individuals. There is no question about their ability. When we talk about the full census, this is when we bring in our temporary employees. They are not as expert as are our interviewers.

Mr. WHITE. I have people with master's degrees in my office who can't recognize many Spanish surnames. This is a problem I have in my own office, and I am sure in your office, assuming the mass of information they get, they are apt to miss more.

Mr. BARABBA. That is why we move to the self-identification question. A person knows if he is of Spanish origin, and it is much more indicative of whether his name is or is not.

Mr. WHITE. If Mr. Rodriguez has an Anglo mother, is he Anglo—

Mr. BARABBA. That is up to Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. WHITE. But you could recognize his name.

Mr. BARABBA. That is why in the areas where there tends to be a preponderance of Spanish surnames, we do that as well.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much. I know this is a new area which we are exploring to try to come to conclusions that will be beneficial to the population as a whole in this neglected area. We appreciate your appearance today.

Mr. BARABBA. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. We are going to call the Honorable Fortney H. Stark, U.S. Representative from the State of California, as the next witness.

STATEMENT OF HON. FORTNEY H. STARK, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE NINTH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. STARK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. You may read your testimony or present it as you wish, and we will enter your testimony in the record as your discretion.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit my written testimony for the record. I am sure that you can all read it faster than I can out loud.

I would add additional remarks to it, if I may.

Mr. WHITE. Without objection, the entire testimony will be included in the record.

[The complete statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to come before you and express my full support for H.J. Res 406; an issue whose time has most certainly come and an issue that we should address ourselves to quickly and decisively.

On the surface, the resolution appears rather cold and simple: it instructs the appropriate Federal agencies to compile figures on the demographic, economic, and social conditions of Spanish speaking Americans. The Resolution does not introduce new, costly programs for the Spanish speaking people. It makes no promises for better jobs, improved education, or decent housing. It merely insists that accurate and complete information be collected on this all too often "invisible" and "forgotten" group.

And yet, this resolution could mean as much to these people as any previous legislation passed by Congress for the sad and embarrassing truth is that we do not have competent statistics that have been selected and organized to describe the social and economic conditions, trends and concerns of the Spanish speaking in this country. We do not know how many Spanish speaking Americans there are. We do not know where they live. We do not know the social and economic conditions under which they live. We need detailed information on the health, education, employment, income, housing, leisure, and population status of these Americans. As long as we remain uncertain, uninformed and unaware of their plight and hardships, the Spanish speaking in this country will continue to be invisible and forgotten.

To those unfamiliar with the subtleties of injustices to minorities, asking for numbers, estimates, projections—computerized printouts based on scientific methodology—might appear a simple task. In fact, many people may erroneously believe that the Bureau of the Census already performs this function with cold, objective honesty.

To the contrary, it is because the government's data collecting systems are so highly mechanized that it is so easy for insensitivity to persons of Spanish speaking background to permeate the work and result in discriminatory treatment. A recent study done by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights declared that the Bureau of the Census has failed drastically to correctly identify and record the living conditions of the Spanish speaking in this country. A conservative estimate is that over 10 percent of the Spanish speaking population was not counted during the 1970 Census operation.

The report found the Bureau insensitive and unfamiliar with the unique problems of the Spanish speaking that must be understood and overcome if useful and complete information is to be received. The Bureau employed very few Spanish speaking personnel and they were not used to effectively develop methods to reach the Spanish speaking in this country.

The Bureau, and other Federal agencies responsible for collecting population data, fail to seek the advice or participation of Spanish speaking organizations and individuals in developing their programs for data collection; nor do they offer bilingual questionnaires to all Spanish communities.

These Federal agencies explain their failure to properly identify Spanish speaking Americans in terms of increased cost, difficulty in asking proper questions, need to generalize, and unimportance of data. The disastrous results of following this limited approach and using the incomplete data thus obtained is, however, far more serious than any initial problems that its collection might raise.

Until we know exactly where, and under what type of social and economic environments the Spanish speaking of this country live, our efforts to improve their lives and offer real hope for success are little more than shots in the dark. We cannot know if we are reaching those in need with the type of assistance they can and will use without complete information.

Current demographic, social and economic statistics on persons of Spanish speaking background are needed by Federal agencies, State and local governments, private organizations and individuals for a variety of purposes including protection of voting rights, the administration of assistance programs, and the assurance of equal employment opportunities.

An undercount of the Spanish speaking population may seriously limit and infringe upon their franchise by denying them the full representation in State and Federal legislatures they deserve. Voting age data is necessary to determine whether, because of a language barrier, persons have been denied their voting rights. If, as many of us believe, this is the case, then bilingual voter assistance programs must be enacted immediately.

Federal aid to State and local governments is often allocated on the basis of demonstrated need. The size of the population to be served and its social and economic characteristics, as recorded by the Census or other population count, are the primary factors taken into account in determining that need. Therefore, an undercount, or incomplete information on environmental conditions, would mean insufficient funds for the education, manpower training, housing and social assistance programs in the community. It would also severely limit the Spanish speaking community's opportunity to receive special programs for which they may very well qualify, had they only been fully counted.

Effective implementation of Federal Equal Employment Opportunity programs is also dependent on the statistics of the ethnic minorities in the area. Once again, incomplete accountings of the Spanish speaking population will result in incomplete employment opportunities—perhaps not even out of malice or prejudice on the part of employers, but simply by their acceptance of the Federal government's ignorant and inaccurate population figures. This, I believe, is even worse than bigotry.

The need to implement this resolution is very clear. I share the fear of many that tens of thousands, perhaps millions, of Spanish speaking citizens are being denied their rights and opportunities simply because this government has failed to count—failed at a basic arithmetic, yet humane, task of identification. Our success in future efforts for the Spanish speaking in this country will depend on our ability to receive the accurate data this resolution would insure.

We need to make this first, crucial step forward. We need to make a sincere commitment, both ideological and financial, at both the Congressional and Executive levels, to employ whatever innovative and comprehensive methods we need to count the "forgotten". We must call on bilingual and sensitive persons from the Spanish speaking communities and ask their advice on how best to insure the complete picture materializes from our counts.

We must make bilingual questionnaires easily available and provide assistance to those unfamiliar with filling out these type of forms. The identification of Spanish speaking persons must be simplified by including a comprehensive "Spanish origin" section on every form. We must be creative, and we must be thorough, but most of all we must begin now. The Spanish speaking Americans have been forgotten long enough.

Mr. STARK. Thank you.

This resolution doesn't require costly new programs. It makes no promises for better jobs or improved educational opportunities for a minority group that I guess might be, by the terms of our sampling and our statistical gathering ability, the invisible or nonexistent minority. Those of us who come from areas of the country where Spanish origin or Spanish-speaking people make up the large portion of our disadvantaged and our poor, recognize that there is indeed a vast minority in this country.

The need for this information is multiple. It will help insure voting rights; it will help with Federal, State, and local assistance programs. It will insure people receive their fair share of established economic programs.

In the affirmative action, equal employment, programs the only way we have to measure the effect of these programs is by taking local statistics and measuring that against the employment profile of various organizations who claim to be subscribing to an affirmative action program.

I brought with me, for example, a very excellent publication from the Office of Management and Budget, talking about social indicators in 1973. This booklet is 258 pages of statistics and graphs dealing with all the aspects of different social and economic characteristics in this country. It contains detailed information on health, education, employment, income, housing, leisure and recreation, and population statistics.

Nowhere in this booklet does it mention Spanish-speaking minorities. None of the information provides a racial or ethnic breakdown other than "white" and "Negro and other races."

Mr. WHITE. What is the date of that book?

Mr. STARK. It is 1973, published by the Office of Management and Budget, "Social Indicators, 1973," Library of Congress 73-600356.

Mr. WHITE. This was after the 1970 census?

Mr. STARK. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

I think it is important to note that the marketing departments of most schools of business administration throughout the country make excellent use of census data, that the Bureau of the Census is quick to publish the availability of census data by ZIP codes, to help people prepare direct mailing lists and marketing campaigns. Our nationwide magazines are able to identify areas where you can advertise in their magazines and they can almost assure you that your ad would be received by no one with an income of less than \$10,000.

Marketing data generally, and the Bureau of the Census on marketing data, wants to deal with well-to-do people. I can't think of a marketing organization in this country that deals with the poor or the economically disadvantaged. I submit the business constituency of the Bureau of the Census has become our marketing enterprise in this country, and they have done an excellent job.

But I think through indifference, we may have tended to overlook the classification of minorities, and people get so concerned with accuracies of samples, and with the accuracy of data, and high square tests and I would submit that we may have to err on the other side.

I can think of absolutely no harm that could come to this country if, through the enactment of this resolution and through the efforts of your good subcommittee, we were to count a few extra Spanish origin or Spanish-speaking. We might be a little tougher on our affirmative action programs, or a few more dollars might find its way into housing for lower income rather than upper income, or we might be aware that there are more severe education, employment, and health problems in this country than we recognized.

I think that while no one wants to bring any blame and point a finger and say that our excellent Bureau of the Census or the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been derelict in their duty, I do think they have been aiming, too, at the sophisticated corporation or the sophisticated bureaucrat.

We are dealing with people who are terribly unsophisticated and need our help in counting every one of their numbers.

They are not articulate in the ways of highly complicated statistics, nor are they articulate in the ways of the marketing and advertising experts, and I think that is really the basis of what our resolution suggests, that we give them the help of saying that it is the sense

of the House of Representatives that this data shall be gathered and it will be used to help the plight of all Spanish origin or Spanish-speaking citizens of this country.

Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Stark.

I hope the other members of the committee will have an opportunity to read your excellent statement. You point out a number of failures and defects of our present system, and you explicitly state how it will affect the people of Spanish-speaking origin, such as on many of these governmental programs, education and other opportunities, and unemployment problems and so on.

I think it is very well done. I commend you on an excellent statement. This is your first term, is it not?

Mr. STARK. It is.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to commend you for your excellent representation.

Where are you from?

Mr. STARK. I represent the Ninth Congressional District, centered around Oakland.

Mr. WHITE. That would be up around the northern area and you have a large population of Mexican-Americans?

Mr. STARK. Yes; 13 to 15 percent of my constituents, depending on what numbers we use, are of Spanish-speaking and Spanish origin populations. We find unemployment in that group is running 15 to 20 percent, and those are the kind of figures we have to arrive at locally. That points out the plight of a district such as mine where we have a high concentration of low-income population, and it would help if we had those figures more frequently.

Mr. WHITE. You are not too far from Oregon. Is there a large Mexican-American population up in Oregon?

Mr. STARK. I expect there is concentrated around the city of Portland in particular, but Oregon is a small State, so that I would suspect it is a higher percentage than most people would imagine, but not as large in numbers as California.

Mr. WHITE. There, there would be another area that might be overlooked in terms of the total count that the Census Bureau would be making.

Mr. STARK. Indeed.

Mr. WHITE. You spoke of several suggestions for redress in the Census Bureau, such as hiring enumerators who are Spanish-speaking, sending out questionnaires in Spanish.

Mr. STARK. For instance, Mr. Chairman, in the area you discussed earlier, the 5-percent sample—it is my understanding that there are three levels of census sampling; 80 percent of the sample receives one questionnaire and 15 percent another and 5 percent receives another.

Further, it is my understanding that only the smallest segment of that sample, the 5 percent sample, received those questions dealing with Spanish language or origin.

That may very well be good sampling techniques if you want to assume that we are dealing with people who read English well and have an education and who are used to taking samples.

It is my understanding that commercial mailing lists are used to getting these samples. Those are used to identify property owners or taxpayers. I assure you, many of my constituents are not property owners. They wish they could be, but they don't have the money to pay a modest rent. So there is a certain discrimination that comes up in using a normally sound commercial practice, because we are dealing with a lot of people who are outside the mainstream of commercial America. That is why I believe different techniques than have been used before will be necessary to properly identify this particular group.

Mr. WHITE. One other point comes to my mind.

You are from California and you have probably observed a rather large migratory labor force that does move into Oregon, and I assume they even go to Washington and come through California and go to the Southwest, and sometimes they go into the Southeastern portion of this country for harvesting of crops.

From your observations, is a large portion of this migratory work force of Spanish origin?

Mr. STARK. I would say close to 100 percent.

Mr. WHITE. It would seem to me from the methods that have been described by the Census Bureau that this particular group would be missed in this sampling?

Mr. STARK. It is missed by the Border Patrol and by the Migratory Workers Authority in California, and indeed even the growers who tend to hire this group sometimes are very inaccurate in their counting.

Indeed, one often finds two or three workers operating under the same wage scale which gives you strange wage statistics in that area. So I would submit that it could indeed be woefully underestimated and inaccurately counted.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, this group, according to publications that I have read, need attention on educational opportunity. The children seem to drift, and sometimes don't even go to school, and this is deplorable if they are to understand the type of life that we have and the opportunities that will be open to them with education.

Mr. STARK. They are indeed a separate class of citizen which we have, because of a rare distinction of either illegal entry or temporary entry, have chosen to ignore in every way, including education of the children, which is, in my opinion, just something that we can't tolerate much longer.

Mr. WHITE. I haven't seen any estimations at all. I have no idea how many persons are included in this category.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I don't either. I could see if we could get an estimate just to submit for the record, if you would like, because I am sure there are estimates, legal and illegal.

Mr. WHITE. We will ask counsel to try to check into this. You don't have to worry about that.

Mr. LEHMAN. In Miami, counting these people, I wonder whether it applies differently in Miami. In the telephone directory of Miami, the frequency of names, before you can get to Smith, which is six, you have Rodriguez and Garcia and one or two others, but I wonder is this is a basis for determining Spanish population, whether such

a common factor as the telephone directory would be applicable to your area.

Mr. STARK. It certainly would be an interesting cross-check, Mr. Lehman.

The question, again, in my area would be that, using telephone numbers would weight against the poor in terms that they would tend to have a lower incidence of phone subscribership than the more well-to-do, and they would drastically undercount, it would seem to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is a very interesting factor, though. It seems like in our area that the Latin Americans do not put unlisted numbers in and many of the Anglos have a tendency to be unlisted.

Mr. WHITE. I would think perhaps the meter registrations might be more accurate than the telephone, although a few possibly might not have either. I think the majority have utility registrations.

Thank you, very much.

Mr. STARK. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Van Deerlin?

STATEMENT OF HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE 37TH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. WHITE. Mr. VanDeerlin is also from California, and represents the San Diego area.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, a district much like yours; a border community. By the last census, the Mexican-American or Spanish surname population in my district ran to 19 percent. Their registration as eligible voters is hardly more than a third of what is shown in the census. This, of course, is no justification for further neglect.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I have just been advised by the Census Bureau that "persons of Spanish language or Spanish surname" in 1970 constituted 19 percent of the population of my congressional district, as newly reapportioned.

But who knows for sure, either how many such individuals there are, or how they are faring in relation to the rest of the population?

In my own district, the rough indices tell me that the Mexican-Americans are lagging behind—a supposition that should surprise no one. Annual incomes for the Hispanic group are listed as being about \$600 below the norm for the district. The Census Bureau doesn't add this, but obviously language and cultural barriers are primarily responsible for the gap.

I am wholeheartedly in support of Congressman Roybal's bill, H.J. Res. 406, which would require the Federal Government to make special surveys of the social and economic conditions of the Spanish-speaking citizens of our country.

We lack these data now, and our Spanish Americans are paying a steep price for this neglect.

Even the Census Bureau now tacitly concedes it erred in counting only 9.2 million Spanish-origin persons in the 1970 census. Using new criteria, the bureau revised this estimate up to 10.7 million as of

March 1973, while Hispanic organizations put the total at closer to 12 million.

It is a shame that our Government is permitting language differences to prevent a sizable block of the population from sharing fully in the benefits of American life.

I can think of no excuse for these official oversights except insensitivity, and that is hardly an acceptable alibi.

I second Mr. Roybal's call for the Census Bureau to develop techniques "sensitive enough to produce an accurate Latino count." Presumably these improved techniques would include more personal contact, greater use of bilingual forms, and updated mailing lists.

Because of the language problem, Spanish-origin persons may well be the most isolated ethnic group in the country. As a consequence of this isolation, they may also be the most frequently overlooked category of Americans by the census takers.

Mr. Roybal's resolution would not be a panacea, promising instant redemption for the Chicanos. But it would at least mark a start toward obtaining a measure of justice for them, and therefore is worthy of prompt approval by your subcommittee.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Van Deerlin.

Now, you have been in the border area, and you know the Mexican-American people as we do. We recognize their great needs.

If you were given the job of determining how many people of Spanish origin are in the San Diego area, how would you go about it?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I would surely begin with a greater involvement of Mexican-Americans as enumerators. I don't know whether the gentlemen from the Census Bureau were asked how many persons are Mexican heritage they employed—

Mr. WHITE. I don't think they really knew. They were a little vague in their testimony.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. That is really no area for vagueness. I think a more enlightened hiring policy might help achieve accuracy. There has been reference to the reluctance of people who are on parole, or who are illegal aliens, to answer questions fully. This is completely understandable, and it isn't peculiar to Mexican-Americans or blacks. It is a reaction that is common to poor people, to people in lower educational levels, people who are likelier to be rousted by police, likelier to be evicted from their homes, than others. They learn throughout the years that you don't get racked up for something you didn't say.

So they clam up. There is this shell-like resistance to intrusion, to questions from strangers, and especially to questions from persons of another ethnic background. That is why, in minority areas of our great urban areas, it is important to have police who are of the ethnic background of the majority of residents of the neighborhood.

Mr. WHITE. You are thinking principally of first generation from some other country, those who are not as conversant with our ways and our language.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. It applies obviously to persons where there is a language barrier. The first generation who don't speak English are almost helpless in this regard. But often the second generation

too has been rousted around long enough to have a very strong misgivings about the kind of questions that appear on the census forms. So I am not at all sure that the language barrier is the only one.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, you are talking about any particular national origin group?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Would you try to collate your information with other available statistics that a local community might have?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. On that, I think I would have to yield to more expert opinion. It seems to me that we have always expected the Census Bureau to provide in and of itself the finite system for achieving a full count. And we have come a long way from Biblical days, when you had to return to the place of your birth in order to be counted and taxed.

We now have very sophisticated methods, and I have mostly praise for the Census Bureau. I am certain that they want to do the most thorough and comprehensive job possible. But we are on the firing line in a way that appointed Government employees are not, and we are likely to be the first to learn of their failures.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Van Deerlin, you have been in Congress for a number of years, and you have been involved in much social and economic legislation and have been the coauthor of much of it, and therefore are well acquainted with its import.

Do you feel that by an inadequate count that some of the people in your area might have received less than their allocated share or contemplated share of various programs?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. There is simply no question of this, and I was amazed by the variation between that 1970 count and the revised count using updated methods. A million and a half people, even in a country of this size, is a very sizable element to have missed, and therefore to have ignored.

The principle is almost the same as with cities that get a return on gasoline taxes, or State sales taxes, according to their population. If they don't have a fair shake in the population count, they are not getting the right amount of money. This is measurable.

But it goes deeper than this, as the chairman is well aware. The purpose of this House Joint Resolution is to help provide justice to all elements of the population.

The gentleman preceding me, Congressman Stark, mentioned that the sophisticated marketing agencies are left in no dark at all about the service that they are getting from the Census Bureau, and this is not surprising. There is no difficulty measuring people with \$10,000 or \$15,000 in the country. The difficulty is getting into those byways and alleyways and barrios and ghettos, finding out who is there and how badly off they are.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, very much, Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Lehman?

Mr. LEHMAN. No questions.

Mr. WHITE. We appreciate your appearance before us today, and if you have material you would like to submit for the record, we would be happy to receive it.

Mr. Wetzel?

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. WETZEL, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. WETZEL. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Good morning, Mr. Wetzel.

You may summarize your testimony, or read it in full if you wish.

Mr. WETZEL. I will summarize it, if I may.

[The complete prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. WETZEL, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR
STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear before this Subcommittee to discuss progress on the analytical and data production program of the Bureau of Labor Statistics with respect to the labor force characteristics of persons of Spanish origin. I am especially happy to be able to report that the intent of House Joint Resolution 406 is now being substantially met in the field of labor force statistics, thanks to the active support and technical assistance provided by the Bureau of the Census, the financial support provided by the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor, and the legislative support expressed in House Joint Resolution 970.

With the release in April of a study entitled Employment and Unemployment Among Americans of Spanish Origin, the Bureau launched a program of regular publication of labor force and unemployment statistics for this important group. The findings of this study provide insight into the social and economic conditions of the Spanish-origin population. Before discussing the methods of developing these data and where we hope to go in the future, I would like to summarize some of the important findings of this first study.

Persons of Spanish origin accounted for about 4 percent of the Nation's civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and over in 1973. The Spanish origin civilian labor force averaged 3.6 million persons in 1973. The labor force participation rate—the civilian labor force as a percent of population—of Spanish-origin persons did not differ much from those of their white and black counterparts. Among the age-sex groups there were several major differences. Among 20 to 24 year-old men, for example, the labor force participation was higher for Spanish-origin men than for white or black young men, while women of Spanish origin—of all age groups—were far less likely to be working outside the home. The major activity of Spanish-origin persons not participating in the labor force emphasized home responsibilities as the reason for not working or looking for work.

An average of 3.3 million persons of Spanish origin were employed in 1973. The occupational distribution of employed persons of Spanish origin was essentially similar to that of blacks, except that a smaller proportion of Americans of Spanish origin were employed in service occupations and slightly larger proportions were blue-collar and farm workers. The differences between the occupational distribution of white and Spanish workers are significant. Fewer than one-third of Spanish workers held jobs in white-collar occupations, whereas half of the whites held jobs in these occupations.

Unemployment is a severe problem for persons of Spanish origin. Their unemployment rate, at 7.5 percent in 1973, was much higher than the 4.3-percent rate for white workers but also well below the 9.3-percent rate for blacks. As with the total population, men, women, and teenagers of Spanish origin are not affected equally by unemployment; the jobless rate for adult men averaged 5.3 percent, while the rates were 7.2 percent for adult women and 19.8 percent for teenagers. These unemployment rates were higher than those for whites for each age-sex group but somewhat lower than those for blacks.

The Bureau also began in April a regular program to release labor force data on persons of Spanish origin each quarter. Data for the first quarter of 1974 showed essentially the same relationships as outlined above for 1973.

The vehicle for the collection of these labor force data is the Current Population Survey, a survey of some 47,000 households throughout the country conducted monthly by the Census Bureau. The survey provides comprehensive

data on the labor force status of the population, including employment, unemployment, unemployment rates, and the number of non-participants in the labor force, all cross-classified by a myriad of demographic and economic characteristics. In addition to the monthly data, special supplements to the survey provide information on education attainment, school enrollment, marital and family characteristics, work experience, family income, moonlighting, overtime work, and so on. The survey is, in fact, the basic source of most socio-economic statistics on the U.S. population for inter-censal periods.

In working with a sample survey, technicians face certain major limitations. One limitation is always the size of the sample relative to the reference group. A second is definitional; that is, it is essential to properly identify the item or group for which estimates are being developed. In developing current estimates for Americans of Spanish origin, both of these limitations are cause for serious concern. The problem of proper identification has been largely overcome by introducing the concept of self-identification into the survey.

Self-identification—a technique developed some years ago by Census Bureau personnel—involves the showing of a flash card containing many ethnic origin groups to survey respondents, while asking the question, "What is your origin or descent?" There are seven Spanish categories on the card—Mexican-American, Chicano, Mexican (Mexicano), Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, and "other" Spanish—as well as other major groups. This self-identification process eliminates the need for arbitrary judgments on the part of Census enumerators or artificial distinctions of other types such as classification by name alone or by language spoken in the home.

With this problem resolved, a conceptually consistent data series was developed for persons who identified themselves as being of Spanish origin. The next and more important question, given that the ethnic group can be identified, is whether the sample is of sufficient size to provide reliable data for the potential uses of this series. On the basis of a close analysis of sampling error associated with these estimates, it was determined that quarterly-average data provided an adequate sample for most analytical purposes.

We are satisfied that the Spanish-American program is progressing at a reasonable pace, but we also recognize the need for development of additional analytical capability in this area and for publication of more detailed data with greater frequency. There are, of course, the constraints of budget and personnel, and we are attempting to find acceptable ways to achieve our goals by exploring possible avenues of broadening the data base, looking forward to the day when new techniques will permit both an increase in the amount of data that can be provided as well as monthly publication. We are also working with the Census Bureau to attempt to identify a method of providing regional data that meet reliability tests.

I would like to thank the Subcommittee for the opportunity to discuss the Bureau of Labor Statistics progress and plans in the area of socio-economic statistics for persons of Spanish origin. We agree completely with the Subcommittee that the need for timely statistics for this important minority group continues to grow. Progress has been made toward reaching the goals articulated in House Joint Resolution 406, and, with the continued support of the Congress, we are confident that these data needs will be met.

Mr. WETZEL. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear before this subcommittee to discuss progress on the analytical and data production program of the Bureau of Labor Statistics with respect to the labor force characteristics of persons of Spanish origin.

I am especially happy to be able to report that the intent of House Joint Resolution 406 is now being substantially met in the field of labor force statistics, thanks to the active support and technical assistance provided by the Bureau of the Census, the financial support provided by the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor, and the legislative support expressed in House Joint Resolution 970.

I have copies of the study—based on the first year's (1973) data output—with me for the subcommittee's information, and I will

dispense with comments on it except for some observations on the unemployment situation.

We observed that in 1973 unemployment was a problem for persons of Spanish origin. Their unemployment rate, at 7½ percent in 1973, was very much higher than the overall rate for whites, which was 4.3 percent, but below the 9.3 percent for blacks.

As with a total population, we find substantial variances in unemployment among the age and sex groups. The rates for adult men, which are defined as over 20 years of age, averaged 5.3 percent. The rate for adult women was 7.2 percent, and for teenagers in the 16-19 year-old group, nearly 20 percent. In each instance, these rates are higher than for whites, but lower than those for blacks.

The Bureau also began in April, publication of quarterly data on the same characteristics for persons of Spanish origin. In the first quarter of 1974, the data showed essentially the same patterns as those measured during 1973.

The vehicle for collecting these data is the Current Population Survey which was described earlier by Mr. Barabba. I will also dispense with comments on the CPS other than to say that it is a monthly survey of about 50,000 households around the country; it is the basic source of our employment and unemployment data.

In working with this particular survey, technicians had to overcome the definitional question before tabulation of data for persons of Spanish origin. We use a concept of self-identification to determine a person's origin or descent.

This technique was developed some years ago by Census Bureau personnel. It involved showing a flashcard which contains many ethnic origin groups and asking at the same time the question: "What is your origin or descent?"

By using the self-identification technique, a data series could be developed for persons who identify themselves as being of Spanish origin.

The next, and most important question, is whether this sample of the population is of sufficient size to provide reliable data for the potential analytical uses of the series.

On the basis of very close analysis of the data for 1973 by month, it was determined that the estimates were sufficiently reliable to provide quarterly data. The Bureau's overall Spanish-American program is progressing at a reasonable pace, but we need additional analytical capability in this area and publication of more detailed data with greater frequency.

We are attempting to find avenues to achieve these goals by examining methods of broadening the data base, and looking for new techniques that would permit both an increase in the amount of data that can be provided as well as monthly publication.

We also are working closely with Census Bureau technicians in an attempt to identify methods of providing subnational data, either regional, metropolitan-nonmetropolitan.

I would like to thank the subcommittee for this opportunity to testify, and I would be pleased to attempt to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Wetzel, you spoke of flashcards. Are these flashcards used only in the five Southwestern States?

Mr. WETZEL. The flashcard is used for all new respondents in the CPS each month, except March. In March, all respondents are once again asked "What is your origin or descent" rather than simply transcribing the information obtained on the interviewer's first visit to the household.

Mr. WHITE. Throughout the United States?

Mr. WETZEL. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Do you have a record that you can submit to the committee on your findings in the Chicago area?

Mr. WETZEL. We are not able, Mr. Chairman, to tabulate these data by very small areas, because of the comparatively small size of the sample. Data are collected, as you know, under certain confidentiality restrictions. They are collected for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the Bureau of the Census. The basic record for individuals is considered an unimpeachable source. Every effort is made to prevent identification of a household or family or individual.

Mr. WHITE. I was not asking for confidential information, but for the Chicago metropolitan region.

Mr. WETZEL. No, that is not confidential. It is published on an annual basis, although without Spanish-origin tabulation. The ethnic breakdown for Chicago is so minute for Spanish-origin individuals that the CPS, at its present size would not be representative of the Spanish-origin population in Chicago.

Mr. WHITE. If I were to come to you and say, "Tell me what percentage of the population in the Chicago metropolitan area is of Spanish origin?", could you tell me?

Mr. WETZEL. We have no data on persons of Spanish origin in Chicago, sir. The best reference I would have to give would be the Census Bureau's CPS supplement which relates to data collected in the month of March and relates back to the census. Although their report series P-20, No. 264 has some geographic breakdown, data on Spanish origin persons in Chicago are not included.

Mr. WHITE. How do they get theirs?

Mr. WETZEL. In the month of March they have a special CPS sample and collect additional data in selected regions of the country, including areas already mentioned by the Director of the Census.

Perhaps it would be constructive to add that the Bureau of Labor Statistics' responsibility in this area is in the general area of classifying people by their economic or labor market status, rather than attempting to measure population as a separate variable. We are primarily interested in how extensive participation in the labor force and the incidence of unemployment is among different ethnic groups and demographic groups and a wide variety of other socioeconomic categories, and less so in the observed population figures.

Now, it is important to know, of course, that we have concentrations in particular cities, and in a city like Miami for example, one might be able to draw some inferences about the unemployment for Cuban-descent Americans on the basis that they represent a disproportionate share of Miami's population now.

But at the moment, we need such a large sample representation to get some national data that we haven't been able to find a way of

cutting the pie so that we can develop tabulations that we consider reliable.

If I gave you data for Chicago, I would have to give it to you with a proviso that as far as we're concerned, it is not accurate.

Mr. White. Can you provide this committee with the figures on how many are in the migratory work force of this Nation?

Mr. WETZEL. Well, again, we don't tabulate by the pattern of living of the individual, however, the CPS does include migratory workers if they reside in the United States. There have been several comments, however, of coverage of migratory workers, and I am not an expert at this, but I have had the opportunity to observe enumeration in the current population survey, and the selection of sample leaves out virtually no possible dwelling unit. They go to sites where there are, commonly, tents pitched, temporary living units of various kinds and migrant camps of various kinds. Indeed, we find a large share of these in any given month, and obtaining continuous household interviews in these areas is one of our problems. They are off and on vacant by virtue of the fact that there are people who are there only for a temporary period of the year.

So there is some representation with regard to the migratory stream, but the number of persons involved is statistically small so that a real study of this problem would have to be directed at drawing a sample from the migratory population alone; in effect, almost participating in the stream.

Mr. WHITE. Insofar as this is considered one of the problems of this Nation, has any study ever been made by the Labor Department?

Mr. WETZEL. I can't speak with authority on studies that have been done of the migratory stream. The BLS overall directive is national data, and we are only now getting into the business of sub-national data.

I am sure the Manpower Administration has had over the years these interests of migratory labor, and I know the training accounts have directed that special attention be paid to the migratory stream. In addition, since the demise of the OEO, the Labor Department's Manpower Administration has taken over full responsibility for the National Migrant Information Clearinghouse.

I can go back and review our records in the Department and speak to those who should be experts in this area and submit any studies that may have been done in this area.

[The documents which were furnished the subcommittee in response to the above request are retained in the files of the subcommittee.]

Mr. WHITE. If the Secretary of Labor calls you up and asks you to provide him within a week with a percentage of the migratory population of Spanish origin, what answer would you give him?

Mr. WETZEL. I would not be able to give him an answer to that question. What little data there is available cannot be disaggregated by Spanish origin.

Mr. WHITE. The vehicle used is the survey of some 47,000 households throughout the country conducted monthly by the Census Bureau. So really your records and their records would be off by

the same percentage, wouldn't they, if there were an error at all?

Mr. WETZEL. To the extent that it was incorrect, it would be incorrect in both.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Is there any effort on the part of the Census Bureau to collate or check the data that the Department of Labor Statistics submits? In other words, in the area of minorities, what percentage of the labor force is made up by certain minorities? Does your Department make any effort to go to local records or some other available records to cross-check to be sure of their accuracy?

Mr. WETZEL. We do have continuing what I would think of as a high standard of statistical reliability and technical competence applied to the data. The basic assumption is that this vehicle (the CPS) is subject to the high standard imposed on the activities regulated by the Statistical Procedures Division of OMB. We are participants in that system.

If we were ever to be aware of an error in the data and development of the data, certainly we would correct it, if it is at all feasible and possible.

Mr. WHITE. The checking is important.

Mr. WETZEL. When you come right down to it, any alternative method we would have to check on the Census Bureau collection and tabulations would be far too expensive for us to use, given our present budget. We couldn't go out and replicate the CPS. We couldn't take a census count as a check against the CPS. We have done activities studies which can suggest that the unemployment numbers we obtain on the various labor market classifications are accurate in the CPS and consistent with the concepts of the CPS.

Mr. WHITE. Do you get any reports at all from the States as to their unemployment counts?

Mr. WETZEL. We do have data on the number of persons drawing unemployment insurance benefits under the various laws, and each State has a different law. There is a subsample of that data which covers demographic characteristics. It is not classified by Spanish origin or Spanish speaking. We have only just begun to take a look at that, since we are moving, I think, more vigorously than before into areas of subnational data.

Mr. WHITE. Does your Department approve the joint resolution?

Mr. WETZEL. We certainly approve the spirit of the joint resolution and we are moving to fulfill its provisions.

The only proviso I would add is consistent with what the Census Bureau suggested, the question of Spanish speaking vis-a-vis Spanish origin. We think that more accurate data is available on Spanish origin based on the self-identification technique. Also, on the question of regional breakdowns, it is more efficient in a sample such as the CPS to use existing divisions, metropolitan, nonmetropolitan, or general regional breaks where one can aggregate a fairly large population to get a sufficiently large sample to provide accurate data.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Wetzel.

Mr. BULLOCK. I have two questions.

First, would you be willing to provide the committee with specific information concerning the reliability of the labor force data on persons of Spanish origin which you have recently begun to publish?

Mr. WETZEL. Yes, I will submit the generalized standard error tables. That is what you are asking for?

Mr. BULLOCK. Right.

[The material which was furnished in response to the above request is retained in the files of the subcommittee.]

Mr. BULLOCK. And also recognizing CPS as a source of current information on conditions in the country and the increasing use of that data for a multitude of purposes, do you feel the present size is adequate, and have studies been done from your side of the picture to determine whether it would be advantageous to go to a larger sample size?

Mr. WETZEL. Certainly one of the things we are considering all the time is the quality of the statistics required for various program and policy needs. As you know, any expansion in the sample would improve the reliability of the monthly, quarterly, and annual data. Sample expansion has not been considered in this particular context, however.

If the committee were to ask what kind of sample expansion would be appropriate, the BLS, being a service organization, would look into it and submit for your information those kinds of estimates we felt would be appropriate.

We have not considered sample expansion for this purpose, and no such proposals are currently in effect. However, if the committee were to request that we look into that question, we would submit a statement on the kind of sample expansion necessary for the purpose of obtaining better geographic coverage of minority persons.

Mr. BULLOCK. That is all.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Wetzel, do the labor unions of this country receive questionnaires from your Department in order to answer any imponderables that you might not otherwise have answers to?

Mr. WETZEL. We have communications with trade unions, and the labor and business communities on a number of issues, but not on this particular issue, so far as I know.

Mr. WHITE. Why wouldn't it be appropriate?

Mr. WETZEL. Is the question directed at a question of labor force status of individuals?

Mr. WHITE. Well, labor force status and percentage of minority groups. That is what we are talking about today.

Mr. WETZEL. I think that that is a question that is most reasonably directed at those organizations that have oversight responsibilities with respect to equal opportunity activities. Yet, we have found through our business and our labor advisory committee discussions that they look to the Bureau for data, and data collection direction in the field of labor statistics.

Mr. WHITE. The Labor Department is not interested in the percentage of minorities at all?

Mr. WETZEL. The Bureau of Labor Statistics most certainly is, and furthermore, sections of the Department of Labor have responsibility for enforcing certain rules with respect to equal employment opportunity. Those data, I am certain, are collected for both legal and administrative purposes, and we have looked into some of those data insofar as past analyses of the employment situation for black persons.

I have not, and my staff has not looked into the question of what Spanish American data might be available as a byproduct of this system, but that is one avenue that we are intending to pursue.

Mr. WHITE. You are with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. WETZEL. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. And minority groups, Spanish origin, or blacks, or whatever, are part of the labor force.

Mr. WETZEL. Absolutely.

Mr. WHITE. And this is of interest to your Department?

Mr. WETZEL. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. It would not be inappropriate to ask the labor unions to break down their membership in that regard, would it? Wouldn't this be something of a cross-check for you to determine in the skilled and nonskilled areas that are unionized what percentage are these minority groups?

You take 50,000 households throughout the United States, and certainly you would get a more accurate picture if you took labor union statistics.

Mr. WETZEL. I want to answer this question consistent with the spirit of what we are looking for, which is good information, and if I seem to be negative about it, it is because offhand I don't think it is a very good idea.

Specifically, trade unionists only account for about 20 percent of the workers in this country overall. Trade unionists, insofar as we are in communication with national and local units, may not be aware of the composition of their own organization.

For example, if I trot down to the UAW, unless they have done some very special studies, utilizing the kind of techniques, say, self-identification, we would not have an ethnic breakdown that would be consistent and applicable across a spectrum of unions that vary in size.

I will take that question home, though, and mull it over. Again, in our responsibilities of data collecting and dissemination organization—we want to provide the public and you with the best and most reliable and consistent data.

Mr. WHITE. Let me give you something else to think about while you are mulling these over.

What percentage of the households in this country would the 50,000 comprise?

Mr. WETZEL. About 1 in 1,200.

Mr. WHITE. Isn't that less than 20 percent? You said the labor unions comprise about 20 percent of the work force of this Nation. It seems to me that would be a far more reliable figure than the 1 percent you are relying on in the households.

Mr. WETZEL. In general, we take a sample equal to the total population of the union membership, but our sample is scientifically drawn to represent the entire U.S. working population, union or nonunion.

What I am saying is selecting this particular block and saying we want to take a look at it and then communicating with a president of a local, and there are thousands of locals. It would be a very expensive undertaking and not as representative of the U.S. working

population. In addition, we would have no idea of the expertise of that individual in classifying his workers.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I think it wouldn't be difficult for Rodriguez or a few like that. The reason they may not know right now is that they have never been asked.

Mr. WETZEL. I will be delighted to take a look at it.

The other side of the CPS, of course, is that it is a survey of the entire population by its place of residence. We feel that we have pretty accurate breakdowns of the occupational distribution of workers of Spanish origin, and we are satisfied that we are getting good quality information there.

The question of unemployment is the question that concerns us most. A man who is employed has a sort of a stable relationship to the society, and once you have a measure of that relationship, it isn't a serious problem. The distribution of Spanish Americans is more concentrated in less desirable occupations and some of those comments are developed in my direct testimony.

Mr. WHITE. If you want to know about the unemployment situation, the unions have an idea, because that is their job.

We appreciate your appearing before us, and if you have anything further that you want to submit for the record, we will be glad to entertain it.

Thank you, very much.

Mr. WETZEL. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. At this time, we are going to call Dr. Steglich of El Paso.

STATEMENT OF PROF. W. G. STEGLICH, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

Professor STEGLICH. There are at least three grounds on which one can testify in behalf of House Joint Resolution 406. I know of none on which I could argue against its basic intent, though I think that the label "Spanish speaking" should be changed to "Spanish origin" or "Spanish heritage." I suspect that some will oppose it on the ground that the technical difficulties of conducting monthly surveys on the Spanish origin population are insurmountable.

The first ground on which the resolution should be supported is simple justice. The Spanish origin population is America's second largest minority group, and our only large national origin and/or linguistic minority group. The Spanish origin population has been economically, occupationally, and educationally disadvantaged for decades. Such disadvantage is, at least in part, the result of the fact that they are a largely unknown group at the national level, though quite visible in some sections of the country. This unknown and forgotten status of the group can only be overcome by regular and accurate reporting about them on the part of our governmental agencies, much as is now done in respect to the black population.

The second ground is that Government programs intended to assist disadvantage people in rising a rung or two on the ladder of American life require accurate information for their implementation. Such existing programs as bilingual education, affirmative action and

equal employment opportunity programs, and, more indirectly, revenue sharing, require accurate information on income, education, and employment disadvantage, on language customarily spoken in the home, on surname, and on other identifiers of the Spanish origin population. None of this has been available until very recently, and the accuracy of that which is available has been widely challenged.

The third ground—and the one that affects me most closely personally, though it isn't the most pressing for most others who will testify here—is that one cannot do meaningful research on the problems of our society unless accurate and unambiguous information is available on its component groups. In the Southwestern United States in which I do my work, such data are simply not available on the large Spanish origin population. In other regions also, especially in the cities of the Middle Atlantic States and in southern Florida, social research is handicapped by the absence of accurate information about the Spanish origin population. But it is especially in such southwestern areas as the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, or in such cities as San Antonio, El Paso, Laredo, and Albuquerque, where the Spanish population is a majority or near majority, that the absence of accurate information inhibits realistic research as well as significant social action.

Doubtless the first ground mentioned above will be eloquently presented by others testifying here. I shall, therefore, confine my comments exclusively to the interrelated second and third points.

The Census Bureau began to recognize the importance of the Spanish population in 1969 when it included questions about them in its "Current Population Survey." It has continued to do so in each year since, expanding its inquiry year by year. Also, in the decennial census conducted in 1970, the importance of the Spanish population was further recognized by expanding the definition from the traditional identification by Spanish surname in the five Southwestern States only to new and more inclusive definitions applied at the national level. Although the intention was doubtless good, the result of the changing definitions has been negative in many respects.

Traditionally—that is, in the censuses of 1950 and 1960—the Spanish origin population was reported for the five Southwestern States only, with Spanish surname being the only identification—other than nativity by country of origin. In 1970, the definition was changed to include—in addition to surname and self-identification—something called Spanish language. This definition "comprises persons of Spanish mother tongue and all other persons in families in which the head or wife reported Spanish as his or her mother tongue." See 1970 Census of Population, Subject Report, National Origin and Language, page X. In other words, if either husband or wife, regardless of current competence in Spanish, grew up in a household in which Spanish was the dominant language, then all the members of that household are counted as being of Spanish language even if no one in it can speak Spanish. By that standard, all five members of my household are of German language, though only I can speak the language, and that only minimally after 40 years of nonuse. Basically, this composite definition of "language," surname and self-identification is also the one that was used by the Census Bureau in

its 1973 survey in which the Spanish origin population of the United States was pegged at 10.6 million.

The mischief created by this composite definition is considerable. I have time only for an illustration or two. First, the EEOC and the HEW Office for Civil Rights, in ascertaining the proper proportions of people who should be considered for employment purposes within a city, use the new 1970 "mother hubbard" definition of "surname and Spanish language." Thus they define the minority group in maximum terms when they assign "quotas" and goals for hiring purposes, but they use surname only, a minimum definition, in assessing degree of compliance. In the city of El Paso, for example, the Office for Civil Rights states that the city's population is 56 percent Spanish and that therefore 56 percent of the persons employed in the city should also have Spanish surnames. Apparently the Office for Civil Rights doesn't know, or doesn't care, that the 56 percent figure comes from a definition that includes considerably more people than those having Spanish surnames. The Census tally of Spanish surnames for El Paso lists 45, not 56, percent of the population as having Spanish surnames. To put it otherwise, Spanish surnames are 80 percent of the Spanish population of El Paso. In San Francisco and San Diego, barely 50 percent of the Spanish population have Spanish surnames. Compliance with employment guidelines which are derived from a population larger than that from which workers can be drawn is patently impossible.

Another illustration is from the field of research into vital records. I have been interested for years—and have published a number of papers in the area—in birth and death rates in the Spanish population. Such records are available on a surname basis only, and generally only at the county level—that is, the vital statistics offices of the several States do not code Spanish surnames into their records, or, if they do, they don't make them available to researchers. Therefore, one must go to the birth, or marriage certificates of a locality and ascertain from individual certificates whether the persons involved are of Spanish origin on the basis of their names. If one wishes to convert such records to ratios and rates, he must—after 1960—divide the surname records by a denominator which defines the population in larger terms than the population being studied. The result, apart from being inaccurate, is to produce lower rates than really exist. In sum, one cannot study births, deaths, marriages, employment patterns, educational records, and so on, all of which can only be based on surname identifications, unless one has surname data on an age and sex basis for the communities being studied. These are not available since the decennial census of 1960.

One other illustration will suffice. At the University of Texas at El Paso we have just received a grant from the National Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency to train MA level evaluation researchers in crime and delinquency programs. The objective is to train bilingual and bicultural persons who can go into southwestern communities and assess the effectiveness of various Federal crime and delinquency control programs, especially LEAA type programs, within the barrios as well as in the communities in general. There are no reliable social indicators for those barrio populations available at present. Our trainees and their teachers will have to have

monumental imaginations and exceptional skill to assess the effectiveness of these programs, for the records on the Spanish populations to be studied are, as indicated above, too ambiguous and too inaccurate to allow for precise analysis.

Although the concern of most interested persons is that the Spanish origin population is undercounted by the Census Bureau—whether in the 1970 decennial census or in its annual surveys—it is clear from the illustrations I used above that there are also other problems, especially problems of ambiguity and inaccuracy. From my point of view, the real problem is not that the Spanish population is undercounted; it is that we really don't know whether the counts are correct or incorrect—and, if incorrect, how large the error is. Indeed, the problem is that we don't really know whom we are counting.

There are at least five ways to count the Spanish population in the United States: (1) The traditional surname only approach; (2) the self-identification approach used experimentally with a 5-percent sample in the 1970 census and used more effectively in the current population survey of the last several years; (3) national origin; (4) mother tongue; and (5) current language used in the home. The 1970 census uses all of these except the last one, and the CPS reports use all of them. A composite definition employing all of these identifiers doesn't enumerate the Spanish-speaking population, though it probably comes as close as we can get to identifying the Spanish heritage population. However, for many purposes, especially those involving such characteristics as employment, education, births, deaths, and marriages, surnames only can be used. If we are all to be talking about the same population, whether we are the EEOC, the National Council for La Raza, or some obscure researcher in a southwestern community, it is imperative that we have accurate and unambiguous indicators for the population being discussed, indicators which can be combined or sorted out separately. From my point of view, the crucial one of these is still the surname. I trust that when House Joint Resolution 406 is adopted and implemented, the compilation of data that it requires will include accurate information on surnames as well as on the Spanish origin population in general.

Finally, I recognize that data of the kind needed and described above cannot provide for small local areas such as a specific community except in decennial censuses. That is, sampling the national population—as is done in the annual current population surveys, for example—simply can't provide the kind of information for El Paso or San Diego or Hidalgo County that is needed. There is only one way to provide it, and that is for the Census Bureau to make available surname data for 1970 of the kind that it published in 1950 and 1960. Researchers can then extrapolate those data to 1974 and following for use within the decade of the 1970's. And even this, unfortunately, would benefit only the five Southwestern States.

There is one other thing that must be done, and that is that the mistakes of 1970 be not repeated in the next census. Surnames, customary language spoken in the home, ethnic self-identification, nativity status, and possibly mother tongue should be ascertained. In the Southwestern States, Florida, and the Middle Atlantic States, if

not in the Nation as a whole, all of these except self-identification should be gathered from larger samples than were used in 1970—say, 25-percent samples—to provide better data at the local level. Ethnic self-identification should be made a 100-percent item along with race, sex, age, and residence. If these things are done, the confusion and ill feelings generated by the 1970 census can be put to rest. And if I read House Joint Resolution 406 correctly, this is what will have to be done to carry out its purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Doctor. You have expanded on some points that have been elicited from the various witnesses. You go even further. You are saying specifically that it requires a 25-percent sampling rather than the 5 percent which was testified to, to have any type of validity. I am inclined to agree with you. You speak of 100 percent self-identification on the questionnaires sent out. I think perhaps you are right on that.

I was looking at your testimony to determine in addition what you feel should be done in order to insure the adequacy of the census, and I presume you would be in accord with Congressman Van Deerlin's statement that enumerators should be out among the minorities, that can be identified, such as in San Diego and El Paso. Would you agree with that?

Professor STEGLICH. Yes. I think in El Paso they were primarily Spanish speaking. A number of my students were employed. I can't speak for the rest of the Southwest.

Mr. WHITE. Would you say a mail-out of the nature of the census in 1970, without proper followup would be sufficient to gather the information that would be necessary to form a proper picture?

Professor STEGLICH. No, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Do you think that a mail-out followed by the enumerator would be appropriate, or the initial contact should be by an enumerator?

Professor STEGLICH. I think in areas such as El Paso, and indeed the whole border, especially south from El Paso to the Lower Rio Grande Valley, mail-outs are simply not feasible. They are not feasible as census-gathering devices,

Mr. WHITE. How would you go about trying to enumerate the migratory work force and determine the percentage of that force that belongs to minorities, such as Spanish surname people?

Professor STEGLICH. That is a hopeless problem, I have attempted to do that at Texas Tech, rather than the University of Texas, and I discovered that nobody knows what the size of the migratory labor force is. We know substantially that it is 100 percent Spanish or Mexican origin population in the Southwest, but the estimates range from, well, the errors are in the range of several hundred percent for the several estimates.

I have interviewed children in the migratory stream in the schools, I have interviewed adults. There is no way to estimate their numbers.

Mr. WHITE. What do you think of the value of trying to coordinate information with local records? Do you think this has any value at all in the accuracy of the census?

Professor STEGLICH. I am not at all familiar with labor union records. So I can't comment on that particular form. However, I have

done a great deal of checking myself with birth records, school enrollment patterns, and this sort of thing, and have attempted on the basis of them to predict the population for the next census. In fact for El Paso in 1970, I had predicted in 1969 that there would be 48 percent Spanish surname on the basis of births and school enrollment. The figures indicated that it was 56 percent. I could not harmonize my errors with the new figures, until I discovered a year later that they had changed the definition. They were no longer talking about surname, but surname plus this so-called language definition.

Mr. WHITE. Doctor, for the record, it would be helpful if you could describe your background and your particular field of study.

Professor STEGLICH. I am a sociologist who has spent most of his life in the Southwest, whose primary interest is demography, a study of population composition and change.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, sir. We certainly appreciate your coming to testify. We know you came at personal sacrifice and personal inconvenience, considering the distance covered. If you have anything further you would like to submit for the record, we would be glad to receive it.

At this time we call on Dr. William C. Motes, from the Department of Agriculture.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. MOTES, DIRECTOR OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY J. RICHARD GRANT, STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE; AND VERA J. BANKS AND ROBERT C. McELROY, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Mr. MOTES. Mr. Chairman, I have a short statement. With your permission, I will read it.

Mr. WHITE. Please proceed, sir.

Mr. MOTES. I am responding on behalf of Secretary Butz to your invitation of May 8, 1974. I am accompanied by J. Richard Grant of the Statistical Reporting Service, and by Vera J. Banks and Robert C. McElroy of the Economic Research Service.

I will address myself only to the implications of the resolution for the Department of Agriculture. Under the resolution, the Department of Agriculture, as well as the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor, would:

Undertake further efforts to collect and publish regularly statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic condition of Spanish-speaking citizens in urban and rural America.

At present, the Department of Agriculture conducts an annual national sample survey of farms, in which it identifies the population residing on farms, and the distribution of this population by location and farm characteristics. The racial categories now used are white, black, and all other. There is no major problem involved in adding a category for people of Spanish-American origin, although we have some question about the suitability of the term "Spanish-speaking citizens" as employed in the resolution. However, we have not added this category to the annual survey on farms and

farm people because of the comparatively small number of Spanish Americans who live on farms. About 11½ percent of U.S. farm residents are Spanish Americans, as shown by the 1970 census. This number is too small to yield very meaningful or reliable results in a sample survey of the size and design currently in use. The Department could make a pro forma compliance with the resolution insofar as its current farm survey is concerned, but without a great deal of useful effect.

We have no means at present of engaging in regular general surveys on the social and economic conditions of the rural population. Almost any activity of this nature would have to rely on the "Current Population Survey" of the Bureau of the Census. The representatives of the Census Bureau have addressed the issue from their point of view, but I would only note that the Current Population Survey is not designed to yield annual updated data on the rural population per se, although it could be used to identify the population on an updated metropolitan-nonmetropolitan basis.

In summarizing the problems of the Department of Agriculture in complying with H.J. Res. 406, I want to emphasize that the Department is concerned with the need for data regarding Spanish Americans. We collect and publish annually a great deal of information on the participation of Spanish Americans in the programs of the Department. In social and economic research we have sponsored a number of special studies and tabulations on the situation and problems of this population, including some done under contract for us by the Bureau of the Census. For example, the Economic Development Division is now preparing a report based on the Current Population Survey of December 1973 which will include national data on income of hired farmworkers by ethnic groups, including Spanish Americans. In addition, we are studying migration from Spanish-American villages in New Mexico.

The scope of our research is limited in that we do not have a survey capable of providing regular and detailed information for rural people in general. We shall probably find that our research activities in regard to Spanish Americans—as well as other groups of special interest—will continue to be restricted to particular problems or areas, unless we have access to additional socioeconomic statistics.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Dr. Motes. In reference to page 3 of your testimony, the last statement, what additional socioeconomic statistics do you have reference to, and where would they come from? Speaking of an expansion of the Census Bureau surveys, are you speaking of that more than anything else?

Mr. MOTES. We depend on the Current Population Survey for most of the characteristics of these populations. We did not mean rural people specifically. To do that, you would need a larger sample.

Mr. WHITE. So, to do your job better, you would have to rely upon their expansion of their activities

Mr. MOTES. Many questions we would like to answer we cannot now answer with the current survey.

Mr. WHITE. Has your Department made any request of the Census Bureau to gather further information for the Agriculture Department?

Mr. MOTES. We regularly ask them for special surveys, and we pay for some of these. We always run into fund limitation problems in these areas.

Mr. WHITE. Is your Department consulted on the composition of the general questionnaire?

Mr. MOTES. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Have any of the questions you have submitted been rejected?

Mr. MOTES. I am sure they have. I can't say specifically.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel it would be of help to include more questions about rural population and their movements and activities than is now presently contained in the surveys made?

Mr. MOTES. We would have interest in more questions, but also in a larger sample, so that we could have and publish, more detail on local areas.

Mr. WHITE. By larger sampling, are you suggesting larger expansion into the rural areas, or larger in terms of numbers?

Mr. MOTES. In terms of numbers, which would allow publication of more detail for local areas, including rural areas.

Mr. WHITE. What percentage did you have in mind? What percentage do your experts say would be appropriate in order to accurately reflect this information?

Mr. MOTES. I simply don't know. We can respond to that question.

Mr. WHITE. Would you, please, for the record, and let us know what the Department feels would be a proper percentage of sampling that would accurately reflect conditions for the Agriculture Department? I presume by that you are talking about the rural areas, going into rural areas, as well as the metropolitan areas.

[The letter which follows was received for the record:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1974.

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics,
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request, during our May 28th testimony on H.J. Resolution 406, for us to provide additional information on our research data needs and our evaluation of the sample size required for the Current Population Survey of the Bureau of Census to provide the appropriate data needed.

The Economic Development Division administers a national program of economic and social research and performs associated staff and service work on a broad range of activities related to the development of rural areas. In the conduct of our work we utilize statistics from all available sources and sometimes conduct special surveys to obtain detailed information on a specific geographic area.

As you know, only the decennial Census of Population provides detailed demographic and related social and economic data on the population and labor force at the state and county level and breakable on a rural and urban basis. Because of normal on-going changes affecting such information, however, the value of the data declines with time and for many purposes, such as labor force evaluation relative to industrial development or other investment purposes, and becomes dated before the next Census.

In these intercensal years, the Current Population Survey is the major vehicle providing social and economic statistics. However, this survey was designed

essentially to provide National level statistics and, as we indicated in our testimony, not to yield annual update data on the rural population. While we utilize this survey to obtain annual information on the nation's hired farm work force, farm and nonmetro population, and for other purposes, an expansion of the sample size to provide sub-national geographic and demographic detail on the rural population and labor force at some points during the decade, such as bi-annually, would be most helpful. We believe that this information should be sufficiently consistent with that obtained in the Census so as to be comparable for purposes of evaluating changes and trends and at the same time enable foregoing the sample survey during the census year.

The type of information collected during the intercensal surveys should include such basic data as the magnitude and ethnic composition of the population; the size and composition of the labor force, employment and occupational status, age, education, and income level.

We understand that the Census Bureau proposed a sample of one and one-half percent to obtain mid-decade data for states, large SMSA's, and groups of counties that would aggregate 50,000 or more in population at an estimated cost of \$45 million. A doubling of this sample would probably enable breaks on a rural and urban basis of the data for State and county groups and thus allow provision of the type of "rural" information indicated above with less than a proportionate increase in cost. To obtain such information for individual counties would require a much larger sample, perhaps up to a full Census, to accomplish and be considerably more expensive.

I have been pleased to respond to this request and hope this information and these estimates will be useful in your endeavors.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. MOTES,
Director, Economic Development Division.

Mr. MOTES. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. On page 2, you said that you have no means of engaging in general surveys, and that has already been answered. That is because the Census Bureau just hasn't expanded sufficiently in order to make those studies.

Counsel?

Mr. BULLOCK. I have one question regarding the migratory work force. You mentioned that you will be coming out with a study soon that will include national data on the income of hired farmworkers, and I guess that will provide some perspective. Do you furnish information on a regular basis with respect to migrant farmworkers, either Spanish-American or overall?

Mr. MOTES. I will let Mr. McElroy respond to the question.

Mr. McELROY. We use the Current Population Survey to do an annual study of the hired farm work force, where we obtain the total number of workers and the proportion that are migratory as well as the number of days work and annual earnings of all these people.

Mr. BULLOCK. I think that is all.

Mr. WHITE. The fact is, Dr. Motes, that the Agriculture Department and several other Departments seem to have the same built-in potential for error, because they all seem to rely on the Current Population Survey for the analysis of their respective fields. Is this true, sir?

Mr. MOTES. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. It would seem to me if we are going to insure greater accuracy, there should be more checking on some of this. In this instance, percentages of minorities of Spanish origins in a particular field, like in the farming field, or whatever.

Mr. MOTES. In that regard, we conduct studies in great detail in some areas, small selected areas, and I have a set of publications here, which I would be happy to leave with your staff.

Mr. WHITE. I think we would like to have that, and counsel will submit for the record whatever portion of those publications are pertinent.

Mr. MOTES. I am sure you can understand we are unable to cover in this kind of detail anything like all those areas or problems that need to be studied.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me that you are in a sense blind in many of your areas of interest, because you have to rely for more detailed information on the decennial census, as I understand your testimony. Every 10 years then you receive a great deal of information, but in between, you have a blind spot of 10 years, because the census, the current population census, does not cover the rural areas. Am I correct?

Mr. MOTES. Yes, sir. We find it very difficult to make specific conclusions about many kinds of social problems in rural areas between the censuses.

Mr. WHITE. I assume you would, like the others, be unable to tell us or even make a guess of what the migratory force numbers are.

Mr. MOTES. We have estimates on that, and I will let Mr. McElroy answer that.

Mr. WHITE. We would like to have some of those.

Mr. McELROY. Our estimate for the year 1973, which came from the December survey is approximately 200,000 migrants, of which about 35 percent are Spanish-American.

Mr. WHITE. How did you arrive at that, sir? How did you get those figures?

Mr. McELROY. This comes from the Current Population Survey that has been discussed here this morning, and the flashcard which the gentleman from Labor talked about is used. The survey, again, is done at the end of the year when the migrants, the interstate migrants, have practically all gone back home, south Texas, Florida, and California.

From that survey, the figures are tabulated and compiled, which results in these estimates.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask a question I should have asked earlier. I presume that 50,000 different households are reviewed each time and not the same households.

Mr. McELROY. No, not really. The households do rotate, but they don't rotate in total. I don't know the exact number, but it is something like a fourth of them rotate each time.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, it is very likely that the same household could be hit a number of different times?

Mr. McELROY. If I am correct in the quarter, it could be hit four times.

Mr. WHITE. In 1 year?

Mr. McELROY. No, no. I am speaking only about our annual survey now. The Current Population Survey is operating monthly for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. McELROY. I think Mr. Grant wants to speak to that.

Mr. GRANT. This is a monthly survey panel that is on a continuing basis around the year. The census rotates out each year's samples in a certain proportion, but it is correct that those in the sample or the panel would get the same questions asked each month.

Mr. WHITE. The same people each month?

Mr. GRANT. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. So, we are really talking about 50,000 households a month, and not 600,000 households per year?

Mr. GRANT. Yes, with the understanding there is a rotation procedure.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Census Bureau hit 50,000 each month, or a certain percentage of 50,000 each month?

Mr. GRANT. They hit 50,000 each month, and on that subject, I would like to correct one point. I think you made the point that this is a metropolitan sample, but it is metropolitan and nonmetropolitan as well. The point we are making is that the distribution outside the metropolitan areas, particularly in the rural area, is relatively small.

Mr. WHITE. Percentagewise and populationwise, do you feel a less representative group is interviewed in the rural areas than in the cities? In other words, it is not proportionate?

Mr. GRANT. It is proportionate, but the sample was not designed to provide for a break of rural households. All sample households located outside of the standard metropolitan statistical areas are grouped together under the heading of "non-metropolitan," which includes many urban as well as rural places. We have found there are so many more urgent demands for increasing the sample in the metropolitan areas, among minority groups with respect to income statistics and education and so on, that we have difficulty getting a proper appreciation for increased data needs in the rural areas.

Mr. WHITE. If this committee were to ask of you, in the five Southwestern States what percentage of the population is of Spanish origin, would you be able to provide those figures?

Mr. GRANT. No, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Do they exist?

Mr. GRANT. This would necessarily depend on Census data.

Mr. WHITE. I know, but do those figures exist?

Mr. GRANT. For the decennial census years.

Mr. WHITE. Just every 10 years?

Mr. GRANT. My understanding is that CPS would not have this.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Census Bureau break it down after they compile the decennial census so one can take a read-out and determine what percentage of the rural population in, say, the five Southwestern States is of Spanish origin?

Mr. GRANT. Mrs. Banks, perhaps you have that.

Mrs. BANKS. We would give you these data from the 1970 census, but it is not available from any of the present census surveys. It is available from the census. You can get the estimates of the Spanish-American population.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

Mr. McCLUSKEY. Dr. Motes, this 200,000 figure of migrant workers that you come up with, is that from your annual survey by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MOTES. By the census.

Mr. McCLUSKEY. Let me carry on this, and you can answer the whole thing. You have here on page 1 of your testimony that the Department of Agriculture conducts a national survey of farms, and you have established 200,000 migrant workers, and then you state 35 percent are Spanish speaking, but you only asked on that survey according to page 1 of your testimony, the racial categories: white, black, and all other.

Mr. MOTES. These are different surveys. The survey we are talking about on page 1 is a survey of farms conducted by the Department of Agriculture. This survey identifies and examines the population residing on farms, their geographic distribution, and characteristics of the farms on which they live. The other is the Current Population Survey conducted by the Census Bureau which has been discussed this morning. Through this national survey we obtain estimates of the size, composition, and migratory status of the hired farm work force and information on selected personal and economic characteristics of this work force. We can go into more detail on how we make these various estimates if you wish.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Dr. Motes, and your associates. We appreciate your coming.

If there is no other business at this time, the committee is adjourned until June 11 for a continuation of these hearings.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene on Tuesday, June 11, 1974.]

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1974

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:30 a.m., in room 219 of the Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Richard C. White (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. WHITE. The Subcommittee on Census and Statistics will come to order.

We are meeting today to hear additional testimony on House Joint Resolution 406, introduced by Congressman Roybal of California.

The purpose of this resolution is to encourage a greater Federal output of relevant statistics on Spanish-speaking Americans.

It is estimated that there are now approximately 12 million Spanish-speaking Americans in this country. Many of these persons experience major social and economic problems which effective legislation could do much to rectify.

Congress, however, cannot hope to formulate such legislation in the absence of satisfactory information concerning conditions in the Spanish-speaking community. If effective programs are to be established, it is essential that accurate, comprehensive, and up-to-date statistics on the Spanish-speaking population be produced on a regular basis.

House Joint Resolution 406 raises disturbing questions concerning the adequacy of present Federal Statistics on the Spanish-speaking Americans. Our purpose in holding these hearings is to provide interested parties an opportunity to comment on the issues raised in the resolution.

On May 28, the first day of the hearings, the subcommittee heard from two Members of Congress and representatives of Government statistical agencies.

At this afternoon's session, we shall hear from the bill's sponsor, Congressman Edward Roybal of California, Louis Nunez, Deputy Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Robert Cueller, American G.I. Forum, and Marion Obledo of the Mexican-American Legislation and Education Fund. Mr. Obledo will be the first to testify and will be introduced by Mr. Manuel D. Fierro, president, Raza Association of Spanish-surnamed Americans.

Mr. Benitez was scheduled for the afternoon session but he will be here this morning, instead.

Mr. Obledo, I had a note here that Mr. Fierro was going to introduce you.

STATEMENT OF MARIO G. OBLEDO, COUNSEL, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
 ACCOMPANIED BY JOE BENITEZ, PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF UNITED
 LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS; AND MANUEL D. FIERRO, PRESI-
 DENT, RAZA ASSOCIATION OF SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICANS

Mr. FIERRO. Thank you.

I want to thank you all for the opportunity to appear before you this morning and I want to introduce to the subcommittee the two gentlemen next to me. Right next to me is Manuel Obledo, former general counsel for the Mexican-American Legal and Educational Defense Fund, also a member of the American Bar Association in Texas and who was responsible for the Mexican-American population study that was conducted in California that related to bringing the number of the Spanish-speaking up by 1.5 million.

Mr. Obledo has considerable experience in the field of litigation and he, particularly, has a great deal of experience in the area of census and statistics through his efforts in California.

Next to him is Mr. Joe Benitez, who is the National president of the League of United Latin-American Citizens which is the largest single member organization of Spanish-speaking Americans in the United States, with 33 chapters throughout the country.

Rather, there are chapters in 33 States in the United States and Mr. Benitez is the first national president on a full-time basis with the league, so he will be responding to your questions.

I would like to introduce Mr. Manuel Obledo who will read his testimony.

Mr. OBLEDO. Thank you.

The Mexican-American community of the United States has an ongoing dialog with the U.S. Bureau of the Census as a result of the population statistics released by the Bureau enumerating the number of Spanish-surnamed Americans in this Nation in 1970.

The population figure was immediately challenged, and rightly so. Leaders in Mexican-American affairs knew the February 1971 report, allegedly based on a 2,000-family sample, was an obvious undercount. What they did not know, of course, was whether the undercount was due to the Census Bureau's haphazard methodology or to overall inefficiency.

I shall not detail the need for an accurate count of the Spanish-surnamed or of the Mexican-American. Suffice it to mention, however, that the statistics released by the Bureau have an impact on the socioeconomic and political posture of this significant identifiable ethnic group. I refer this subcommittee to the just released report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Counting the Forgotten," for a detailed analysis on the deficiencies of the Census Bureau in regards to census taking of the Spanish-speaking population. The Commission's findings should be adopted by this subcommittee and its recommendations should be implemented by the Bureau.

I should like, however, to relate to you the actions taken in response to the Bureau's 1971 report by a concerned organization under the legal counsel of Mr. Robert Gnaizda, Public Advocates, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

Because of the Census Bureau's indifference in 1971 to the obvious undercount of Spanish-surnamed Americans, which undercount had been called to their attention, the Mexican American Population Commission of California, in April 1971, completed and published, "An Official Census Report by the Mexican-American Population Commission of California."

This report documented that the Spanish-American population in California as of 1970 was at least 3,140,000 or approximately 50 percent higher than that reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census ignored the findings of the Mexican-American Population Commission. In October 1971, it issued an official publication allegedly showing a nationwide decrease of 274,000 Mexican-Americans and approximately 2 million Spanish-American residents in California.

At that point, gentlemen, I wrote Mr. Brown of the Census Bureau, asking that the priorities given by the Bureau would be to find the missing 274,000 Mexican-Americans which comprised at least the missing number of persons in Vietnam at that time.

The Mexican-American leaders knew that, obviously a decrease of 274,000 in a period of several months was obviously an error on the part of the Census Bureau.

Thus, it was that on November 29, 1971, American-Mexican organizations, supported by the Mexican-American Population Commission, filed suit in Federal court in San Francisco charging the U.S. Bureau of the Census with deliberately undercounting Spanish-Americans. (*Confederacion de la Raza Unida, et al vs. George H. Brown, Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census, et al* [N.D. Cal. No. C-71-2285 REP].)

What they wanted was to publish a warning in the census figures, stating that the figures therein might not be accurate. That would give notice to the Federal agencies and private institutions as well that the figures being released with regard to the Spanish-speaking population could have been inaccurate.

On December 22, 1971, the U.S. Bureau of the Census pursuant to this Federal court suit, reluctantly released its own statistics documenting the accuracy of the Mexican-American Population Commission's April 1971 report.

These new Census Bureau statistics implicitly contradicted its own October 1971 report. Specifically, the U.S. Bureau of the Census admitted that there were at least 3.1 million Spanish-Americans residing in California as of 1970. This was virtually identical to the statistics contained in the Mexican-American Population Commission's report released 8 months earlier.

On April 25, 1973, the Census Bureau belatedly acknowledged that it had undercounted the black population by at least 7.7 percent, 1.9 million nationwide undercount. However, the Census Bureau admitted that despite Spanish Americans being in a similar socio-economic position to blacks, it had not sought and could not seek a specific recount of Spanish-Americans.

In June 1973, the Mexican-American Population Commission, still unable to secure redress from the U.S. Census Bureau, despite the similarity of undercount problems among blacks and Spanish-

Americans, released its own report showing that as of April 1973, there were over 3.7 million—3,758,000 Spanish-Americans in California. This report was praised by Senators Cranston, Tunney, and Montoya.

Despite this report and the accuracy of prior Mexican-American Commission statistics, the Census Bureau refused to acknowledge the validity of the methodology or the accuracy of the statistics.

In January 1974, however, the Census Bureau again belatedly acknowledged that the methodology we criticized as early as October 1971 was inadequate to accurately count Spanish-Americans.

Now, this was the methodology that the population Commission had criticized the Census Bureau for utilizing.

Consequently, the U.S. Census Bureau, based upon its new methodology, discovered that there was a 1.5 million increase in the Spanish-American population. Further, it reluctantly acknowledged that a substantial portion of this 1.5 million increase was due to a 1970 undercount.

On May 10, 1974, the Census Bureau once again acknowledged the accuracy of the census taken by Spanish-American organizations and in particular the Mexican-American Population Commission. It acknowledged that there were 643,000 more Spanish-origin persons in 1973 than there were in 1970 for the State of California. This 27-percent increase in 3 years was obviously not due exclusively to population increases and resulted from an undercount.

In fact, this increase of 643,000 reported by the Census Bureau meant that there were 3,744,000 Spanish-Americans in the State of California as of April 1973. This census figure is virtually identical to that set forth 11 months earlier by the Mexican-American Population Commission of California, 3,578,000 versus 3,744,000 for the Census Bureau.

The League of United Latin American Citizens, the American G.I. Forum, the Mexican-American Political Association and the Mexican-American Population Commission of California believe that the foregoing demonstrates the historical weaknesses of the Census Bureau in counting minorities and in particular Spanish-Americans. Further, it demonstrates that there is at least some validity and some merit to the informal census conducted by major Spanish-American organizations under the supervision of the Mexican-American Population Commission.

These organizations, therefore, respectfully request that the following action be taken within the next 90 days:

- (1) This subcommittee formally request that the Census Bureau activate a pilot study to determine whether, in fact, its methodology can do the job or, in the alternative, whether the methodology suggested by Spanish-American organizations is more likely to produce an accurate count and full cooperation from Spanish-American groups.

- (2) The outline of the pilot study we propose which would cost less than .02 percent of the cost of a full-scale census, and that would be \$50,000 to \$100,000 depending on the intensity of the study, compared to what I understand is a \$500 million budget for the Census Bureau, this pilot project would be as follows: American areas of East Los Angeles, San Antonio, Phoenix, Chicago, and New York City. In each city, of the 10 census tracts, 5 tracts would have the population

counted by the Census Bureau in accordance with the methodology used in the 1970 Census.

In the other five tracts in each city, Spanish-American organizations would conduct the census, accompanied, of course, by official Census Bureau observers for verification. The results in each case would be compared to the 1970 census.

Ten census tracts would also be chosen in the rural areas of each Southwestern State and the same procedure would be utilized as used in the urban centers.

We believe that we will show a significantly large statistical differential between the results in those census tracts where 1970 methodology was used and those where the Spanish-American conducted methodology is operative.

In fact, we predict that there will be a minimum of a 10-percent differential and perhaps as high as a 25-percent differential.

To put this in context, such a differential projected over the Nation would mean the addition of 1 to 2.5 million more Spanish-Americans.

The Census Bureau has admittedly failed in all its past efforts to accurately count Spanish-Americans. The Census Bureau today has a creative and imaginative new Director, Mr. Vincent P. Barabba, who has engaged in commendable efforts to reach minority communities and, in particular, Spanish-American communities. What we propose would be consistent with his efforts and, equally important, consistent with the efforts every agency is now making to reach minorities and establish credibility with minorities.

We believe our offer is one that can only enhance respect for this Government and the Census Bureau and, therefore, respectfully request an affirmative answer to this pilot study within 30 days.

I might add, and I would like to submit for the use of the subcommittee the Mexican-American population report issued in June 1973, detailing the methodology that was used by the Commission, the statistics, the projections until 1980 and so forth.

The House resolution, as I understand it, would command the Census Bureau and the Labor Department to issue monthly statistics on Mexican-Americans and the Spanish-speaking with regard to their socioeconomic and political status, but that is not enough if the accuracy is not correct.

By that I mean they can conduct all the studies they wish, but, as long as they produce erroneous figures, then we would just as soon not have those figures.

Time and again, the Commission in California has shown the Census Bureau the accuracy of the methodology that it has used and the accuracy of the projections it has made has been lacking.

The Census Bureau has never acknowledged the Commission's findings except in belated statistics released verifying the figures of the Commission.

I will not dwell on the importance of having the accuracy of the figures. It seems to me that at this late date it would behoove the Census Bureau and the Government to produce accurate figures on this significant part of the population.

Mr. WHITE. Do any of the other gentlemen desire to say anything at this time?

Mr. BENITEZ. I am national president of LULAC. As an example of what is happening, we are currently doing a model experimental program on the aged in Phoenix, Ariz., and one of the assumptions we have made is that the Census Bureau has drastically undercounted the aged Mexican-American persons. They are invisible using the methodology used by the Census Bureau.

We are trying to find out if there is an elderly Spanish-speaking person in the household. To get information on that person, you have to go into the household and dig them out. Not only that, but the methods we are employing to do our study incorporates Spanish and English versions of a questionnaire with a television scheme that we have where we actually show pictures to the elderly so they can respond accurately to the questions we are posing to them.

It is a visual-verbal type of questionnaire we are doing with them, and we are testing in Arizona for the first time the accuracy of the Census Bureau figures, and we feel we are going to find out they are very, very inaccurate.

As a result of that in Arizona we assume that money coming in, especially now under the revenue sharing plans that is given to communities on the basis of population figures, that we Spanish-speaking people in this country are not getting out share of the moneys that are coming in, and the programs that are being instituted State-by-State. So it is really hurting us in that respect.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Obledo, the chronology of events in your testimony show the Census Bureau to be rather changeable in its pronouncements concerning the size of the Mexican-American population. The subcommittee would like to take a look at these.

Would you be willing to provide the subcommittee identification of the census publications and press releases and other literature noted in your testimony?

Mr. OBLEDO. Certainly. The U.S. Commission study contains a lot of that information.

Mr. WHITE. But do you have a list that you all have cataloged in the course of your complaints?

Mr. OBLEDO. It is all cataloged there.

Mr. WHITE. All the statements to which I alluded?

Mr. OBLEDO. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. All right.

What was the outcome of the suit you referred to on the bottom of page 2 of your statement?

Mr. OBLEDO. That suit was dismissed by the plaintiffs after the Census Bureau came back and acknowledged the accuracy of the statistics.

Mr. WHITE. Would you be willing to provide the subcommittee with a copy of the official census report?

Mr. OBLEDO. That is the Commission report. We have labeled it as an official census report.

Mr. WHITE. Would you be willing to provide for the study of the subcommittee the methodology used in your studies of the Mexican-American populations in these various localities?

Mr. OBLEDO. Yes, sir; I certainly would. I think two of the main ingredients in the methodology used by the Commission is the fact that bilingual census takers are utilized, statistics are gathered from a lot of

agencies and sort of studied, and projections are made, and one added aspect to it is when you use bilingual census takers and you use this talent in the Mexican-American community, you get more cooperation.

The Census Bureau has gone on record and they issued a press release in 1971, at least trying to soften, perhaps, either inefficiency or whatever, trying to explain the undercount, and they were saying, "Well, people have become more distrustful of Government and they are not cooperating with the Census Bureau, they are not answering the questionnaires, people are not willing to come out and talk to us anymore."

That is how they were justifying the undercount. What we are saying is that in the Mexican-American communities or in the Spanish-speaking, Spanish-surname communities, if you use a bilingual census taker, then you get more cooperation.

Mr. Fierro has mentioned earlier this morning about perhaps illegal aliens who might be in this country, but who have children who are born here, three, four, five, six, whatever the number, who are not counted by the Census Bureau, because these people won't divulge that information, but to a Mexican-American census taker or a bilingual census taker who would explain to them what the study is for and how it would affect them, et cetera, perhaps they would be willing to give that information.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel that the person of Mexican-American heritage, say the second generation in this country, would be likely to answer a written questionnaire that is mailed to their residence, or do you think not?

Mr. OBLEDO. I would not think so, Mr. Congressman. Even as formally educated as we are, we hesitate to answer questionnaires that are mailed to our home, surveys, et cetera. Sometimes they are rather complicated. We tend not to answer them. I think a house-to-house survey in selected areas would produce more accurate results.

Mr. WHITE. What effort was made on the part of the various Spanish-speaking organizations to educate the membership and those of the Spanish-speaking heritage to be certain to answer the questionnaires at the time of the census?

Mr. OBLEDO. There was information that was placed, and group meetings were held, and oral communications were transmitted to cooperate with the Census Bureau, because we wanted to get an accurate count.

Mr. WHITE. There was a conscious program then under the sponsorship of LULAC?

Mr. BENITEZ. Yes, there was; but it was rather small because we don't have command of the news media, or the money it takes to do an indepth study for our people. Like the Reverend Channing Phillips says in Washington, even with an organization like yours, you are only reaching a small percentage of the population.

Mr. WHITE. What effort was made to approach the OEO programs in various communities and propose they ask persons to be certain to answer questionnaires?

Mr. BENITEZ. I am from the State of Arizona. We did approach the regional office of region 9, and they found it difficult to find funds in their budgeting so they could launch any kind of a program, so there was nothing done at all.

Mr. FIERRO. I think one of the problems, Mr. Chairman, that occurred, was that the Commission itself, the Bureau, was not responsive or attempting to identify organizations in the Spanish-speaking community that they could work closely with and utilize their resources to identify the people. I think that the effort should be from the Bureau itself.

Now I think that it illustrates here as to what the Population Commission of California had to go through to get the undercount in California, and the efforts of the Bureau not to acknowledge what they did. You know, here they took it upon themselves to do this, wanting to make sure that there was an accurate count, and I feel that the Bureau itself, you know, was negligent in identifying those groups at the national and local level that they could work through in counting the Spanish-speaking.

Mr. WHITE. This may be repetitious, but would you describe to me what the Mexican-American Commission on Population in California did that was different than the Census Bureau?

Mr. OBLEDO. There were some house-to-house surveys conducted in selected counties in California. Then figures were obtained from the office of education in California. Mexican American organizations were contacted to get their suggestions on the methodology to be used. All this information was compiled and projections were made on it.

Mr. WHITE. How were these collated with the findings of the Census Bureau?

Mr. OBLEDO. They were not really collated. We came up with a figure and compared it to the figure they had, and said ours was accurate.

Mr. WHITE. I am taking this situation: If you use a selected Spanish-speaking census tract in Los Angeles, you would be likely to find a very high percentage of Spanish-speaking people in that community, but you could not project that as an example of the entire State of California. How did you proportion that?

Mr. FIERRO. I think, Mr. Chairman, the response to that question is that the Census Bureau did a 5-percent sample of 20 percent; 5 percent of the 20 percent sample that they did, they randomly did. They took 5 percent, you know, where the commission itself went out and did a total community, the whole State of California, not taking necessarily a 5-percent sampling, but in those identifiable areas, statistics that the State was compiling, there was a broader involvement of the people to identify the Spanish-speaking and not necessarily such a small percentage.

Mr. WHITE. But they would have to use a formula.

Mr. OBLEDO. We came up with a basic figure, and then the undercount. The Census Bureau acknowledged a 7-percent undercount in the black. We knew there was at least that much undercount in Spanish-speaking population. For the projections into 1980, we just took—well, I think tables 3 and 4 in the population commission report—we based that on a 4-percent yearly increase up until 1980, which is a very conservative figure.

Mr. WHITE. But did you take, then, the heavy residence of Mexican-American heritage and project this as a percentage to the entire State?

Mr. OBLEDO. Counties were divided between rural and urban.

Mr. WHITE. Maybe you don't understand.

Mr. BENITEZ. I can't speak for that, but the one we are conducting now on the elderly in Arizona, what we are doing is, we are taking the census tract figures that are already projected within the Census Bureau figures, and then we are doing door-to-door rather than taking a percentage, and we are going to check the accuracy of the percentage against the national headcount.

Mr. WHITE. Then you figure out the percentage in the entire State?

Mr. BENITEZ. In Arizona, we are going to do it door-to-door, statewide, against the census tract figures of the Bureau. So that we should have a very, very accurate count in the State of Arizona. That is what I am suggesting be done across the country.

Mr. WHITE. You know, the Census Bureau in taking the count of those Spanish-speaking persons, or of Spanish origin, concentrating on five States by using a name identification system. You do this, I presume?

Do you feel that this is a reasonably accurate way to try to ferret out the census returns to determine the population in those five States that are of Spanish origin?

Mr. FIERRO. Name identification?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. OBLEDO. It won't be accurate. I don't know what the difference would be.

Mr. WHITE. Well, fairly accurate might be within, say, 3 percent?

Mr. OBLEDO. There is no way I could forecast that.

All I can say is that it would not be an accurate count. That is why we propose this pilot project. Let's find out who has the better methodology now in trying to arrive at an accurate count.

Mr. WHITE. Obviously, the door-to-door is always better. The Census Bureau says this, that they send out these questionnaires to all residents. If a recipient does not answer the questionnaires, then an enumerator goes out to see those particular individuals. On questioning, it was determined that they did not stress Spanish-speaking.

I think this was a failure in their system. They claim, in effect, that they did have a door-to-door type of enumeration because they had a followup system, but they first advocated the sampling through mail as an alternative under budgetary stresses at the time. Whether or not they could by budget have an enumerator go out in the first instance to every designated or targeted area, I could not tell you.

But of course that is superior and would obviously be more accurate than a mail survey would be.

Mr. OBLEDO. Our budget was zero dollars. The only money we got was some to publish this report.

Mr. WHITE. But you had volunteers.

Mr. OBLEDO. Yes.

Mr. BENITEZ. I discussed this with a number of people, and a small number were of Spanish origin. They indicated to me after close examination that even when they are within a household, they are afraid of the neighborhood, No. 1, and No. 2, they wouldn't have the

rapport with the family, and therefore, the questions aren't posed accurately. If you look at 4.5 fertility rate that the Department of Labor gives for family, you can apply that straight across-the-board, and that is inaccurate itself. There is a reluctance of the Spanish origin family to relegate into a discussion of the census taker, and there is a failure of the census taker, by not being familiar with the area, to really pose the questions accurately.

Mr. WHITE. If the Census Bureau came back and said, "We don't have the budget to fulfill your methodology, having Spanish-speaking enumerators that go out in the first instance," would the various Spanish-speaking organizations, or Spanish origin organizations be interested in providing volunteers to accompany enumerators who would be Spanish speaking? That is, the volunteers would be Spanish speaking. Would this be important enough for you to suggest that you could obtain volunteers for your organization?

Mr. BENITEZ. On behalf of our organization, we would, yes. Not only that, but there is already an effort underway to try to convince the Ford Foundation that they might fund a special census to be taken nationwide and our organization would then come in and conduct that by the methodology of the Census Bureau.

Mr. WHITE. The only problem about that is if it is not an official Government enumeration, it wouldn't have any force.

Mr. FIERRO. Mr. Chairman, I think if a Spanish-surname organization is going to volunteer their time to assist, I don't see why they don't just hire them.

Mr. WHITE. If they felt they could, but this is just a suggestion, because they may feel that they can't find the Spanish-speaking persons. I think you are right. I am just looking for alternatives for the record.

Now, further more, the Census Bureau said as to the balance of the country it relied on the dissemination of the question regarding "Spanish origin." Did you have any objection to the inclusion in their census forms the words "Spanish origin"? Do you think this was helpful in getting an accurate profile of the Mexican-American population, or the Spanish origin population in the country?

Mr. OBLEDO. I wouldn't quarrel with that. So long as they come up with an accurate figure. I think it might narrow it down to identify the real Spanish origin in Mexican-Americans. The Mexican-Americans comprise the bulk of the Spanish-surname population.

Mr. FIERRO. If the Bureau indicated concern with having bilingual census forms, I think if you translate it into Spanish and you have a Spanish-speaking family going over the form, there is a reluctance, I believe, in terms of the people who are Mexican-Americans, you know, because the areas—well, in some of the families there will be problems in putting a designation down.

Mr. WHITE. They wouldn't answer "yes" on Spanish origin? This is a form that goes to everybody in the country. They can't put "Español" for everybody, because nine-tenths of the population wouldn't know what that meant. This is Spanish origin. Do you find a reluctance to have that in the questionnaire, or do you think that would be helpful?

Mr. FIERRO. Why can't they put "Mexican-American, Cuban, and so forth in there?

Mr. WHITE. I think they do.

Mr. OBLEDO. They put in "Spanish origin" and then break it down.

Mr. FIERRO. I think that would be more accurate than just one designation.

Mr. WHITE. Yes. What I am asking you is, do you feel that form of question would not elicit accurate information?

Mr. OBLEDO. I think it would be more accurate than the methodology used previously.

Mr. WHITE. They used that designation.

Mr. OBLEDO. They started using Spanish origin in their current population surveys, but in 1970, it was not that clear a designation.

Mr. BULLOCK. It is my understanding that the Census Bureau used several different identifiers to identify the Spanish-speaking population in 1970. On the 15 percent or 20 percent questionnaires, they gathered data on the Spanish surnames in five States. They also gathered information on Spanish language, and Spanish parentage or birth, and then on the 5 percent questionnaire, they asked the question, "Are you of Spanish origin or descent?" And there was a list of various background categories there. Now, what has been changed is that the categories that were specified, a lot of people would not identify with, and they have now improved and expanded on them. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. WHITE. Well, for clarification here, apparently the questionnaires went to everybody. The Spanish-origin designation was not on those, plus the breakdown. Do you feel it would be proper to have the designation "Spanish origin" and the breakdown on all questionnaires that are sent out?

Mr. BENITEZ. Definitely.

Mr. WHITE. This question will be asked by those who read the record and, for the record, would you tell us why the Mexican-American population, or the Spanish-speaking population should be identified separately as compared to any other ethnic group, like Irish-American, or anything like that?

Mr. OBLEDO. Well, Mr. White, we, the Mexican-American organizations and Spanish-speaking organizations, contend that there are at least 12 million persons belonging to this so-called significant identifiable group.

Now, they also contend, and I think the record has shown this to be the case, and I say record, and I am talking about lawsuits, statistics, et cetera, that this population figure or group has immense social, economic and political problems, more so than any other ethnic or racial group in this country.

The only way those problems are going to be resolved, if they have accurate information that they exist, and I believe that is what the utility of the Census Bureau information, that that is the thrust it should take.

In other words, we contend that we are in the lowest socioeconomic posture of any group in the country, that our income is lower, and we took issue with an income figure with the Census Bureau where they projected that the Mexican-American had a higher income than black. We say we don't.

We took issue with the Census Bureau when they quoted a figure on the unemployed, and that is because we know there are many people in the Mexican-American community that are unemployed who are not counted in the statistics, because to them you have to be in the labor market in order to be unemployed, not have a job, but be available. Many people in our community have been out of work so long that they are no longer so-called available for work. I could cite various areas, and there is a letter to the Bureau of the Census in 1971 pointing out various areas where we take issue with the accuracy of their figures and so forth, and explaining why.

But that is getting back to your original question, that is why it is so necessary to have particular statistics, and specific and accurate statistics on this group.

Mr. WHITE. The percentage of growth, I understand, say, in Mexico, as an illustration, is 3 percent, plus, today. Do you have any idea what the percentage of growth of the Mexican American population is, that is in the birth rate in this country, as to show whether or not the Census Bureau's figures were inaccurate, or whether it is a matter of a growth factor?

Mr. OBLEDO. Especially when they come up with a decrease in the figure, we knew they were inaccurate.

Mr. WHITE. Do you have any idea what the percentage growth is?

Mr. OBLEDO. We say it is approximately 4 percent.

Mr. WHITE. In the resolution of Mr. Roybal, it calls for a census periodically of "Spanish-speaking Americans." The Bureau suggests that that should be changed from "Spanish-speaking" to "those of Spanish origin." Would you have any objection to that change in the resolution, or do you feel that would add to the accuracy of the census?

Mr. BENITEZ. Would it be possible to break that down as you suggested in the questionnaires that will be sent out? In other words, it would state "Spanish origin" and then state Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and so forth?

Mr. WHITE. I don't know that he does this. In the preamble, it mentions various designations but in the body it doesn't. We will consider that.

Mr. BENITEZ. I think it would be wise, Mr. Chairman. If you study the history, you will find, as Mr. Fierro mentioned, there is some reluctance to identify as Spanish. If you have a breakdown, I think more people would identify with it.

Mr. WHITE. You have, also, different socioeconomic problems and characteristics.

Mr. BENITEZ. That is correct.

Mr. OBLEDO. One added comment. From El Paso, representing El Paso, you yourself are well acquainted with the problems of the Mexican Americans. Other Members of Congress may not be as well acquainted, if they reside in the eastern portion of the United States, and are not acquainted with the tremendous problems that we have, economic and social.

Let me conclude here with this paragraph from the Population Commission report about the Mexican-Americans in the Southwest:

The social, economic, and political consequences, referring to the uncounted, to both the Chicano community and the State of California are too obvious to us to bear discussion by the Population Commission. The Commission does wish, how-

ever, to point out that the present Spanish-American population of California is greater than the population of each of 31 States. It is greater than the aggregate combined populations of 7 States with the smallest populations, and it is greater than the population of 55 nations, the vast majority of which are members of the United Nations.

That is the group we are speaking of.

Mr. WHITE. That is very graphic.

Mr. BENITEZ. I would like to close with this statement, as an indication of hurt that we have in regards to, again, looking at El Paso, because I have been there quite often and I am very interested in that area: The Department of Labor statistics on unemployment, when you look at the rate nationwide, if you look at designated areas within El Paso, we are finding out we have as high as 20 percent unemployment, so that by having inaccurate census figures and statistics, we are really being included in a percentage factor that doesn't relate at all to what is really happening in the community. So it really hurts us.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

Mr. Rousselot?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Thank you for being here.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Rousselot is from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. In your statement, you mention that the League of United Latin-American Citizens, which I realize is an organization, but there are Mexican-Americans, and other terms used. How are we to understand how you want to be broken down; those that speak Spanish, those that don't, or is there a general classification that you will accept?

Mr. OBLEDO. I think the Census Bureau in its revised questionnaire, has covered that rather well, under Spanish origin. They list the various categories.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. How many do they list?

Mr. OBLEDO. Five or six, I think.

Mr. BULLOCK. In 1970, they listed only four. There is a Bureau member out there, if you want an accurate answer.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Just so we understand what is satisfactory to you first.

Mr. OBLEDO. What may be satisfactory to me, sir, may not be satisfactory to other groups.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is the point.

Mr. OBLEDO. We have had a lot of debate on that.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. How many classifications are we talking about?

Mr. OBLEDO. We are talking about the classifications now listed by the Bureau.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am Ed Fernandez. The categories were Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central and South American, or other Spanish.

In the Current Population Survey—and some of the statements I am making here are mixing these—in the samples the interviewer shows a flashcard to the respondent. That flashcard has categories further broken down for the Mexicans in case they do not want to classify themselves as Mexican-American.

For tabulation purposes, the response is tabulated as "Mexican," but the respondent has the opportunity to identify himself in four categories, or subcategories, of Mexican origin.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is that what you want?

Mr. BENITEZ. Yes, sir. We think that would be helpful.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Let's assume we could achieve that full identification with the income status, with the other items that are normally in a census that you think are necessary.

What does that then do that you don't already have?

Mr. BENITEZ. If I may respond to that, particularly under the new revenue sharing concept of the various departments of the Federal Government, we are going to ask the various States in which we have our people include within the proposals that they submit to the Federal Government those accurate statistics which will then relate to dollars that will go to programs to assist us.

That is where it will count.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You want that identification for more Federal dollars?

Mr. OBLEDO. In the report by the U.S. Civil Service Commission they point out several factors in there where accurate statistics would have to be taken into account.

We talk about reapportionment. That would be one.

LULAC in 1972 issued a report called the Electoral College in Mexican-America, and we took the statistics, and showed that a five-eighths percent of the Mexican-American vote in five States would decide the election and did decide it in 1960 and 1968.

So it is not only dollars that we are concerned about. We are concerned about a lot of other things. I think it also provides for the planning.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So a second item would be reapportionment—the ability of your organization to demand districts, and things of that character?

Mr. OBLEDO. Not necessarily.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Wasn't that attempted in California?

Mr. OBLEDO. That was attempted. It was approved by the supreme court in the State of California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. It was partially achieved.

Mr. OBLEDO. At this juncture in the history of the Mexican-American, we have to look out for the interests of the Mexican-American people, keeping in mind, of course, that here is a group based in history and culture which has been more devoted to this country, and more loyal to this country, taking the abuse they have taken for years, since time immemorial, and yet now this group is saying, "Look, this is our situation. We need help in order to help ourselves."

I think that is the philosophy of the group: "Help use to help ourselves," and once we get there, we will take care of the rest of it.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is why I am asking.

The Federal funds, and the ability to encourage better reapportionment as it relates to political divisions of various kinds, you say it will help you in your groups achieve a greater sense of self-help. How, specifically? What does the production of more precise statistics do to help you be more self-sufficient?

Mr. BENITEZ. If I may.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Go ahead.

Mr. FIERRO. You are alluding to statistics, but we have to look at how statistics are utilized by the Federal Government in its planning processes, of the birth rate in the community. The city has to begin to plan in terms of additions or rezoning areas. The Government has

to plan in terms of programmatic areas. The educational system is important, in terms of working within the area of assisting our children.

There are no statistics—well, there are not today—that we need to begin to plan in terms of assisting and providing services or whatever it is to these age groups in the various categories, whether it is preschool or elementary, secondary, or college, to begin to plan on a broader scale that will include us. Presently we are not included in the planning of these facilities and programs at all.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Of the school systems? Take east Los Angeles—

Mr. FIERRO. Let me take the health area, which I am more familiar with.

Take the mental health capability of this country. Most of the facilities located are located in the predominantly affluent areas. Very few of the Mexican-Americans have access to them. There has never been comprehensive planning for help.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You are talking about private or public?

Mr. FIERRO. Both. I am talking about mental health. They are now located within our community in a majority of the States or communities.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Are there no county clinics there?

Mr. FIERRO. That is right. Most of them are not easily accessible to the Mexican-American community themselves. We have documentation that illustrates that.

There might be "outreach" stations located there, but not necessarily comprehensive facilities.

I think that planning has to be taken into consideration—the growth of the Spanish-speaking community in terms of identifying educational achievement or educational progress within the community, and to plan for those efforts.

I don't want to be misled that statistics are going to be used only to bring more dollars into the community. I think that probably, as Congressman Stark of California indicated in the first session, and I have a tendency to agree with him, that the Census Bureau conducts the census for marketing purposes.

These are the people who use the statistics and not necessarily low-income residents or people. But that the marketing agencies or companies use statistics to push out products.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. The county government of Los Angeles says they use statistics in the field of health, in the field of education. What you are saying is that those figures aren't precise enough as they relate to identification of your groups.

Let's take the field of education. How would additional statistics that are now not included, and let's acknowledge, as the Census Bureau did that identification of Mexican-Americans was not very accurate in 1970. Let's say we had more precise statistics as a result of that, and corrected the census. How would that have helped you in the field of education or in the field of health or in the self-help area?

Mr. OBLEDO. We can relate two areas, I think, in the field of education.

As I understand it, educational moneys are allotted by the number of students. I understand there is a bilingual education bill now pending in Congress before the conference committee.

I think an accurate count would be very important in that situation. I have participated in the State of California in negotiating employment plans with various employers. For instance, Pacific Telephone, or the savings and loan industry in the State of California, the 12 largest in the State, and I think that including 6 in this area, with the banks of California, whether we agree with this philosophy or not, they have agreed to employ Mexican Americans based on population.

So that becomes a very important area to have an accurate figure in. All the way from the lower levels to management, statistics are very important to us. That is in the employment field.

Suppose you get into other fields. In San Francisco, and I think in Los Angeles itself, an action against the fire department, when they came out and said, "The black and Spanish-surname population of Los Angeles is x , so from now on every Los Angeles Fire Department employee must be from that particular group." So, statistics are very valuable in those situations.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is in the employment field. How would statistics be helpful or produce results in your concept of self-help?

Mr. FIERRO. Let me also respond to that. I think if you had not had the opportunity to read the study conducted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in terms of education of the Mexican American in the Southwest, I think this illustrates the potential statistics have in terms of identifying specific problem areas, specific needs within the educational community and what was not being done to assist or to adequately assist children progressing in school.

I think those statistics in identifying the teachers, identifying the children, identifying the kind of programs and State moneys have gone into the communities to illustrate, you know, tremendous neglect by our educational system to the Spanish-speaking community.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. In Los Angeles, for instance?

Mr. FIERRO. In the whole Southwest, those are the five or six studies conducted—

Mr. ROUSSELOT. But in Los Angeles you said that was true. In the east Los Angeles area there has been a neglect in the education field, and statistics would make a difference?

Mr. FIERRO. Yes.

And I think identification of statistics. The dropout rate in California is just as much in California as it is in Texas and you will find that in Los Angeles County it is, you will find the dropout rate of the Spanish-speaking extremely high.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is it higher than, say, it is in Watts?

Mr. FIERRO. I would say it is.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That isn't my recollection.

Mr. FIERRO. The level of achievement in the Mexican American community is still lower.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Suppose we find out the dropout rate is higher. What do we do to change that?

Mr. FIERRO. You plan for programs to assist, looking at the educational capability of those institutions.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Haven't you already done that by electing people to the school board?

Mr. BENITEZ. Let me respond, because I don't think people can step away from Government. When you talk about self-help and all that. You have to start somewhere, you know, and that is what we're really looking for, a starting line.

Statistics are going to, as far as I am concerned, bring more programs and more money from the Federal Government like SBA loans to our people to start new businesses; like the Office of Minority Business Enterprises just has about \$15 million which is peanuts in comparison to what this country has done for private industry. They give that much to Boeing to get a plane off the ground. This country has not wanted to invest money in its people and we are part of the people.

What we are saying, as far as I am concerned, speaking for my organization, statistics, we play a numbers game, and you play a numbers game, sir, when you run for a position. Look at the numbers and you go where the ducks are, and we are the ducks, and we want to show people that we have the numbers; we want the money and we want the programs, you better believe it, in our community, so that we can get into a position where we can be self-sustaining, and we are not going to get there without help from the Federal and the local governments, and both the Federal and the local governments play the numbers game on us.

HEW has what they call educational service centers program. They put \$3 million into it. That is one of the few programs in HEW that can address itself to the bilingual problem and the minority groups; \$3 million is peanuts compared to what we need. We can use that in just one program that we have.

But when we come up here and address ourselves to the departments of this Federal Government, the first thing they ask us is, "How many people do you have, and what is their condition?" Everything is based on that, and we want in. It is that simple.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Have you found Mr. Barabba cooperative? He is from California.

Mr. OBLEDO. I am from San Antonio. I worked in California for several years. I have found Mr. Barabba very cooperative since he succeeded the other person. In fact, I made a comment not too long ago that to me he has been very cooperative with Mexican-American groups. We have our differences, but he has tried to get a task force together with suggestions as to census taking. So, I give him a lot of credit.

On your question of self-help, I will say that if accurate statistics will help us get better educational opportunities, better employment, then we are helping ourselves to get off the Government welfare roll or whatever you get. Assuming you were to get a job with Pacific Telephone & Telegraph, then you would be self-sufficient. There is no use going over all that, because you know that to be a fact. We need a starting point. This is a good part of it. Once we get there, we will get moving.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I guess what I am asking is if you could give us some ideas, we have to go to the floor with something and we have, you know, 435 diverse interests represented, and to justify any increase in expenditure, that is what we are talking about. There will be additional personnel and all kinds of other things, and I realize it sounds like peanuts, as you say, compared to the defense contracts.

We need to know how will those statistics help you generate the specific areas of self-help in the area of employment. Will that generate more employment in your own group, or whatever? Would it help develop more employment opportunities with bigger employment groups? Would it develop more educational facilities or health services that you mentioned?

We all understand reapportionment very well. We have just been through it in California by court mandate. But as to Federal funds, as to how much more that will generate, we are already broke, and I wouldn't want to encourage you that that would provide abundant Federal funds, because we are already in short supply in our treasury. If it generates the kinds of things you say in local and State government, or better educational systems, then you can be a little more definitive, and I think that would help us to better get the authority.

Thank you, very much.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. I am sorry for being late, Mr. Chairman.

I have had a chance to briefly scan the written statement. What I am curious about, assuming there is no quarrel at all with the figures you come up with, if those figures were accepted by the Federal Government apart from the Census Bureau, this, I take it would satisfy you as to what should be done by getting a more accurate count recognized. If that would satisfy you, how would you get more money just by recognition of your figure versus the figure that the Census Bureau came up with?

Mr. FIERRO. I will let someone else answer, but I think we ought to reevaluate. I don't want to leave here the impression that we are only concerned with dollars that the new statistics will generate for a community.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I think we made that clear.

Mr. FIERRO. But the questions you ask want to elicit that. I don't want to leave that impression. We responded to Mr. Rousselot's question, but there are a variety of areas we are concerned about.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is just my first question.

Mr. BENITEZ. The first revenue sharing bill passed by the administration, in the regulations sent out to the regional offices and to the prime sponsors and the CETA Act, it requires that the statistics that were published in the 1970 census be the ones used on the formula that would designate how much money goes to the areas. We have the statistics to show you how that has negated the area of the Mexican-American communities. We are just not getting the moneys.

As you mentioned to Congressman White, in El Paso, an area he is familiar with, we can show you where we have 20 percent unemployment instead of 5, or 3, and therefore, that is another one. The unemployment rate is another part of the formula that they use, and those formulas that are being used reflect the status of our people.

We just want our fair share so that our problems are addressed, since you are going to revenue sharing anyway. All we are saying is that you should include the accurate statistics.

Mr. HINSHAW. The specific point that I was trying to elicit a response to is, must revenue sharing under the legislation consider only the census figures and the figures of population arrived at by the Census Bureau?

Mr. BENITEZ. Yes. That is what it says now under the CETA bill and the Department of Labor.

Mr. HINSHAW. So if we can't get the Census Bureau to change their figures, a change in the revenue-sharing provision, updating population data by more recent figures that might be acceptable, that might solve part of the problem?

Mr. BENITEZ. Yes. If we cannot get satisfaction that will reflect our consideration, then we are considering court action against the legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Coming back to what you appear to have a concern about, apart from the acceptance for monetary purposes, how else do the groups you are interested in benefit by different population figures?

Mr. FIERRO. One that was mentioned was the questions in various congressional districts, that it would reflect—I think this happened in California, because of the concern of the Spanish-speaking community, because they thought they were not being adequately represented, or gerrymandered.

Mr. HINSHAW. Are you suggesting that the congressional districts are or should have the lines drawn by reference to ethnic makeup of the population?

Mr. FIERRO. No; not necessarily to the ethnic, but I think in the case in California, I think they were drawn because there was a disparity in terms of the representation of the community, and that was indicated in the court order, I believe—I may be wrong on that—and in some situations the court has ordered reapportionment to be a little more fair to a specific identifiable minority. I think that that is one of the lines that is drawn on ethnicity, but I think consideration ought to be given more, instead of dividing a community.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me interrupt for a moment.

I am from California, and there are 10.3 percent Spanish-speaking in my area, and I am not familiar with any court attitudes anywhere in the country, including California, where they suggest that congressional representation ought to be based upon ethnic background.

Mr. FIERRO. I didn't say that.

Mr. OBLEDO. Not congressional, but legislatures. The Mexican-Americans had not had adequate representation throughout the years, and the Supreme Court said because of longstanding economic, social, and political discrimination.

There is a case in Indiana where the court addressed itself to problems of various reapportionment cases where racial issues had been a factor in the opinion. So you know, many people contend discrimination in reverse, but I think the courts have recognized in order to remedy past discrimination, and we have all the school cases you can refer to, you sort of end up with this discrimination in reverse.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me understand that point, because I want to get on to other questions.

It is your belief that there is adequate precedent for having some other kinds of representation based upon ethnic background?

Mr. OBLEDO. Yes.

Mr. BENITEZ. If I may also respond to your question for a moment, I think many people alluded to it earlier, that the Census Bureau statistics not only indicate numbers, but they also indicate social

and economic conditions, and we, you know, have gone over the concept of the Chicano-American, and we also have examples. LULAC has a 3-year projected plan, and Congressman, coming back to your previous question, we are trying to get our people into the economic game of this country, because we believe in it, and we are now linking into various industries all over the country where we are going to start doing subcontracting and work for them.

So, we also have to project, including the numbers. We have to know where we are and where we are going. We have to use that information that we get out of the Censes Bureau in order to do our basic planning, also, so as to help us in the planning stages as well as to help the Federal Government and the local government in their planning.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You have quite a few oil companies. Are they OK for work?

Mr. BENITEZ. I hope so. They have a lot of money, we read in the paper.

Mr. HINSHAW. On the question of representation getting more money for revenue sharing, what other areas do you believe correction of the figures would serve?

Mr. FIERRO. I think in planning, sir, when you identify the social and economic parts of the community, the various governmental units begin to plan. If you are talking about a low-income community, what are some of the concerns? If you are talking about the birth rates within a community within, say, the Spanish-speaking community in a given State, have you to plan for facilities; have you to plan for Federal education, or even living facilities for the community? You can look at the disease areas and the mental health area, and you can begin to plan all these factors, and additionally, in terms of the Federal—

Mr. HINSHAW. Don't get too far. I am not aware that there is a different kind of planning for those areas for Spanish-speaking as opposed to the historical relationships of these kinds of plans in a given area, unless there has been a dramatic change in the ethnic population, and I am not sure that I follow that.

Mr. FIERRO. There was a dramatic change in the ethnic population when the Bureau decided there was an additional 1.5 million Spanish-speaking people in the country in terms of identifying them, and the testimony of Mr. Obledo indicated that you feel that that is still not accurate.

So there are still definite changes that are taking place in the Spanish-speaking community. You have an additional 1.5 million people, and the Mexican-American study commission indicated in California, we like to call up the FBI and find out what happened to all the additional people that are missing. So I think that there are some definite changes that are coming about within the Spanish-speaking community.

Mr. HINSHAW. If I could boil it down so I could really understand what you are driving at. My congressional district contains a little over 10 percent Spanish-speaking. If we found out there were 15 percent, how are you suggesting, then, that the planning to accommodate the needs of the Spanish would be any different from the planning processes than they are at present?

Mr. FIERRO. I think you would have to do a demographic study of your people in terms of the Spanish-speaking, in terms of the dropout rate in schools, in terms of the number of children that are going on to higher education, people that are using the vocational educational opportunities within their district, or whether they have them available.

You know, what the retention rate or the dropout rate in the district, and what is the flow to other communities. So things, you know, a demographic study to identify some of the problems and some of the needs that might be identifiable in that area, I think then you can plan or make more programs or facilities more accessible to the community you need.

So that is why I think statistics are so important in this area, and you have to look at the context of the locality in order to begin to meet the needs of that area, and I think that very few areas have done this, have done a demographic study.

Money is being expended by the millions in these areas, and many of our residents are not aware of the programs, or they are not available to them.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would you agree that one of the major difficulties in dealing with the Spanish-speaking in terms of making them aware of the programs available and all the other problems might be traced in part to the language difficulty?

Mr. FIERRO. I think that the language may be a factor in it, I think Congress for the last several years has now begun to be more receptive and more responsive to limited English-speaking citizens of the country. I am speaking of bilingual education and there is a bilingual court act, which provides interpreters in the courtroom.

So I think there are inhibiting factors involved in people taking advantage of their opportunity. By the same token, I think the majority of a large number of people in this country have not accepted, you know, other languages as a positive factor. It is a detriment to success. I think this is why bilingual in this country has proved to be such a successful program, because of the ability of a child to progress much faster in a bilingual program than in a program where he comes into the classroom knowing only Spanish, and then teaching in English and forgetting his Spanish, eliminating what he has learned at home, and at the same time not providing for his own environmental experiences within the classroom.

This was a detriment on him, also, and I think that is one of the reasons the Congress has been so receptive to this effort, because I think they see that the need and the results on the child are beneficial.

Mr. HINSHAW. There has apparently been a great deal of success in the area of providing medical assistance to the Spanish-speaking through having volunteers and others come into a neighborhood health clinic.

Part of the success of that, as I understand it, the difficulty of persons in large concentrations of Spanish-speaking, is understanding the English language and in essence being able to trust some of their neighbors who can speak Spanish. That is the reason for the question, and I would like to have your reaction to the success of those neighborhood clinics.

Mr. FIERRO. The number we have is very, very small. When you look at the enrollment of Spanish surnames in the medical schools it is less than 1 percent of Spanish-speaking students going on to medical schools.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. At all levels, or just doctors? You mean medical training of all kinds?

Mr. FIERRO. At all levels. There is an organization in California, the National Chicano Health Organization. You have the East Side Health System, and these organizations send you their statistics in terms of working throughout the country where the health needs have been so neglected, both physical and mental, and also providing educational opportunities.

I can provide statistics that will demonstrate that the few neighborhood clinics that we have, they have been successful, but they have been funded on demonstration grants, and they don't in some cases continue to operate after the demonstration is over.

But those two organizations have enormous amounts of statistics that will document the reverse to what you have indicated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have the gentlemen submit any of those items relating to your effort to have your community enter the market system and employment.

Mr. BENITEZ. It will take me about a day.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Benitez, if you will submit that for the study of the subcommittee, it will be appreciated.

Mr. BENITEZ. Thank you.

[The letter which follows was received for the record, subsequent to the hearing:]

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., August 14, 1974.

Re H.J. Res. 406, Roybal, House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics.
Mr. RICHARD WHITE,
U.S. Representative,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: After my testimony before the above named subcommittee in June 1974 you asked me to submit for the record the methodology utilized by the Mexican-American Population Commission of California in arriving at the census statistics published in their recent report.

Mr. ROBERT Gnaizda, Public Advocates, Inc., San Francisco, who is General Counsel for the Commission provided the information you requested.

The system used by the M-A Population Comm. of California in gathering information for their Census Report was as follows:

A. Unpublished State of California Public and Parochial school statistics were analyzed and projections were made based on grade by grade analysis.

B. U.S. Labor Department data was analyzed including percentage of Spanish-Americans served.

C. Welfare data was analyzed.

D. Past Census data was analyzed.

E. Immigration data was analyzed.

F. Spanish-American leaders in various suspected "undercount" communities were interviewed.

G. Scientifically accepted projections were made from the above data.

Please let me know if you need further information.

Sincerely,

MARIO G. OBLEDO.

Mr. WHITE. We are honored to have with us this morning the sponsor of this resolution, Mr. Roybal of California.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYBAL. Good morning.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here this morning to discuss with you and members of your subcommittee the urgent need for reliable up-to-date statistics for Americans of Spanish-speaking background. I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for cosponsoring my bill, H.J. Res. 406, and holding hearings on this important issue. This bill calls upon the Census Bureau and the Departments of Labor and Agriculture to begin collecting data which accurately depict the social and economic conditions facing Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and other Spanish-speaking persons. It also provides for the monthly publication of a nationwide unemployment rate for Latinos.

I am deeply impressed with the work and dedication this subcommittee has shown in asserting the importance of accurate data for this second largest minority group. In May of 1969 the subcommittee, then under the leadership of Congressman Wilson of California, held hearings after receiving numerous complaints against the Census Bureau for its failure to provide, in 1970, proper identification and enumeration of Spanish origin persons. As a result of pressure from this subcommittee and representatives of the Mexican-American community, the Bureau agreed to include a 5 percent sample question on Mexican or Spanish origin. But this concession was at best an expedient, an afterthought, adopted by the Bureau to quell criticism. Very little was done to insure that even this small sampling would adequately estimate and describe the Spanish origin population in this country. The Bureau, in failing to develop adequate bilingual and bicultural methods, ignored its legal responsibility to comply with Federal equal opportunity laws, including our voting and civil rights acts.

In the wake of the 1970 census, several Latin groups, particularly the Mexican-American Population Commission, conducted independent surveys which estimated the Spanish origin population at over 12 million people, as compared to the Bureau's estimate of just over 9 million. In a November 1971 suit against the Bureau, the commission accused the agency of "incompetence, and often willful and arbitrary indifference" in counting Spanish origin persons.

During that same year, I introduced a bill similar to the one being considered today to alert Congress to the issue. This move was followed by a letter to the Bureau protesting its defective methods and calling for an immediate recount in selected areas as a realistic approach to check accuracy. Your subcommittee was again instrumental in setting up a series of meetings with the Bureau and persuading it to guarantee proper identification of Mexican origin persons on a 100-percent basis in future censuses. These meetings only confirmed what I had earlier suspected about the Bureau's ineptness in reaching low-income families, particularly those living in the inner city, the barrio, and the migrant community. The Bureau did not provide a Spanish or bilingual questionnaire on a routine basis and relied too heavily on the mailout-mailback procedure, despite the fact that many Latinos needed help to fill out the lengthy English-only forms. Further, the

Bureau showed insensitivity in its hiring practices, failing to employ adequate numbers of bilingual enumerators and community education specialists—census-takers and advisers who had the trust and support of the Latino community.

What emerged from the 1969–72 period was the picture of a governmental agency reluctant to change or admit serious error in the face of criticism. As a consequence, it refused to recognize the importance of bilingual and bicultural factors. Many of us became convinced that the Bureau actually believed it possessed statistical infallibility and immunity to criticism.

Perhaps one reason for this contemptuous attitude has been the lack of Latino representation in the Social and Economic Statistics Administration which houses the Census Bureau. According to March 30, 1974, employment data, the Spanish surnamed continue to comprise a negligible 1.3 percent of the administration's total staff, with no Spanish-surnamed at the GS-16 to GS-18 executive levels.

In May of this year the Bureau issued a 1973 population survey for "Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States," which showed a substantial increase in Spanish origin of more than 1.5 million over 1970 figures. This revision showed a 17-percent rise in Spanish origin population and a nearly 40 percent increase in the Chicano population since 1970. The Bureau credited two-thirds of this increase to population growth. I find it difficult to believe that any group could multiply at such a Malthusian rate. A more convincing explanation derived from the 1973 improvements in the data-collecting methods. The first dealt with the expansion of Spanish origin for children under 14 years old to include the Spanish origin of the wife of the head. The second involved the expansion of Mexican ethnic origin from two to four categories. And the third related to changes in survey procedures with emphasis on interviewing.

Recently, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in a report entitled "Counting the Forgotten," presented further evidence of a "significant undercount" of the Spanish origin population, citing the Bureau's own estimate of the 1970 black undercount, and its insensitivity in developing methods to accurately count Spanish-speaking communities. The National Urban League also observed in a 1973 report that the undercount rate for Spanish origin population was "probably much larger than those for blacks."

In response, the Bureau has taken the position that without reliable statistics on births, deaths, and net immigration it cannot prepare undercount estimates for persons of Spanish origin. I consider this defeatist attitude premature and harmful. A substantial undercount means the loss of millions of dollars a year in Federal and local assistance as well as equal employment opportunities for Latinos. While the Bureau has made improvements in Spanish-origin census, particularly in the March 1973 results, I am disappointed by its apparent failure to develop a strategy estimating the size of the Spanish-origin undercount. I regard this strategy building as an essential step in determining census accuracy. There exists a number of possible sources: the Immigration and Naturalization Service data on the nationality of immigrants, available statistics on the migration of Puerto Ricans to the mainland, statistics on Spanish surnamed from the five Southwestern States, and various school enrollment and em-

ployment data kept by Federal, State, and local agencies, to mention but a few sources.

The Census Bureau has the constitutional mandate to compile and publish accurate data on U.S. population. There is little doubt that governmental agencies at all levels rely heavily, and in many cases exclusively, on data developed by the Bureau. This dependency has its own domino effect, particularly in the case of Labor and Agriculture, agencies directly affected by House Joint Resolution 406. Since both rely on census figures, any inaccuracy or deficiency directly affects their own statistical reports and interpretations. If Bureau figures are suspect, then theirs and those of other agencies, are also suspect.

The consequence of an undercount are extremely serious, and involves constitutional issues of due process and equal opportunity. For one, an undercount encroaches on the voting rights of a constituency. It affects not only reapportionment but the very right to vote as protected by the Civil Rights Act and recent court decisions mandating bilingual elections. Further, an undercount affects a wide spectrum of Federal assistance programs which depend on racial and ethnic data to determine need, including the Civil Rights Act, general revenue sharing, equal employment opportunity, comprehensive employment and training, adult and vocational education, elementary and secondary education, national housing, and economic opportunity.

With so many agencies involved in data collection and use, I would expect that the Office of Management and Budget would carry out its responsibility under the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act in setting guidelines for the "improved" gathering and publication of Federal statistics on Spanish-origin population. To achieve this goal and strengthen the intent of House Joint Resolution 406, I wish to make the following recommendations:

1. Include language stating that the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census and other data-gathering agencies, develop a Government-wide program for collecting data on Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish-origin groups.

2. Change the term "Spanish speaking" as it appears in the resolution to a more comprehensive phrase like "Spanish origin or descent" or "Spanish-speaking background." This change will avoid any narrow interpretation of the scope of the resolution.

3. Provide that the Bureau of Census, in cooperation with appropriate State and local agencies and various population study groups and experts, develop a program for estimating undercount of Spanish-origin population.

4. Call for the development of an aggressive action plan to hire Spanish-origin personnel within the Social and Economics Statistic Administration, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service and Economic Service.

5. Provide for the development and use of bilingual or Spanish questionnaires in future censuses.

6. Insist on the publication of monthly national unemployment rates for Spanish-origin Americans, as well as the development of data on migrant population.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that the adoption of House Joint Resolution 406 will set in motion a greater Federal awareness of the

just concerns of Spanish-speaking Americans. There is no excuse for defective data as a basis for present or future programs. Clearly Federal agencies have a legal responsibility to develop and use accurate statistics on Spanish origin. To fail in that commitment is to raise a most serious issue—one encompassing a people and its government. As this country's second largest minority group, the Spanish-speaking have scrutinized the performance of this Government in responding to its concerns. They have become increasingly critical and disappointed in the Government's conduct. Defective counts and surveys bring not only loss in funds, resources, and representation, but loss of trust in the legal and governmental process itself.

House Joint Resolution 406, if carried out, offers substantial evidence of this Government's willingness and intent to respond to the grievances of Spanish-speaking Americans.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I just want to comment. I know my colleague from California has been most diligent in his effort to make sure that the Spanish-speaking and the Spanish-background people and those of Spanish descent or Mexican American, are adequately and fully represented, to have a full voice here.

I appreciate the work that he has done in trying to make sure that the Congress is responsive to this need, also, and I regret I have to go to another committee meeting, but we are aware of your efforts and appreciate them.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hinshaw?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the recommendations which my colleague from California has indicated to solve the problem are very good ones. One of the things I want to ask you about, Congressman, is in the southern California area, we have had a problem that we dealt with in one of my other subcommittees, the so-called illegal aliens in this country of all kinds, Chinese, Mexicans, and others.

I would like you to comment on that which we are now addressing ourselves to, is part of the problem caused by persons working for the Census Bureau not speaking Spanish, going into some of the areas where the Spanish persons would be, and not being able to get full rapport with the persons.

They don't speak Spanish, or perhaps there might be persons who would be defined as illegal aliens in that area.

Mr. ROYBAL. The illegal aliens are just a fraction of the Spanish-speaking population of the United States. That does not mean, of course, that there hasn't been a problem when it comes to census taking.

The problem, I believe, has been the reluctance on the part of the Bureau of the Census, to actually provide the guidelines that are necessary to make an accurate count. In order to implement those guidelines, it is, I believe, necessary that they hire men and women who do speak Spanish, and who can go into the various barrios and communities in the United States and get adequate information.

I think that one of the recommendations that has been made deals with that particular subject matter, and I believe that this should be implemented.

Now, I don't wish to be critical only of the Census Bureau. I am critical of the entire Government of the United States because, at the moment, only 3.1 percent of all of its employees have Spanish surnames. Now 8 years ago during the time of President Kennedy, the percentage was 2.6. Then we went to 3. Now it is 3.1. To have made progress at the rate of one-half of 1 percent in 8 years is absolutely no progress at all.

Now the same conditions as then are reflected in the employment pattern of the Bureau of the Census, and because of that, they are unable to do the job correctly.

Mr. HINSHAW. My concern principally with this problem would be California, because that is where most of the Spanish origin persons are, I believe.

Mr. ROYBAL. There are over 3 million Spanish-speaking people in the State of California.

Mr. HINSHAW. That would constitute a major portion of the entire U.S. population, would it not, in terms of Spanish origin?

Mr. ROYBAL. According to the report made by the Census Bureau, the estimated there were 9 million throughout the United States. Other organizations making a similar count estimated 12 million, and just the other day I got another report saying that the figure was closer to 14 million. So it depends on what estimate you use.

At least let us stipulate to the fact that the State of California has approximately one-third.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. So this would constitute 25 to 35 percent of the total U.S. population of Spanish origin. It would be a significant number.

Recognizing that, and recognizing that within California alone, most of that 3 million or whatever the figure would be, would be in southern California, could part of the problem in your opinion be posed by the allegation that there are substantial numbers of aliens in this country illegally from Mexico? Therefore, this would contribute to an undercount because of the difficulty of understanding the language on the part of the census enumerators and perhaps a certain amount of suspicion on the part of those persons who might consider themselves to be here illegally.

Mr. ROYBAL. It would be assumed that is a problem. I don't believe it to be a major problem at all. First of all, most of the people coming in from Mexico do not really come to the State of California. They do go out to work in the farm belts of other States. I think the State of Texas, for one, has that problem. So does the State of Arizona and the State of New Mexico.

They go as far north as Illinois and Michigan. So it is a problem not only in the State of California.

Now having said that, I do agree that it does present a problem in California, but that it is not the major one, and should not be used as an excuse.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the answer I was hoping you would finally get around to saying, that to help alleviate the problem of discrimination of Spanish origin in southern California, we should not assume that the major portion of that discrimination is because there may be some aliens here illegally. I have no further questions.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Hinshaw. Mr. Roybal, you are certainly to be commended for taking the initiative in this important area. I think you pretty well delineated some of the problems that caused an undercount on page 3 of your testimony.

Going on to page 5 of your testimony, you brought out one possibility that I alluded to earlier in one of the other witness' testimony. Certainly there are other sources in finding accurate figures or testing the figures that are made or gathered by the Census Bureau, and I would think the school figures would be very helpful in Spanish-speaking areas where you could take a percentage that are in the school system and by a formula work out the population in that area.

Has this ever been done by the Census Bureau?

Mr. ROYBAL. It is my understanding that it was not done. Some of the other guidelines that should have been developed by the Census Bureau have not been carried out, and very little work has been done in Spanish-speaking communities, particularly in the State of California, to arrive at a true population figure. A little while ago, I mentioned that there were over 3 million Spanish-speaking people in the State of California. The Census Bureau originally estimated that there were less.

Through the efforts of this subcommittee and various community groups, the Bureau did a second estimate and discovered that there were more than 3 million people in the State of California with Spanish surnames. Now to have to do the job twice is expensive. We would like to see a guideline that will enable them to do the job once and do it right.

Mr. WHITE. How accurate do you think the system is of name identification that the Census Bureau uses in the five Southwestern States?

Mr. ROYBAL. I think it is as accurate as anything can possibly be.

Mr. WHITE. The testimony shows that for this purpose, the Census Bureau did not use those familiar with the Spanish language. Do you feel that this would pose a problem insofar as properly identifying these names?

Mr. ROYBAL. I think it is a major point. For example, there are very few Anglos, if I may use that term, that would recognize all the Spanish surnames. The name "Roybal" to many would not be a Spanish surname, but it is definitely a Spanish surname and recognized as such by other persons of Spanish-speaking background.

Mr. WHITE. We had one witness that testified between these hearings, really a hearing on another bill, but he also made a comment in the area of counting accurately those of Spanish origin. He said that it was in his study that five names, I believe it was five names of Spanish origin constituted about 20 percent of the Spanish-speaking population, and his system was to go through the directory in the community and count those five names and then multiply by five, and that would give a figure. Of course he was on the side of your resolution. What do you think of that particular system?

Mr. ROYBAL. I would not want to use that system. I don't believe it would be accurate, or any more accurate than taking all the Smiths and Joneses and trying to arrive at a national population figure based on the number of Joneses and Smiths we may have.

Mr. WHITE. You suggest on page 6 of your testimony that this resolution be amended to include language to compel the Office of Management and Budget in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census and other data gathering agencies to develop a good Government-wide program for collecting data on Mexican-Americans and others of Spanish origin.

How would you envision this language? Do you have the language that you would like to submit at a later time for this subcommittee?

Mr. ROYBAL. I believe we can prepare language that would address itself to this particular situation.

Mr. WHITE. We would welcome that language and would consider it at the time of markup on this bill, which we hope would be soon.

Mr. ROYBAL. I would be happy to provide it.

Mr. WHITE. Fine, and we agree with you on the change to Spanish origin. The question I have now concerns the matter of national monthly unemployment rates for Spanish origin Americans. Do you feel this would cause budgetary problems? Do you think quarterly would be adequate?

Mr. ROYBAL. At present, we do get monthly unemployment rates for the entire Nation, and it seems to me it would not be too much of a problem to provide the unemployment rate in the Spanish-speaking communities. However, should that not be possible, quarterly reporting probably would be sufficient.

Mr. WHITE. In your resolution, where you call for monthly publication for the Bureau of Labor Statistics of collection and compilation of data, were you then contemplating unemployment rates?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Merely as to labor profiles?

Mr. ROYBAL. There is a great deal of information that can be made available by modern methods. If it is possible to get other data monthly, I think it should be done, but to ignore certain data simply because you don't want to include it, I think, is something that should not happen.

Whatever data can be made available with regard to the Spanish speaking, as is now made available on other groups, should be published. I hope it can be done on a monthly basis, for this would be widely used by community activists, and by professionals who work in Spanish-speaking communities of the United States. It would also be useful to educators or doctors, and people who are involved daily in the problems of the Spanish-speaking communities.

Mr. WHITE. If the Congress passes a mid-decade census bill, then from the tenor of your testimony, you would recommend that the Bureau of the Census also include questions that would assist on the delineation of the socioeconomic problems of the Mexican-Americans and other Spanish origin persons.

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes, I would.

Mr. WHITE. Your testimony has been very helpful, and we again want to commend you for very constructive steps in developing the knowledge of this problem for the subcommittee.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. At this time, the Chair calls as a witness Mr. Louis Nunez, Deputy Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS NUNEZ, DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS; ACCOMPANIED BY CYNTHIA GRAAE, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS EVALUATION, AND JAIME TARONJI, JR., SPECIAL ASSISTANT

Mr. NUNEZ. Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I am Louis Nunez, Deputy Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this subcommittee in support of House Joint Resolution 406 on the collection and publication of social and economic statistics on persons of Spanish-speaking background.

I am accompanied by Cynthia Graae, Associate Director of the Office of Federal Civil Rights Evaluation, and Jaime Taronji, Jr., my special assistant, who are the Commission's specialists in the area of social statistics and their implications for the Spanish-speaking. Ms. Graae is the principal author of "To Know or Not to Know: Collection and Use of Racial and Ethnic Data in Federal Assistance Programs," and Mr. Taronji is the principal author of "Counting the Forgotten: The 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish-Speaking Background in the United States." Both of these reports have been published in the last 2 years.

In these reports, and in its series on the Federal civil rights enforcement effort, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has expressed major concerns regarding the problems of establishing an accurate count of persons of Spanish-speaking background and regarding the adoption of uniform definitions for Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Spanish-speaking people. We have been critical of the methods used by Federal agencies to collect statistics for this group of citizens, who constitute the second largest minority in the United States.

The importance of an accurate count becomes obvious when one considers the varied uses made of census data by Federal, State, local, and private program administrators.

For example, let us look at general revenue sharing as it relates to El Paso, Tex., a city where 50-percent of the population was Mexican-American, according to the 1970 census. The 1970 census data is one of three factors in determining general revenue sharing allocations. Subsequent to the 1970 census, the Census Bureau released new Spanish origin population figures which indicated that as of March 1973 the Mexican-American population had increased nationally by 39 percent. The Commission believes that much of this increase was actually a failure on the part of the Census Bureau to count accurately persons of Spanish origin. In all probability, there was an undercount of the Mexican-American population in El Paso in 1970. However, the allocation of general revenue sharing funds continues to be determined by a formula using 1970 census data—meaning that El Paso probably is not receiving its fair share of Federal funds.

The situation would be similar for other cities with high concentrations of Spanish origin populations such as Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, San Antonio, and Miami—cities where allegations of serious undercounts of the Spanish-speaking have been made.

There are many other Federal programs which use census data, even where it is not required by law. Compliance with the provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act for nondiscrimination in public and private employment cannot be monitored effectively without census data on the available work force, broken down by race and national origin and cross-referenced by sex.

In the protection of voting rights, census data is crucial to establishing the eligible voter population so as to identify discrimination against racial and ethnic minority groups. Data collected by the Bureau of the Census are used by other Federal statistical agencies, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Agriculture, in evaluating unemployment and the socioeconomic characteristics of the rural population. Because of the exceeding importance of census data for all these purposes, "Counting the Forgotten" focused on the Bureau of the Census' data collection of persons of Spanish-speaking background. This report, whose findings and recommendations I am submitting, makes several points which are particularly germane to the pending legislation, H. J. Res. 406.

The Commission found that the Bureau of the Census' programs and procedures were insensitive to the problems of counting the Spanish-speaking background population. In the 1970 census, the Bureau did not use a uniform measure to identify all persons of Spanish-speaking background. It relied, rather, upon a variety of indices administered on a sample basis. Further, the Census Bureau provided inadequate assistance to Spanish-speaking households for them to respond accurately to the census questionnaire.

The Commission has concluded that the Spanish-speaking background population was probably undercounted substantially in the 1970 census. Evidence of an undercount lies in the Census Bureau's deficient methodology and data collection techniques. The evidence is supported by the fact that the Bureau has admitted that it undercounted blacks by 7.7 percent. Like blacks, persons of Spanish-speaking background live under conditions where the probability of an undercount is great. Moreover, some independent surveys supply higher estimates of local Spanish-speaking background communities than that of the Census Bureau.

To insure that the deficiencies noted in the 1970 census do not occur in 1970 and subsequent censuses, the Commission recommended that the Census Bureau's programs and procedures be made more sensitive to the Spanish-speaking background population; that the Bureau use a uniform measure to identify persons of Spanish-speaking background on all questionnaires; and that the Bureau provide adequate bilingual assistance to Spanish-speaking households.

Even though Commission staff have discussed the issues identified in our report with the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau has made no commitment to incorporate our recommendations for the 1980 census. The Bureau states that it has had, and continues to have, meetings with Spanish-speaking background groups to discuss this problem and that it is in the process of evaluating the 1970 census.

The time for meetings and evaluations has passed. The time for action is now. If the Bureau of the Census refuses to correct the deficiencies noted in the 1970 census on its own initiative, this sub-

committee, under its legislative oversight responsibilities, should insure that the Bureau's programs and procedures for the 1980 census, and its intercensal data gathering programs, are responsive to the needs of the Spanish-speaking background population. These hearings today are a major step in that direction.

The Census Bureau is not the only Federal agency whose data collection efforts regarding persons of Spanish-speaking background are adequate. Other Federal general purpose data collection agencies, such as the National Center for Health Statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare collect no data on persons of Spanish-speaking background. These agencies confine their data collection activities to the racial classifications of "white" and "Negro and other races."

Other Federal agencies collect some data on racial and ethnic minority groups participating in their programs. Some collect data using the generic terms "Spanish-American" or "Spanish surnamed." Only a few agencies collect data on the constituent groups of the Spanish-speaking background population: Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other persons of Spanish-speaking background.

There is no consistency in the Federal Government on whether to collect data on persons of Spanish-speaking background; to what extent the data should be collected; or how to identify the group. There is, moreover, no consistency in the methodology for collecting the data. Some agencies provide for collecting racial and ethnic data on the basis of visual observation, in which an observer makes a judgment about the individual's race or ethnic origin. Other agencies use self-identification, in which the individual supplies his or her race or ethnic origin. These inconsistencies are covered in another Commission publication. "To Know or Not to Know: Collection and Use of Racial and Ethnic Data in Federal Assistance Programs." I am submitting a copy of the findings and recommendations from that publication.

The Commission has recommended in both of these reports that data should be collected and published on the major groups of the Spanish-speaking background population—Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other persons of Spanish-speaking background—through self-identification. This is a more accurate measure than Spanish birth or parentage, Spanish language, or Spanish surname because it allows persons who consider themselves to be of Spanish origin but who are not of first or second generation, do not speak Spanish, or do not have a Spanish surname, to so identify themselves.

The Office of Management and Budget is, to a large extent, responsible for the inconsistency in the Federal Government's data collection activities on persons of Spanish-speaking background. OMB is the single most important Federal agency setting standards for data collection. OMB has oversight responsibilities over the statistical activities of all Federal agencies. OMB is charged by Congress with regulating Federal statistics to improve the gathering, compilation, analysis, publication, and distribution of statistical information. OMB also is responsible for approving all questionnaires and administrative forms used in Federal programs.

OMB has not required the collection of any racial or ethnic data. It has only provided guidelines stating that the categories "white," "Negro," and "other races" should be used by those Federal agencies collecting racial data. No mention is made of data on persons of Spanish-speaking background.

The Commission on Civil Rights has recommended to OMB that it establish regulations requiring the collection of data on persons of Spanish-speaking background, but OMB has not been forthcoming with such regulations. OMB insists that each Federal agency must weigh its own data requirements and collect data commensurate with its needs. OMB recently produced a publication called "Social Indicators—1973." This publication was an attempt to consolidate, in one volume, all social statistics on population growth, education, employment, income, housing, health, public safety, and leisure and recreation data available from other Federal agencies. Data were only published, however, for "white" and "Negro" and other races. This was yet another instance in which the Spanish-speaking background population was not taken into consideration.

The Commission supports the intent of House Joint Resolution 406. We would like to make some recommendations to strengthen further the proposed legislation. We feel that the self-identification method, as previously discussed, should be incorporated into the proposed legislation. In addition, the provision of bilingual assistance in collecting the data should be included in the legislation. Such assistance should be in the form of bilingual data collectors and bilingual questionnaires. We recommend that all Federal agencies responsible for data collection be required to collect data on persons of Spanish-speaking background and that OMB be required to coordinate this effort.

The Commission commends Congressman Roybal for having introduced this legislation and the subcommittee for having provided all interested parties the opportunity to testify. We hope that these hearings will cause the Federal Government to respond to the need for adequate data on persons of Spanish-speaking background so that these persons will no longer be uncounted and forgotten. I thank you for the opportunity to present the Commission's views on House Joint Resolution 406, and I am at your disposal to answer questions.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Nunez. This is a very thorough statement of your position, and very helpful to the subcommittee.

In speaking of the one example you use, El Paso, you said that they were exempted from the rest of the country in that there was an undercount of those of Spanish origin for purposes of certain Government programs.

Now, so that we will clarify the record, are you speaking of an undercount of those of Spanish origin per se, at the same time there was an accurate count of heads, or are you saying there was not an accurate count of heads, whether they be of Spanish origin or not?

Mr. NUNEZ. You mean whether there was a total count of the total population of the community?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. NUNEZ. It is difficult to determine whether some people were counted and chose not to identify themselves as Mexican-Americans,

or whether they were not counted at all. I think unless you conducted a precise investigation of what went wrong, I would gather that both situations occurred—that some people were simply not counted, so that the total general population of El Paso was indicated as being lower than it actually was; and some other people were not classified as Mexican-Americans. I think there is some evidence that can be brought to bear on this issue in that one of the interesting facts revealed in the March 1973 reestimate by the Bureau of the Census, was the enormous upsurge in the population of Mexican-Americans, and the drop in numbers of the categories of “other Spanish” speaking.

I think that is attributable to the fact that more choices were given as to defining the Mexican-American population, and people who would not otherwise be identified as such chose, under the new system—the new questionnaire—to identify themselves.

Mr. WHITE. Is that what you use as a reference related to economic programs—socioeconomic programs—in counting for the distribution of moneys, it isn’t counted by ethnic group, but it is counted by heads that fit into an economic category?

Mr. NUNEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. That is why I asked. But there are many other purposes, such as you mentioned, discrimination, equal employment and other things.

Mr. NUNEZ. Ms. Graae did investigations on revenue sharing and could give us insights on this problem of the relationship of minority groups to revenue sharing.

Ms. GRAAE. I think the point about the El Paso case is that El Paso was, according to the 1970 census, 50 percent Mexican American. So, a substantial undercount of the Mexican-American population would be an undercount of the total El Paso population.

Mr. WHITE. I am getting at whether they counted heads and failed to identify them as Mexican-Americans, or whether they failed to count the people themselves. This is the question.

Ms. GRAAE. It is our opinion that both occurred.

Mr. WHITE. But do you know?

Mr. NUNEZ. No; unless you make a specific investigation.

Mr. WHITE. Now, is there anything that you heard during the course of the morning in testimony with many of the witnesses that you would differ with, for the record?

Mr. NUNEZ. Not that we could differ so much, but I think it is very important that the Bureau of the Census and for that matter, OMB set up a standard Spanish origin category. One of the problems is the way you define people, you get a different set of figures, and one of the startling facts was that the census in their 1970 census essentially had five different counts of the Spanish-speaking population in the United States, and depending on the definition, the figures came out differently, and we would feel this is very much in order that we have a uniform definition of the Spanish-speaking minority population of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Nunez, you made three recommendations for changes in the current resolution, one as to self-identification incorporated into proposed legislation, one for bilingual assistance in collecting the data, and the third for recommending that all the Federal agencies responsible for data collection be required to collect data on

persons of Spanish-speaking background and that OMB be required to coordinate this effort.

Would you, or could you, please, provide us with language that you feel in each instance would be proper for consideration of the subcommittee? If you could get that to us, say, in a week, we would appreciate it.

Mr. NUNEZ. Fine.

[The following letter was furnished:]

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1974.

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to Representative Hinshaw's request that the Commission on Civil Rights advise the Subcommittee with respect to whether or not the Commission believes that data which we recommend for persons of Spanish origin should be collected for other racial and national origin minorities. In addition, I am also complying with your request that we draft appropriate language so as to include in House Joint Resolution 406 the recommendations contained in my testimony on June 11, 1974.

The Commission favors accurate and thorough data collection regarding this Nation's minorities. We have gone on record in two reports making recommendations for the improvement of Federal minority group statistics. "Counting the Forgotten: The 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish Speaking Background" is limited solely to persons of Spanish speaking background. However, "To Know or Not to Know: Use of Racial and Ethnic Data in Federal Assistance Programs" pertains to all disadvantaged minority groups.

It would be inappropriate to say that most of the recommendations in "Counting the Forgotten" should be applied to other racial/ethnic minorities. On page 10 of that report we do note that inadequacies in census data have been alleged by other groups including blacks, American Indians, and Asian Americans, but we have not undertaken an indepth study of those inadequacies and thus cannot, at this time, make specific recommendations for their remedy. There are, however, several recommendations in this report which appear to be applicable to other racial and national origin minority groups when one of these factors is present: (1) where language differences create a communication barrier; or (2) where there are natural obstacles to the respondent providing accurate information, i.e., reluctance to be identified either due to lack of understanding or fear of some punitive sanction.

Our recommendations in "To Know or Not to Know" are more generally applicable. In that report we stated that we believe that there are five major racial/ethnic categories which should be used when data are collected on a nationwide basis. These are "Black," "Spanish Speaking Background," "Native American," "Asian American" and "Other." Separate data should also be obtained for the major sub-groups in these categories especially Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Chinese, and Japanese unless a valid reason for failing to do so can be demonstrated.

In addition, we also recommend that there be separate data collection on other racial/ethnic groups, such as Philipinos, Koreans, or Portuguese, where these groups are disadvantaged and data collection takes place in the local communities in which significant numbers of these people reside.

We continue to believe that this recommendation should be applied where racial/ethnic data are collected for most purposes, including program planning or evaluation, allocation of resources, measurement of discrimination, and other general uses.

I have also enclosed draft language which would amend H.J. Res. 406 so as to require OMB to establish and coordinate uniform data collection with respect to Spanish origin groups. Our language would also postpone by one year the deadline for the Labor Department's monthly publication of unemployment rates of Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban and other Spanish origin groups. Finally, we have suggested language which would require bilingual data collectors and use of bilingual questionnaires.

If you have any further questions or desire clarification, please have a member of your staff call Bud Blakey (254-6626) or Jaime Taronji (254-8134).

Sincerely,

LOUIS NUNEZ,
Acting Staff Director.

Enclosure.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all Federal data collection agencies include the collection and publication of data on Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban and other "Spanish origin" persons through self-identification and that the Office of Management and Budget coordinate this data collection effort; that the Department of Labor in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census immediately begin to undertake the collection and compilation of data in order to provide for the monthly publication by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, beginning not later than July 1974, of the nationwide unemployment rate of Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other "Spanish origin" persons; that the Bureau of Census and the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture undertake further efforts to collect and publish annual statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic conditions of Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other "Spanish origin" persons; and that bilingual assistance in the form of bilingual data collectors and bilingual questionnaires be provided respondents when collecting data on Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other "Spanish origin" persons.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hinshaw?

Mr. HINSHAW. Up to the time of the push for civil rights, there had been a considerable complaint lodged by minorities on the collection of ethnic backgrounds. Specifically the big complaint then was on the employment forms. Would it be your position now that we should go back to the original insertion of ethnic backgrounds on employment forms?

Mr. NUNEZ. I would say that in order to monitor civil rights enforcement, we must know what progress or lack of progress is being made in equal opportunity programs, affirmative action programs, and the various grant programs; and the only way you can effectively monitor these programs is to know the impact these programs are having on the major identifiable racial and ethnic minority groups.

I would refer you to Ms. Graae and her report "To Know or Not To Know" which speaks directly to the whole issue as to the degree of information required by the Government to properly perform its function in assisting people in our society into the mainstream.

Ms. GRAAE. We recommend that such information be collected, but that certain safeguards be taken to be sure this information would not be misused. We have also found that where people were intent upon using racial or ethnic information to discriminate, even if the data were not directed to be collected, such information on the race or ethnicity of an applicant or employee was generally available to employers, in one form or another.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not sure I understand your answer now, and I think you could do it with a "yes" or "no." Would it be your position that on employment forms, we should allow, or even require the collection of this racial or ethnic information?

Mr. NUNEZ. On employment forms?

Ms. GRAAE. I think yes, with the caveat that it is explained what the information is collected for.

Mr. HINSHAW. All right.

Do you have any feeling at all, if we were to adopt this resolution, and even include some language which might be recommended in

strengthening the resolution, perhaps, that there would then be demands by others that we collect the same data and have the same emphasis on other racial or ethnic groups?

Mr. NUNEZ. It is an interesting problem that the census counted the Koreans and Japanese and American Indians, and this has gone back 30 or 40 years, and all these groups are tiny compared to the total Spanish-speaking background population.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want to stay with the principle and not with the number.

Mr. NUNEZ. As a matter of fact, the census does compile statistics on ethnic Americans. They have figures on first generation Polish Americans and Italian Americans. This is not new. What we are looking at is that they have really ignored the problem of the Spanish-speaking until recently, but they haven't ignored the problem of looking at other groups for various and diverse reasons. The immigration acts of the 1920's were based on census data.

Now, the question you raise is information, or facts, which are not good or bad in themselves. I think you, gentlemen, as policymakers, make those policy considerations, but I think it is important to have the information as to the number of any group in our society, and then what you chose to do with it is something else, but having the facts, I don't think, is a danger.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is not the question running through my mind right now. What I am wondering is, if the Census Bureau has some emphasis in these various areas, has it been that the method of identification and collection has been inadequate across the board for all groups, the Indian groups, the Chinese, the Korean, the Italian Americans, the Mexican Americans and all these different groups? Has it been that the collection process has not been as good as it ought to be, but now we are emphasizing that because of the substantial percentage of Spanish origin?

Mr. NUNEZ. Our investigations have not been conducted on the problems of other groups, but I would say there was a dramatic increase in the number of American Indians between the 1960 and 1970 census that could not have been attributed to natural increase. It was probably a question of definition. These people chose to identify themselves as American Indians.

Mr. HINSHAW. Assuming that that could be the case, and again staying with the principle rather than numbers, shouldn't this subcommittee address itself to the overall problem of identification and definition of all groups, as opposed to just Spanish origin?

Mr. NUNEZ. I would recommend that this Commission stand for an accurate count of every group that the Government would be interested in having statistics on. I don't see any problem in that. I think that would be a good position to take. If statistics are inadequate, if the methods of defining the various groups are inadequate, then the Bureau of the Census and various other organizations in Government should refine their techniques to get the most accurate statistics possible.

Mr. HINSHAW. Your Commission, I take it, is concerned with more than just Spanish origin?

Mr. NUNEZ. Oh, yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Could you give us a statement from your Commission as to whether or not we ought to look into the other racial-ethnic groups. We know there is a question about Spanish origin. There might have been substantial undercounting of the Indian group. Could we get a statement from your Commission that we ought to look at the definition of all groups?

Mr. NUNEZ. Yes. [See letter on p. 91.]

Mr. HINSHAW. I have no further questions.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Nunez. We appreciate your coming. The subcommittee will presently adjourn until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. WHITE. The Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee will be in order.

We have held hearings this morning and have adjourned to the afternoon for completion of our testimony for the day. I made an opening statement, so I won't repeat the statement, on the purposes of these hearings. I believe most of you were present at that time.

So I will just go ahead and call the first witness, Mr. Zazueta, national director, Operation SER, Jobs for Progress, Los Angeles, Calif.

STATEMENT OF RICARDO ZAZUETA, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, OPERATION SER, JOBS FOR PROGRESS; ACCOMPANIED BY NARCISO CANO, ASSISTANT NATIONAL DIRECTOR, OPERATION SER, JOBS FOR PROGRESS

Mr. ZAZUETA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am accompanied by Narciso Cano, deputy executive director.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Zazueta, you may proceed.

Mr. ZAZUETA. Mr. Chairman, honorable Members of Congress, on behalf of the SER, Jobs for Progress organization and our two sponsors, the American G.I. Forum and the League of United Latin American Citizens, thank you for allowing me to present our thoughts on the House Joint Resolution 406. There is no doubt that in statistics, as in our children, lies our future. Statistics reveal problems that need solutions. Without statistics, the problems and their magnitude are clothed in the darkness of ignorance.

My testimony will be limited to one such problem, just beginning its emergence into the sunlight. How many Spanish-origin Americans hold jobs; and how many that want them, don't have them?

The economic terms are employment and unemployment rates, with the term discouraged workers added as a twist. We wish to recommend how answers to these questions can be better obtained.

Thanks to the work 2 years ago of Congressman Roybal, Senator Montoya, and this subcommittee, the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics have begun to provide annual national averages for unemployment rates of Spanish-origin Americans.

However, the emphasis is on the words "annual" and "national" No es bastante. This is not enough.

Unemployment rate data for the Spanish-origin American population as with other special segments of the population is needed on at least a State basis, and preferably on a local market area basis.

Why? Because increasingly laws and administrative policies and procedures are passed which rely on these statistics. We already have one law which apportions over \$1 billion per year among States and localities according to unemployment rate data. (I am referring to titles I and II of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.) And the Spanish-origin communities must negotiate for these funds with mayors, county administrators and Governors with 1970 census data—which was faulty, as the 1.5 million Spanish-origin undercount reflected. They need better data—they need your help. Our thoughts on how you can help follow.

We ask you to encourage the Bureau of Census and Labor Statistics, as well as the Department of Labor, and the Office of Management and Budget to adopt the following points:

1. Expand the current population survey so as to give employment data on the Spanish-origin population in all 50 States and the 100 largest metropolitan areas. We understand such an expansion has been proposed to OMB by BLS and the Bureau of the Census. The cost is approximately \$160,000 per State. Not too high a figure for the better distribution of over \$1 billion per year.

2. Modify the current population survey so as to identify the number of "discouraged workers" of Spanish-origin. "Discouraged workers" are those who indicate that they would like to have jobs now but for some reason are not looking for employment at this time. They are generally termed the "discouraged" or "hidden unemployed." We understand discouraged workers are now either "white" or "non-white." We believe Spanish-origin people constitute a portion of the discouraged worker category in excess of their proportionate representation in the published unemployment rate totals, and in the civilian labor force. And because many policy decisions which rely on unemployment rate data, including the "discouraged worker," the Spanish-origin population must be properly counted in that category.

3. Expand the use of bilingual interviewers in conducting the current population survey. As in the 1970 census, how many of our people are not included because the interviewer is not familiar with our cultures and our language. Many monolingual interviewers admit to being afraid to go into the barrios. Now is the time to change.

4. Modify the "70-step" method so as to obtain monthly employment and unemployment estimates for the Spanish-origin population. While expanding the current Population Survey will provide satisfactory annual average data on unemployment for the majority of labor markets and all States, we understand the 70-step method will continue to be used to provide monthly estimates. And it will remain the main method in labor market areas below the largest 100. If so, we feel that this method too must be overhauled so as to provide data on the Spanish-origin population. One place to start would be to have the unemployment insurance claim forms of all States allow for Spanish-origin self-identification. And while unemployment insurance excludes many Spanish-origin people such as migrants, we believe identification of claims from Spanish-origin people would be desirable as it is a fundamental building block in the 70-step method.

5. Our last recommendation is: join with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and staff to investigate how existing or planned EEO reports might be utilized to supplement or benchmark

their Spanish origin employment data-gathering procedures. For example, perhaps the 70-step method could become the 71-step method.

Mr. Chairman, and honorable Members of Congress, I believe we made some specific recommendations which are not farfetched. We hope you give them your serious consideration.

This concludes our testimony. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to appear.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Zazueta. Your testimony has been very helpful. I must confess that I have not heard of the 70-step method before. Could you elaborate so I have some clear picture in my mind as to what it constitutes?

Mr. ZAZUETA. Mr. Cano is the expert in that.

Mr. WHITE. Would you give us your first name, and spell it for the reporter.

Mr. CANO. N-a-r-c-i-s-o.

The 70-step method has been the traditional means by which unemployment estimates are made for the Nation.

It was developed quite a number of years ago. My guess is that it is between 25 and 30 years old, and it has not gone through many changes during that time. It is based on literally 70 steps. One of the fundamental building blocks being the unemployment insurance claims filed in the State. The others, as I understand it, are the wage and hourly reports submitted by employers plus a number of other indicators. These are generated monthly by the individual State employment services throughout the States for their States, and in addition, many of the local areas use this method to produce their own calculation on the unemployment rates in their hometowns or localities.

Mr. WHITE. There is nothing in the bill that would preclude the using of this. The resolution really gives the background and the basis for having a monthly report of unemployment expansion. So you are suggesting that this is a means of quick and accurate determination of the Spanish-origin unemployed, working with existing agencies and data collection?

Mr. CANO. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. You heard the hearing this morning, I believe?

Mr. ZAZUETA. Yes, part of it.

Mr. WHITE. Did you hear anything with which you would differ in the sense of the needs and the means and the failure in the past.

Mr. ZAZUETA. No. We just wanted to zero in, so to speak, on unemployment. We are a national manpower delivery system for the Spanish-speaking, and those are our most serious concern.

Mr. WHITE. What is your home State?

Mr. ZAZUETA. We are out of California, but we have programs in Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. We have 14 States, mainly in the Southwest, but we are finding more Spanish-speaking people in the Midwest, and they are having serious problems statistically in the Midwest, also, the same problems identified this morning, and mainly in our area is the unemployment problem.

Mr. WHITE. Are you familiar with the procedures that the Census Bureau set up for the decennial census in determining the numbers of persons of Spanish origin in this country?

Mr. ZAZUETA. Mr. Cano is probably more familiar with that.

Mr. CANO. Mr. Zazueta asked me to do the research for the testimony. I am familiar with that.

Mr. WHITE. Do you know they have those who were to recognize the persons of Spanish surnames in a five-State area, and then outside the five-State area they had only a percentage that they sent out for Spanish origin?

Mr. CANO. Five percent, that is correct.

Mr. WHITE. In the first phase, they were supposed to mail out to every household a questionnaire form and follow up with an enumerator going to them in person to be certain that the questionnaire was completed, and then later in those five States, including California, the Census Bureau was supposed to identify the Spanish surnames and errors. How do you account for the discrepancy in the computation of the population of California as an illustration? I think it varied something over 1 million people.

Mr. CANO. That is right.

Mr. WHITE. How do you account for that? Do you think it was because the enumerators were fearful of going into an area, or what?

Mr. CANO. I think first of all, it is like comparing apples and oranges. The 1970 census compared to the 1973 Current Population Survey, which the Census Bureau states modified their estimate, are two different animals. And we think that the previous methods of the Current Population Survey were inadequate. In summarizing, I guess what I am trying to say is that there were many flaws in the 1970 census, and I don't think they have been corrected nor can they be.

I guess what I am trying to say is that 1970 is gone, you cannot go back and take another census of 1970 in 1974. The best you can do is do what was done, which is to modify the Current Population Survey to make it more accurate with respect to the Spanish origin, and I guess that is the end of my statement. It is apples and oranges.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Zazueta, you suggested that the Current Population Survey should be expanded to give more accurate information on Spanish origin, and indicated the cost of your program would be \$160,000 per State. Is this a one-time cost, or cost per year?

Mr. ZAZUETA. Our estimates are yearly. They are only estimates, of course, and this is referring only to the \$1 million that are going in there.

Mr. WHITE. Now, you used the words "discouraged workers," and then by your description of the discouraged worker, while this is certainly poignant as to those who actually become discouraged and find no available or proper job, I wonder, to be more encompassing, if you would not want to use the words "nonsearching worker." There are those who don't want to work, regardless of their ethnic background. Would the category of discouraged worker include those who are not in the mood to search right now?

Mr. ZAZUETA. We have a definition, and we took the definitions from the Labor Department data. I would go along with your suggestion. I think that is more encompassing.

Mr. WHITE. You don't want to include in the unemployment figures those who are not really looking and don't want to work.

All right, sir, let me go on. Do you think there would be any objection on the part of the persons seeking unemployment insurance in

identifying themselves as Spanish-origin, or do you feel they would be uncooperative?

Mr. ZAZUETA. I think usually there are some psychological problems that Spanish-origin people do face because of discrimination and ignorance on the part of the interviewers and that type of thing. Sometimes, there is fear on both levels, but I think that if they saw that this was going to be a help, a real help to them in getting more resources or adequate resources or inequity in resources to them, to alleviate some of the problems in unemployment specifically, I think they would be ready to identify themselves.

Mr. WHITE. What about the illegal alien in this country. Would that scare many off, or are you computing many in the figures?

Mr. ZAZUETA. Again, there are some ingrained problems in the illegal alien situation, and it is on both sides. I have had reports that this would be a discriminating factor, that anybody who looked brown, they would not consider for employment because he might be an illegal alien, and again, this would be, I think, a detriment if we start identifying those things in those specific laws that are on the books at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Do you have any idea what percentage of the households, say, in California as an illustration, which are Spanish-speaking do not have anyone in the house that is fluent or competent in English?

Mr. ZAZUETA. I think our figures are roughly 20 percent, the last figure I saw on that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. HINSHAW. This morning I asked Mr. Nunez and Mrs. Graae of the Civil Rights Commission a question relating to employment forms and I would like to get your reaction. I prefaced my question this morning with the statement that it is my recollection that prior to the big push on civil rights there were great pressures brought to bear to not allow, not permit, racial or ethnic information on an employment form. At this point, to help with the problem of Spanish-origin, would it be your position that we should not allow the reinstatement of ethnic and racial information on employment forms?

Mr. ZAZUETA. I think at least the consensus of the people I speak to would say it is an important factor. They were being factored out before by not allowing the ethnic origin, many times; at one time, white and nonwhite, many times, hurts our population quite a bit, and also being identified as a minority, in general with blacks also groups us in a certain group.

Some of the forms say "black or other," and we are thrown in that category of "other," and this, again, doesn't identify our problem as well as we would like it to be identified. Again, we miss out on the resources.

Mr. HINSHAW. With all the affirmative action programs and other efforts that we have to have so-called minorities fully employed, and there are some big efforts in that regard, even including what some tend to call reverse discrimination, would it be your position that we should actively encourage and maybe even have legislation that would permit employers now to include the racial background with the idea put forth that this would monitor the effectiveness of some of these programs?

Mr. ZAZUETA. I think we have gotten very sophisticated, or the majority of the population of America has, on the need for identification of certain problems. I don't think that there would be any kind of backlash or reverse discrimination involved at this time. I think most people realize that you have to identify the problem before you can get to the problem, and sometimes, like they do in school, you know, they have to treat the blind, the people that have deficiencies either mental or physical, because it is a problem. I think civil rights has shown us a way to identify these problems, and I don't think there would be any racial overtones at all.

Mr. HINSHAW. When we try to accurately estimate the populations of racial and ethnic groupings, we tend to concentrate on the black and also the Spanish-origin, because they are largest in terms of numbers. As a matter of principle, shouldn't we also, then, try to more accurately define the other minorities, and the ones brought up this morning quite pointedly, the Indians in the country?

Mr. ZAZUETA. Yes, I think so. One of the things that has happened with the Indian minority is that they have always been separated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other set-aside programs. So the black and the Mexican-American or Chicano, or Spanish-origin, has been thrown into that minority type of situation, whereas the Indian has been identified as a separate entity and worked through separate bureaus and agencies and that type of thing.

Mr. HINSHAW. When you refer to the cost to the State of \$160,000 per State, what works out to \$6,300,000 for all 50 States, which is six-tenths of 1 percent of the \$1 billion you refer to. I take it that even if the figure were at least double that amount, you still think it would be a worthwhile expenditure to isolate the Spanish-origin?

Mr. ZAZUETA. Yes. At this time, the problem is of such proportion that it needs this kind of emphasis.

Mr. HINSHAW. When you were talking about the discouraged or the hidden employee, there has been some criticism of our welfare programs throughout the country suggesting that the welfare levels are so high that payments themselves tend to discourage persons seeking employment. To what extent do you believe the welfare levels of payments are part of this problem and as such to make it almost impossible to distinguish between those who would really like to work and those who are discouraged because of factors such as the relatively sufficient welfare payments?

Mr. ZAZUETA. The history, of course, of the Spanish-origin person has been very low as far as being involved in welfare, because of many reasons, primarily the pride in their culture, and the work ethic that the Spanish origin has.

So we have not at this time seen that problem that the Spanish origin would tend to go to the welfare rolls more than they have. In fact, programs like SER are encouragement for them to get training, and they want to get training and get the opportunity to get a meaningful job and work and take care of their families.

Mr. HINSHAW. One of my other subcommittees this morning just appraised a report on the problem of aliens in this country illegally, and the biggest problem appears to be persons coming across the San Diego-Mexico border into the southern California area. It has been

my feeling during the hearings as well as coming from that area that many of these persons that might be in this country illegally might be taking jobs from those in this country legally. As I recall the testimony this morning, there was a feeling that we should not really be concerned about the illegal alien problem in terms of the difficulties of identifying Spanish-origin persons.

Would you agree that if we were to make a more concentrated effort to find and locate Spanish-origin persons that we would not have any adverse impact on those that are in this country legally?

Mr. ZAZUETA. I would agree with that; that we would not.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Hinshaw.

We certainly do thank you, Mr. Zazueta, for your appearance.

This meeting is adjourned until tomorrow morning in room 219.

[Whereupon, at 2:30 p.m., the hearing was adjourned, to reconvene on Wednesday, June 12, 1974.]

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 1974

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee convened at 9:30 a.m., in room 219, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Richard C. White (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. WHITE. The Subcommittee on Census and Statistics will come to order.

We are meeting today to hear additional testimony on House Joint Resolution 406 introduced by Congressman Edward Roybal of California.

The purpose of this resolution is to encourage a greater Federal output of relevant statistics on Spanish-speaking Americans.

It is estimated that there are now approximately 12 million Spanish-speaking Americans in this country. Many of these persons experience major social and economic problems which effective legislation could do much to rectify. Congress, however, cannot hope to formulate such legislation in the absence of satisfactory information concerning conditions in the Spanish-speaking community. If effective programs are to be established, it is essential that accurate, comprehensive, and up-to-date statistics on the Spanish-speaking population be produced on a regular basis.

House Joint Resolution 406 raises disturbing questions concerning the adequacy of present Federal statistics relating to Spanish-speaking Americans. Our purpose in holding these hearings is to provide interested parties an opportunity to comment on the issues raised in the resolution. In previous hearings, the subcommittee has heard from Members of Congress, representatives of Government statistical agencies, and various Spanish-speaking interest groups.

At this morning's hearing, we will hear from the Honorable Henry M. Ramirez, chairman of the Cabinet Committee for Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People, and Alex Zermeno, national director of the National Counsel de la Raza. We will now call Mr. Ramirez as a witness.

STATEMENT OF REYNALDO MADURO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF HENRY M. RAMIREZ, CHAIRMAN, CCOSSP

Mr. MADURO. Mr. Chairman, I will make a presentation on behalf of Chairman Ramirez.

Mr. WHITE. All right, sir.

Mr. MADURO. My name is Reynaldo Maduro, executive director of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for Spanish-Speaking People. With me today are members of the chairman's staff whom I would like to introduce in the event that questions arise. They are Robert Brochtrup, director of congressional relations, Cabinet Committee; Roy Fuentes, director of program research and evaluation of the committee; Mo Garcia, special assistant to the chairman; and Frederico Perez Molina, senior analyst of the committee.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today to discuss with you my views concerning House Joint Resolution 406 relating to the collection and publication of economic and social statistics for Spanish-speaking Americans.

I wish to commend this committee for having these very important hearings. They are important because they highlight the lack of sufficient data regarding the Spanish-speaking. These hearings hopefully will result in a greater concern and effort by all governmental bodies to assure that opportunities are being provided for the 12 million Spanish speaking persons in our country.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Agriculture are currently demonstrating a vast improvement in their efforts to collect data on Spanish origin people, the term used by the Census Bureau in their data collection. The 1970 census was the first census in which those of Spanish origin were listed in a separate category. More recently, the Department of Labor released a study entitled, "Employment and Unemployment Among Americans of Spanish Origin." The Department of Agriculture is reporting on the large number in this group who are migrant workers.

These and many other efforts by these agencies are worthy of praise. Their means of identifying those of Spanish origin by self-identification is satisfactory, although in many areas a visual identification could be used.

The publication of economic and social data by the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, helps to illustrate certain needs and make some problems more understandable. This information serves as an indicator as to how effectively Federal, State, and local resources are benefiting those of Spanish origin. Good statistical data when available would enable program managers to: (1) Identify eligible minority beneficiaries among the clientele they serve; (2) determine whether these eligibles are in fact participating in the program; (3) evaluate the services to this group of beneficiaries; and (4) thereby take corrective action when deemed necessary.

Two publications have focused their attention sharply in the importance of collection and use of data. In 1973, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued "Collection and Use of Racial and Ethnic Data on Federal Assistance Programs," a report that evaluated the current data capabilities of Federal agencies, the Commission stated:

Racial and ethnic data are essential tools with which to combat discrimination and plan and monitor affirmative action to remedy past racial wrongs. The collection and analysis of these data are the most effective and accurate means of measuring Federal program impact upon minority beneficiaries and for assuring that equal opportunity policies are working effectively.

In 1971, a report of the Interagency Racial Data Committee noted:

We have concluded that the major cause of unequal service to those of minority race, apart from any intentional discrimination that may exist, is the absence of a means that would enable program managers, on a continuing basis, to identify eligible minority beneficiaries among the clientele they serve; to know whether these eligibles are in fact participating in the program; and to assess the degree to which service to this group of beneficiaries is achieving the results intended by the program.

Besides the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are other agencies that collect data which should have a category for the people of Spanish origin.

The National Center for Educational Statistics within HEW has the responsibility for statistics relating to the educational system regarding enrollment, graduates, school holding-power, faculty and administrators by ethnic background, reading levels and math achievement. Data of this nature on people of Spanish origin would reveal any special problems in the area of education at all levels.

The National Center for Health Statistics also within HEW collects data on births and deaths and current information on the health status and needs of people. Statistics collected on births and deaths are necessary as a reliable means of cross-checking census measurements. This would assure a more accurate count of the Spanish speaking.

Data collection has always been one of my primary concerns. For without proper data we cannot carry out our mandate to assure that Federal programs are reaching the Spanish speaking.

As I testified before the Subcommittee on Civil Rights Oversight on March 9, 1972, "It [data] should be analyzed and decisions should be made as a result of the findings. Data cannot be merely collected and then ignored."

The 1973 annual report of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People that is now being printed, shows the need for more accurate data and the beneficial effects of data collection. Agencies are now becoming more aware of the problems and neglect of the Spanish-speaking.

Frequently we are questioned as to why we use the figures of at least 12 million Spanish-speaking when the 1970 census states that there were only 9 million of Spanish origin. According to the Bureau of the Census' March 1973 Current Population Survey the number of persons of Spanish origin is 10,577,000 or 16.6 percent over the 1970 census report. According to the Bureau, although they made every effort to be accurate in counting the blacks, there was an undercount of 7.7 percent. We believe that many of those of Spanish origin share the same conditions as many of the blacks and therefore were probably undercounted. We also believe that not as great care was experienced in identifying those of Spanish origin. Although the Bureau's methods have improved, we feel that there still must be an approximate 10 percent undercount. While the Census Bureau states that there is no way of determining whether there is an undercount, we assume that the undercount for the Spanish-speaking was at least 10 percent or approximately 1.05 million. When added to the March 1973 Current Population Survey of 10.5 million, we arrive at a figure of almost 12 million.

State, city, and other governmental officials use the 1970 census figure of 9 million for their planning and their programs. Only when reliable data is available will those of Spanish origin stop being short-changed in many programs.

During fiscal year 1975 over \$600 million will be expended by the Federal Government on civil rights enforcement. It is our view that very little of this money is expended to assure the civil rights of Spanish speaking, yet almost 30 percent of all minorities in this country are Spanish speaking. We believe that similar efforts should be made in the private sector as well as the public sector.

How many know that 76 Members of the House of Representatives have 10 percent or more constituents who are Spanish speaking? How many realize that 20 Senators represent States that have from 120,687—Michigan—to 3,100,881—California—Spanish speaking?

The Bureau of the Census is currently expanding their collection of data relating to those of Spanish origin. It is my view that they should also institute a program to train bilingual-bicultural interviewers, to train researchers and expand their community relations within the Spanish-speaking community. Robust efforts to inform the community of the need for a more accurate census and of the benefits derived from a census must be undertaken. I would also strongly urge that a methodology that can measure a possible undercount of the persons of Spanish origin be developed. No methodology now exists for this.

Scarcely a decade ago, the Spanish speaking were dubiously characterized as invisible, ignored, or forgotten.

When the Spanish-speaking spoke of statistics, they did not speak of power; they spoke of despair.

To put it another way, Spanish-speaking people are no longer invisible.

In more practical terms for the Spanish-speaking, the latest count means identify, a better economic situation, and political influence.

It means growing numbers of Spanish-speaking will compete on an equal footing with their fellow Americans for jobs and public funds.

It means the acquisition of legitimate power through the democratic process. It means an undeniable presence across the board in both private and public sectors.

As for the Cabinet Committee, we look forward to continuing our meetings with the Bureau of the Census, and building on our productive relationship for the benefit of the millions of Spanish-speaking/surnamed Americans. For it makes sense to us. People who are counted do in fact count themselves. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Maduro.

Mr. Hinshaw?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Maduro, in the hearings that we had yesterday, I asked representatives from the Civil Rights Commission as to what their feelings were as to the racial and ethnic information on various forms.

Preliminary to my question I pointed out that my remembrances are that before the big push on civil rights some years ago there were successful efforts to remove from application forms, employment forms, the racial or ethnic information and so we cannot now evaluate the success of some of the programs that we have had in recent years.

What would be the position of the Cabinet Committee as to now reinserting maybe as a requirement on employment application forms racial or ethnic background information?

Mr. MADURO. I can only speak as far as my particular expertise in this area. I believe attitudes have changed within the Civil Rights Commission as to the need for racial and ethnic data.

As far as the Cabinet Committee is concerned, I think it would be of significant benefit to identify Spanish origin or Spanish-speaking individuals. I also hold the opinion that it would be of great benefit to the Spanish speaking as well as to the programs that serve them to have identifiers which clearly indicate whether or not manpower resources or financial resources are directed to the Spanish speaking.

I would concur with your particular statement that at least at this point it would benefit the Spanish speaking to have identifiers appear within the public sector. I think there has been a change with respect to attitudes on this entire area of data collection and there is an everincreasing need to identify where moneys are being directed.

Mr. HINSHAW. One of the discussions that took place yesterday morning related to the availability of Federal moneys under our current programs that go into programs seeking to assist the Spanish origin or Spanish-speaking persons. I came in late to the hearings yesterday but there was this emphasis on money that was indicated was not the major emphasis, but a major emphasis.

Would you believe that the need for identity of Spanish-origin persons is principally to make sure that the amount of money available to assist persons within this category is directed toward that specific segment, specifically the Spanish origin?

Mr. MADURO. I do believe tax moneys are being collected from individuals of Spanish origin in this country. With the advent of revenue sharing we feel that there should be identifiable categories that would certainly indicate the flow of moneys that are being directed to the Spanish speaking. There's no question about that.

I would hope that during the agencies' planning cycle that consideration be given to the expenditures and allocations of manpower in order to address themselves to the concerns and problems of the Spanish speaking. I firmly believe that the only measurement that agencies within the Federal Government can use for the development of programs, is an accurate count on those of Spanish origin.

So I would most definitely suggest that agencies within the Government should examine their particular planning cycle to verify whether or not appropriate budget allocations are being assessed to address problems of the Spanish origin people.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let's assume for a moment that the Federal Government took the attitude that it would cease to appropriate moneys for civil rights activities or any other activities directed to assist any minorities. To what extent then do you believe Spanish origin persons should be identified in the census and other Federal agencies?

Mr. MADURO. I don't fully understand your question.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let's assume that the Federal Government were to cease appropriating any money for civil rights enforcements or cease to appropriate money for any minority purpose—affirmative action programs and that type of thing. Then, do you believe that it would still be important to accurately count Spanish origin persons and, if so, why?

Mr. MADURO. Well, let me address the first part of the question. I would certainly hope that civil rights enforcement moneys are not taken out of the budget. I also feel that the will of the Congress, by enacting the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of March 1972, brings out a greater need for identifying all minority groups, specifically and especially the Spanish origin people. Further, I hope that we continue to work within the general area of equal employment opportunities and certainly that Spanish origin people are accurately counted.

Mr. GARCIA. May I make a comment?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I think that these civil rights activities exist because we have not been included and they should be there until we are. If the Federal Government could find ways of incorporating us in the normal way, we then would be happy to have all these advocate groups eliminated. However, I think that all these things we're talking about are absolutely necessary to bring our inclusion into all of these opportunities.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, let me see if I can restate my question then and your answer in an interpretative fashion.

Assume that it was determined that there was no longer any discrimination of any kind practiced either in the public or private sector against any minority. You would then believe that it would be appropriate to not count any specific racial or ethnic group. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. GARCIA. No, sir. I'm not saying that. I'm saying that whatever the mechanism required by the Federal Government to include all of its citizens should be in operation continually. If it is necessary, that a count be included all the time, that the minorities be included with or without the civil rights mechanism, and that an accurate count should be institutionalized.

Mr. HINSHAW. The point that I'm trying to elicit some response to is apart from the mere obtaining of money for whatever reason, is there a need to count persons of any particular racial or ethnic groups apart from getting money to enforce their rights?

Mr. MADURO. I would like to respond to that particular item. I believe that due to our elective system, a democratic one, I think it would behoove those elected officials or those individuals who aspire for elective offices to know who their constituencies are. It would be most beneficial even in the hypothetical and imaginary sense if we would all enjoy equal opportunity. As we approach improved methodology, we should include an accurate count of Spanish origin people. Although the Bureau of the Census is attempting to improve upon its methodology, as Chairman Ramirez stated before the Government Operations Committee, he believes that there will always be a need to improve upon the methodology utilized by them. Nor just to assure that the programs and that the moneys that are expended by the Federal Government are for the Spanish origin people, but certainly because of the benefits that are derived at this particular point of obtaining an accurate count of Spanish origin people. It's not just because of moneys and not just because of program delivery.

May I reemphasize that Chairman Ramirez in his statement speaks of socioeconomic situations and I think that measurement of where we

stand as Spanish origin people today certainly is an indicator of the need for a better data collection system.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yesterday morning one of the subcommittees that I'm on approved a committee report dealing with aliens in this country illegally, and the report stresses that it's a major problem, particularly in the New York area and in southern California and perhaps portions of Texas.

My question is: is there a problem in the southern California area of Spanish origin persons perhaps being undercounted or misclassified because the enumerators of the Census Bureau might be somewhat reluctant to go into the barrios and if they do go into the barrios perhaps do not accurately count because they do not speak the language, or additionally, perhaps those persons with whom they might be talking are reluctant to respond to questions because they know of or they themselves might be in this country illegally?

Mr. MADURO. Well, that's an area which presents some difficulty in responding to, but I would like to indicate that the need for enumerators who speak the language and who are able to relate to that particular segment of the community are very necessary in order to obtain an accurate count. We at the Cabinet committee believe that the enumerators in the 1970 census may have been reluctant to enter the barrios, and that this resulted in a serious undercount. Speaking as a resident of New York, I personally feel that was the case in New York City. I think that one of the problems that led to a significant undercount was the lack of bilingual and bicultural enumerators.

Now with respect to the alien problem, I have some reservations because there are a great many elements that play a very important role in obtaining an accurate count. However, I believe that enumerators who are able to speak the language and who can culturally relate to those to be counted can obtain answers to very lengthy questionnaires and are extremely necessary.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, the thing that strikes me throughout the testimony that we have had now in three separate hearings that I have been involved in is an undercount of approximately 1.5 million Spanish origin persons, and that is almost precisely the same number of aliens in this country illegally of Spanish origin persons. And what I'm wondering is to what degree is this undercount maybe constituted in whole or in part by Spanish origin persons who are in this country illegally and, therefore, should not be counted.

Mr. MADURO. I don't believe that individuals included in an undercount have any relationship to the illegal alien problem. I think that the undercount of the Spanish origin people directly reflects on those who are eligible to be counted as U.S. citizens.

Mr. HINSHAW. All right.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Hinshaw, there are current efforts being made to bring about a census of the illegal aliens in this country. Efforts are underway now to develop some sort of methodology or plan to carry out this count. But I concur wholly with Mr. Maduro. I don't believe the undercount has anything to do with the presence of illegal Spanish origin people in this country.

Mr. HINSHAW. There's an effort underway by whom?

Mr. GARCIA. I think it's out of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. HINSHAW. That's the agency we had a year-and-a-half-long investigation on and, quite frankly, I wouldn't believe that they have any facilities or methodology at all, because if they did, they ought to round them up and ship them back to where they ought to be shipped to.

Mr. GARCIA. It's my understanding that some study is being done now to carry this out.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me correct your understanding then, because it's my understanding that they have no way of doing that and they are not attempting to do that.

One further question, if I might. You indicated that some of the Spanish origin people were not counted and then in your last sentence you say "People who are counted do in fact count themselves."

Is there a substantial possibility that the persons were in fact counted but misclassified?

Mr. MADURO. I think that's a dual situation. I would suppose that it falls into both those latter categories. But I still maintain that a number of individuals were never counted. What we're really talking about is methodology and I would very much like to see an improved method of counting Spanish-origin people. I think that we in the Spanish origin community or in the Spanish community, have all types of cultures, from the blackest to the most white with blue eyes and blond hair, and for that reason, we have to be extremely careful as to the selection of the enumerators and the selection of identifiers that are used in the questionnaires. I would certainly appreciate any assistance that this committee or any appropriate committee, can lend in improving the methodology of the Bureau of the Census, which is under the Department of Commerce. Better identifiers should be employed so that a particular family can fall into the proper category. It is my opinion that if we were able to collectively put our efforts forward, we would bring about a better count in the 1980 census.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, recognizing that the 1970 census is past and we can't redo the 1970 census and I gather from your statement and Mr. Ramirez' statement that the Census Bureau is trying to improve its methodology and you believe that they in fact will have that improved by 1980, is there any way that you can suggest to the subcommittee that the Federal Government could update its figures, recognizing the Census Bureau will not change its estimate, so that we can better utilize the feeling that there is an undercount and correct the undercount if it's possible to make sure that moneys are spent in the appropriate fashion? Is there any way you can suggest to the subcommittee that the Federal Government might do so?

Mr. MADURO. I believe so. I think there are provisions under the Bureau of the Census that permit them to conduct new surveys, thereby updating that particular count. One of the methods is certainly the March 1973 survey which increased the number of Spanish origin people from 9 to 10.6 million. I think that's a correct statement. I hold the opinion that appropriate manpower and financial allocations should be given to the Bureau of the Census to permit them to have greater flexibility in obtaining a better count or an update, or in improving their methodology between the 1970 and the 1980 census.

Mr. HINSHAW. Just one further question, if I might. Updating of the figures perhaps could not be done at the lowest level of census as the 1970 census was done. If the Census Bureau were to agree that the 1973 update in the detail that was indicated could be updated to 10.6, would that serve in fact any useful purpose whatsoever?

Mr. MADURO. Well, the problem is that for the planning cycle of government and the allocation of funds and manpower resources, the Federal Government still utilizes the 1970 figures. So that, unfortunately, either because of law or policy, the Government or public sector entities relate to the 1970 census count, or the latest statistics compiled by that particular census.

I think—and I'm not very conversive on that particular item—that if it were appropriate to change the law so that we could be permitted or the Government could be permitted to use the 10.6 figure, it certainly would be of benefit to us.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Maduro, I'm going to refer to your testimony as delivered for Dr. Ramirez, chairman of the Cabinet Committee.

On the first page you said the Department of Agriculture is reporting on the large number in this group who are migrant workers, and we have had some other testimony about the uncertainties of their figures and the inability of getting this particularly very frustrating count.

How are they doing this? What methodology is the Department of Agriculture using in order to count the migrant workers and the Spanish-origin people among the migrant workers?

Mr. MADURO. I'd like to call upon Mr. Fuentes who is conversant on the migrant workers to shed some light on that.

Mr. FUENTES. The only counting system that I'm aware of by the Department of Agriculture is primarily through the Department of Agriculture's manpower offices. I think they have one other private source, some other body they use. But they have always maintained that their figures are very difficult to come by.

Mr. WHITE. How does the manpower department get their figures?

Mr. FUBETES. Through the rural placement services, through the employment security commissions in the different States which in the last few years have been used very little by migrants who are coming looking for work.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, they go right back to the States then?

Mr. FUENTES. That's correct.

Mr. WHITE. So we're not sure about their figures.

Now on the second page you talk about identification of Spanish origin by self-identification. You say it's satisfactory and that would be presently by name identification in five Southwestern States and in 5 percent of the population by the census statistics using a notation among those 5 percent that they are of Spanish origin.

Do you feel that that is satisfactory?

Mr. MADURO. Well, that's one of the identifiers and I think that that is satisfactory. I mean, I believe the category of identifiers can be expanded so as to assure an accurate count.

Mr. WHITE. Well, are you satisfied with the 5 percent? That's what I'm asking. Or do you have a figure that you feel would be more descriptive of the persons in this country of Spanish origin?

Mr. MADURO. Well, the 5 percent I couldn't speak to.

Mr. WHITE. Well, in the Southwestern States, do you feel then that the name identification is adequate?

Mr. MADURO. Among other identifiers.

Mr. WHITE. What other identifiers?

Mr. MADURO. Well, I believe that on the matter of identifiers we're talking about also—

Mr. WHITE. Well, I thought you were talking about the census returns. Are you talking about a different procedure? What procedure are you speaking of?

Mr. MADURO. What I believe we're trying to bring forth here is that there are some satisfactory identifiers that are used by the Bureau of the Census, but we would like to improve upon them.

Mr. MOLINA. I might say they use four different identifiers. What we'd like to have is one identifier as a main method of data collection and the one that we'd like to suggest is one of persons of Spanish origin by self-identification.

Mr. WHITE. Are you from the Cabinet Committee?

Mr. MADURO. Yes; he is. He's a research analyst for Data and Statistics.

Mr. MOLINA. We don't mean to imply the elimination of all other identifiers. We think the other identifiers are very good for special purposes. But there must be one that gives uniform information about the Spanish speaking in the whole country. Right now, for instance, if you went to the 1970 census to see how many Spanish-speaking people there were in that census, you're going to find four different figures. You're going to be all confused. You don't know which one is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Such as?

Mr. MOLINA. Persons of Spanish origin, 9 million; persons of Spanish surname, 4.6 million.

Mr. WHITE. That's for the five Southwestern States?

Mr. MOLINA. That's correct. Persons who speak the language, 9.5 million.

Mr. WHITE. Where did that appear? Which form was that in?

Mr. MOLINA. In the 1970 census.

Mr. WHITE. In which form? The 5 percent of the Southwestern States?

Mr. MOLINA. I think it was 15 percent of the—

Mr. WHITE. I don't think I'm getting the picture. What 15 percent?

Mr. MOLINA. Of the South.

Mr. WHITE. Now to whom were those sent?

Mr. MOLINA. They were sent especially to the east coast, all the United States except the Southwest.

Mr. WHITE. I don't believe we've had testimony on that before.

Mr. BULLOCK. The identifiers they use, it's my understanding, were four, as has been said. The Spanish origin identifier was included in 5 percent of the questionnaires. The Spanish surname identifier was used in the five Southwestern States for everyone in all returns, and on the 15 percent questionnaire was included questions relating to mother tongue and also Spanish birth and parentage.

Mr. WHITE. Is it different than the 5 percent?

Mr. BULLOCK. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And they were sent just to the east coast?

Mr. BULLOCK. Nationwide sample.

Mr. WHITE. What was the last one?

Mr. BULLOCK. Well, there was Spanish mother tongue. That's the Spanish language, and the last one is Spanish birth or parentage.

Mr. WHITE. And to whom was that sent?

Mr. BULLOCK. 15 percent also.

Mr. WHITE. Were those two questions included—Spanish tongue and Spanish birth—in the same questionnaires?

Mr. BULLOCK. Yes; they were.

Mr. GARCIA. May I make one observation Mr. Congressman. The intent of this paragraph in the chairman's testimony on the means of identifying those of Spanish origin by self-identification is satisfactory, although many areas of additional identification could be used. What the chairman means to say here is that it doesn't make any difference how they're identified. We want all of them identified whether they come under Spanish surnames, Spanish origin or any way you want to do it, but as long as they are Spanish-speaking or Spanish surnames we want them identified, and I think at this point we're getting into methodology. I'm not sure from our group that we have sufficient training and background to get into the fine points of the exact methodology to bring about such a census.

Mr. WHITE. Are you suggesting then that the Spanish tongue and Spanish birth or however it's worded should be eliminated and only use Spanish origin?

Mr. MOLINA. No; I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is they should use Spanish origin as a main means of collecting data and that way we can compare data from Georgia to California to have uniform information. And then, besides that, we can use the identifier for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. You're talking about money now. Whenever you answer questions—and, of course, you have to sell the Government on the multiplication of your questions and so that's why I say, what do you feel would be the most authentic question that could be asked if the Bureau is going to boil it down? This is not a census just to find out where the Spanish-speaking are. This is a census to——

Mr. MOLINA. We want to use the 1973 CPS form.

Mr. WHITE. The 1973 form. Do we have that in our record?

Mr. BULLOCK. It's the 1973 Current Population Survey. I can get it.

Mr. WHITE. Now what about the matter of visual identification? Isn't that rather unreliable and also unfair?

Mr. MADURO. I believe it goes back to Congressman Hinshaw's statement as to the difference in attitudes in the country changing from before, as far as identification, self-identification, and the placement of what you are on a particular application form. The Federal Government at this time inhibits one from identifying or asking anyone what they are or where they think they belong as far as racial or ethnic categories are concerned. I think attitudes are changing so that I feel it would be beneficial to the——

Mr. WHITE. For our record we need to spell that out. What do you mean by visual identification? You want the enumerator to go and make a guess?

Mr. MADURO. No. That's not what I want.

Mr. GARCIA. I think that many of us have felt several ways about this. One is that there may be a reluctance on the part of the individual to identify himself if he can be visually identified with a certainty.

Mr. WHITE. How?

Mr. GARCIA. I'll tell you how. Two years ago I had the horrible experience of being in Brownsville, Tex., where I come from, and I went to the airport to come back to Washington with a group of Spanish-speaking appointees. There were Mrs. Ramona Bañuelos, Treasurer; Chairman Ramirez; Mr. Philip Sanchez, then OEO director; and Mr. Carlos Villarreal from DOT. As we went up to the plane, the immigration officers started to stop Mr. Sanchez and I stopped the immigration officer before he asked Mr. Sanchez for his identification. If this type of identification can be used negatively, I see no reason why it can't be used positively.

Mr. WHITE. Are you advocating a positive identification?

Mr. GARCIA. Any way in which we might be—

Mr. WHITE. You might be getting Filipinos.

Mr. GARCIA. There are Spanish-speaking Filipinos. There's a hazard in that. There's no doubt about it, but there are other hazards, too, of our people not identifying themselves.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, you're suggesting a visual identification without a self-identification?

Mr. GARCIA. In some cases I think it may have to be that way.

Mr. WHITE. OK. Now you spoke on page 2, continuing, about the advantages of getting statistical data which we recognize on this subcommittee, but I want to be sure that I understand the testimony.

You have on No. 1, "identify eligible minority beneficiaries among the clientele they serve," and then you have three others that follow that. Are you speaking about individual identities for the agency?

Mr. MADURO. What the chairman is referring to in this particular segment of his testimony is that when we collected data for our 1973 annual report, most of our member agencies responded in the following fashion—and that's most—I'm not saying all—"We have no way of identifying to the penny how much money was allocated for the Spanish origin people."

Mr. WHITE. Well, does the Government allocate them by that or do they allocate them according to economics?

Mr. MADURO. What I'm referring to here is, for example, if we're talking about manpower resources and we're talking about available work force—

Mr. WHITE. That's still economics.

Mr. MADURO. That's true, but what I'm saying here is that we would like to see beneficiary data collected to identify Spanish origin people because I feel that that is the only way in which an accurate distribution of funds can be directed to a segment of the population.

Mr. WHITE. Do you want to allocate funds according to ethnic groups or according to economics?

Mr. MADURO. No; what I'm trying to insure here is that in the event there is a segment of the population that needs assistance, that it be accurately reflected, that that particular segment of the population, whether it be 12 or 9 million, be taken care of.

Mr. WHITE. Well, you're still talking about ethnics then.

Mr. MADURO. Yes, I am.

Mr. WHITE. And not economics.

Mr. MADURO. I'm talking about economics, also, sir.

Mr. WHITE. But I mean, you have a level in a community—let's say you have 5,000 people who are in the State at a certain level or state of economics. You intend to take care of 5,000 people. Now is there an advantage in segmenting 2,000 of those as Mexican-Americans and saying, well, then, therefore, we're going to target our Mexican-Americans; or do you want to take care of the 5,000? What I'm trying to do, sir, is to differentiate economic problems from social problems, unemployment discrimination and things of this nature, and I think this has to be done.

Mr. FUENTES. When the moneys go out to the communities they don't go out in sufficient amounts to handle the total population. You talk about if you had 5,000. Obviously, if you had enough money to deal with 5,000 and the Spanish origin were only 2,000, you wouldn't have any problem.

The point is that you might have enough money for 1,000 of the population or you might have enough for 2,000; we would like to know the portion that goes to Spanish-speaking, the kind of recruitment, the kind of staff and all the increments that go in there—that's where we get left out.

Mr. WHITE. Let's take your 1,000 illustration so we'll know for the record. So you will have 1,000 out of the 5,000 that can be cared for by the moneys that are allocated. Do you then mean that you would proportion the money according to the particular areas?

Mr. FUENTES. We would try to get—

Mr. WHITE. Just answer "yes" or "no," sir.

Mr. FUENTES. Repeat your question, sir.

Mr. WHITE. OK. If you could take care of 1,000 people with the moneys allocated and you had 5,000 that were unemployed or needed help of the same nature, then do you advocate that the persons of Mexican-American heritage be segmented out and the moneys be apportioned by ethnic groups rather than according to the economic population?

Mr. FUENTES. I don't think it's that simple. I would say we wouldn't want it that way, but I want to be sure the Spanish-speaking that are in that 5,000 group are included in some kind of percentage. Generally, what happens is that if you go across the country, particularly up in the Midwest and the places where the population of the Spanish-speaking is less than in concentrated areas of the Southwest or Northeast, you will find that Spanish-speaking are not participating in those programs.

Mr. WHITE. They are in the economic group, though, aren't they?

Mr. FUENTES. They might be, but they are not included.

Mr. WHITE. How are they not included?

Mr. FUENTES. They don't participate in the programs.

Mr. WHITE. Why?

Mr. FUENTES. They are not recruited for programs. They are not a part of the administration or the staff thus they are excluded because of their cultural differences.

Mr. WHITE. What you're saying, there's a reverse discrimination.

Mr. FUENTES. I don't think it makes any difference what the terminology is. I'm just saying they're not being involved in those programs.

Mr. WHITE. That's the heart of it.

Mr. FUENTES. That's right.

Mr. WHITE. I just wanted to know what you meant by that. Of course, we don't have this problem in my area I don't think. That's why I'm asking about these other areas.

Mr. BROCHTRUP. One other item. Our mandate clearly spells out that we are to assure that Federal programs are reaching the Spanish-speaking. It's very difficult for us to assure that programs are reaching the Spanish-speaking unless there's some kind of data collection.

Mr. WHITE. That's the principle on which you're basing this.

Mr. MADURO. That's correct. We're not advocating that individuals of a community don't receive money and that the Spanish-origin people receive money. What we're talking about basically is that in order for equal distribution of funds, manpower resources and those services that are provided by the Government can only be accurately distributed if we have an accurate count of Spanish-origin people.

Mr. GARCIA. I don't think we're only saying this because we're on the committee. We deeply believe this is a moral right, that the Spanish-speaking have a right to their share, too.

Mr. WHITE. Now the next point I'm trying to make is this. You're not trying to individually identify any of these individuals through the census procedure?

Mr. MADURO. Are we trying to?

Mr. WHITE. In other words, you're not trying to say Mr. Gonzales over here is among this group through the census information itself? You don't seek to get the individual identity of Mr. Gonzales from the Census Bureau as one who should be participating in this program?

Mr. MADURO. No.

Mr. WHITE. That's what I wanted to know because from some of your wording I wondered. You said identify eligible beneficiaries among the clientele they serve. You're talking about groups and statistics and not about individuals?

Mr. MADURO. That's correct.

Mr. WHITE. Fine. Now you say on page 5, "We also believe that not as great care was exercised in identifying those of Spanish origin." How did you suggest that that be changed in the procedures of the future?

Mr. MADURO. What I referred to earlier in response to the question posed was that we would hope that improved methodology would be developed by the Bureau of the Census, which is the service that's responsible for this. In addition, that careful attention be given to the selection of enumerators so that when someone has to enter into an area that may present some bilingual-bicultural problems, there will be no hesitancy by the enumerator. We also suggest that appropriate distribution of manpower resources and funds be allocated by the Bureau of the Census to improve upon the methodology to collect data accurately on the Spanish-origin people.

Mr. WHITE. When you speak of training bilingual-bicultural interviewers, you're talking about taking those who already know the language?

Mr. MADURO. Yes, sir. I think we have a readily available work force of Spanish-speaking interviewers.

Mr. WHITE. There are several recommendations, one by Mr. Nunez of the Civil Rights Commission to the committee. I'll go down through these recommendations quickly and see if you concur and invite any language from your agency that you feel might fulfill these particular changes in the bill.

He said that, "We feel that the self-identification method as previously discussed should be incorporated in the proposed legislation." The Census Bureau suggested the change from Spanish speaking to Spanish origin as more proper.

Do you feel that that would be a good change in the bill, from Spanish speaking to Spanish origin, as a more inclusive term?

Mr. MADURO. I believe so.

Mr. WHITE. You would concur with that?

Mr. MADURO. Yes; I do.

Mr. WHITE. In addition, a provision of bilingual assistance in collecting the data should be included in the legislation. Do you concur in that?

Mr. MADURO. Yes; sir.

Mr. WHITE. That seems to follow your testimony. Would you like to provide language to that or would you feel that the committee could develop language?

Mr. MADURO. No. I would like for us to contribute to that.

Mr. WHITE. I also want them to take these down if they would. OK.

Then, the suggestion that such assistance should be either in the form of bilingual data collectors or bilingual questionnaires and that, of course, could be part of your amendment if you so desire.

Then he recommended that all Federal agencies responsible for data collection be required to collect data on persons of Spanish-speaking background and that the Office of Management and Budget be required to coordinate this effort. Do you feel this would be a wise inclusion in the legislation?

Mr. MADURO. I do believe so.

Mr. WHITE. Fine.

Then we go to the testimony of Mr. Roybal. He said include language stating that the Office of Management and Budget in cooperation with the Bureau of Census and other data collecting agencies develop a Government-wide program for collecting data on Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and other Spanish origin groups. We have already mentioned and talked about that. Then he suggested also changing the name from Spanish speaking to Spanish origin or descent. Then he said, or Spanish-speaking background.

Third, he suggested the Bureau of Census in cooperation with the appropriate State and local agencies in various population study groups and experts develop a program for estimating the undercount of Spanish origin population. That would not necessarily have to be in this particular legislation.

Do you feel that a monthly national unemployment rate for Spanish origin Americans would be proper or do you feel that it should be on a quarterly basis considering the budgetary needs? What do you feel would be needed by your agency, for instance, to properly estimate the work force?

Mr. MADURO. I would like to see data collected on a monthly basis to reflect the unemployment.

Mr. WHITE. You don't feel that that would be a difficult problem then from your studies?

Mr. MADURO. I don't know about the degree of difficulty, but I would certainly be an advocate of the monthly statistical survey.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel a survey of existing State and Federal agencies and their statistics they hold would be adequate in order to formulate a profile that would be sufficient for this monthly review without having to send out questionnaires—like schools and things of this nature, unemployment agencies, in the various communities?

Mr. MADURO. I'd like to just expand on that particular item. I think that one of the problems the Spanish origin people have is that the Bureau of Labor Statistics—I believe this is correct—does not collect data on births and deaths on Spanish origin people. Therefore, the base from which you are able to ascertain an undercount is very difficult to do in the Spanish origin category. That was not the case in the black community and that is one of the reasons why the black community was able to make some headway with the Bureau of the Census. Statistics on birth and deaths are identified in the black community as opposed to the Spanish origin.

What I'm trying to set here is an appropriate tone for collecting some sort of base information from which one can work.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Armendariz, former president of the National Counsel de la Raza, lobbied and successfully lobbied for a bill in the Texas Legislature which we passed when I was down there. At one time those of Mexican-American heritage were designated Mexican Americans or of Mexican origin. He insisted, and the legislature agreed, to change it to white. Then all we would record would be black or white.

Now, how would the local and State communities, trying to determine births and deaths, determine who are of Mexican American or Spanish-speaking origin and who are not? In other words, they don't necessarily have the means unless they use a name identification.

Mr. MADURO. I recognize the problems and I think what we're trying to address ourselves to is that attitudes—at least I feel—may have changed so that people of Spanish origin understand the need of accurate data collection.

Mr. WHITE. Do you think that the State legislature, for instance, ought to repeal that law?

Mr. MADURO. I don't think I'm a competent person to respond to that, Mr. Congressman, because I'm not a resident of the State and I couldn't in any way form an opinion.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I think you'd probably get some static, frankly, both ways, because I've noticed that there's a great difference of opinion in this area, and, of course, the legislator wants to do whatever will accommodate the people that he serves and he's not sure. I have had people even complain about the use of Mexican American; they say, "We are Americans." Others say, "We are not Mexican Americans. We are Chicanos." Others come along and say, "No, we're Hispanic." A lot of us legislators don't know how they want to be designated.

Albert felt that this was a discrimination so he moved immediately to dispel this discrimination. I think there are probably many similar laws in many States, probably California, to frustrate statistics taking. In fact, the Federal laws would prevent local employment agencies from trying to identify people or asking "what is your racial background." Am I correct on that?

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe so.

Mr. WHITE. How are they going to do it? We'd have to repeal a whole body of laws which many of those of the civil rights activists would immediately complain about. They say, no, we don't want that; we think it's wrong. You can't even try to identify them by racial background or ethnic background.

Mr. MADURO. I believe that the Federal Government, heeding the mandate of the Congress, is very much aware of that and therefore in the collection of data on minorities that's published on a semiannual basis, that is data which is collected by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, is done through observation. This is the mandate of government.

Mr. WHITE. But they are even prohibited by law from writing it down from observation.

Mr. MADURO. In what respect?

Mr. HINSHAW. I don't believe you can ask the person.

Mr. WHITE. You mean you can put on the application form, employment form, that a man is black?

Mr. HINSHAW. No, I don't think you can do that.

Mr. MADURO. The methodology used in collecting data on Federal employees is through observation and in no way is the card matched up with the person's name, so as to confer or give an opportunity for discrimination to take place. This is done subsequent to the individual coming on board.

I think what I'm trying to relate here or indicate is that attitudes may be changing. I fully understand that there is a host of civil rights organizations that take a totally different point of view from this and as I have indicated, I'm well aware of that. I think it deserves particular treatment and perhaps some other set of hearings so that I think bona fide bodies of recognized civil rights entities can come before you to express what is the current sentiment as far as data collection is concerned.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I think that the balance of these recommendations you pretty well have concurred in by inference or by direct testimony as to use of bilingual interviewers and things like this, and we certainly feel that your testimony has been very helpful today.

Does counsel have any questions?

Mr. BULLOCK. I just have one question and that relates to the percentage of Spanish American households who contain no one who speaks fluent English—do you have any statistics to indicate the size of that percentage or would it be possible to guess, because this is something of critical importance in evaluating just how important it is to have bilingual enumerator services and it also gives some indication about the difficulties that may have existed in the 1970 census in getting accurate counts.

Do you have any input on that or any way you can assist us at all?

Mr. MOLINA. At this time we do not have the available data we need in order to answer that.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman testified the other day that he thought it was 20 percent.

Mr. MOLINA. How much?

Mr. WHITE. Twenty percent; I think that may have been a guess-timate.

Mr. GARCIA. I would suspect so. I would think the Census Bureau or some qualified personnel might be able to run some sort of a sample check that might shed some light on that.

Mr. WHITE. I don't think they even ask that question.

Mr. GARCIA. No, but since they carry out so many services anyway, perhaps a few qualified surveyors could do kind of a Gallup poll.

Mr. WHITE. How long do you think that the Census Bureau should continue their studies, their special studies and special reporting of persons of Spanish origin in terms of years or in terms of achievement?

Mr. MADURO. Oh, I would think that as long as the Bureau of the Census is the appropriate body to collect data or until there is no need for the Bureau of the Census. I think that's—

Mr. WHITE. You mean for infinity then?

Mr. MADURO. I would believe so. I think that's the only way in which we can accurately project jobs and education needs and so forth.

Mr. WHITE. Then why haven't we done it with the Irish?

Mr. MADURO. Well, sir, I do believe that the Irish have, to a great extent, assimilated into the—

Mr. WHITE. That's the point I'm making. In other words, don't you really feel it should be until such time as those of Mexican-American heritage have assimilated into the system?

Mr. MADURO. Well, I don't know how you measure that.

Mr. WHITE. The same way you do the Irish.

Mr. MADURO. Then I would like to see someone of Spanish origin become President.

Mr. GARCIA. Sir, I would suggest that you ask the Irish people themselves.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have heard two responses in two different areas. Mr. Garcia was responding to a question as to visual identity and I might relay a personal experience and then refer to the testimony.

I was asked one time to have, by visual observation, someone on my staff make a determination for approximately 300 persons. My instructions to them were to be very, very careful. You do not just put a person into one category or the other without strong feelings. And the categories that we were asked to identify were specifically Mexican-American, South American, Filipino, black, Oriental, white, and Mediterranean.

I came back with about 27 percent of 300 that this person was unable to draw a conclusion on.

Earlier, you said that for Spanish origin you could go from black to blond with blue eyes. Now in response to an inquiry to you in response to an answer given by Mr. Garcia, how could we expect an enumerator or any well-qualified person to draw these conclusions from visual observation that a person would be of Spanish origin?

Mr. MADURO. That refers specifically to the chairman's testimony and I would like to supply that for the record.

Mr. HINSHAW. If you would, please.

[The following was furnished:]

The Bureau of the Census should use only the self identification method for their census every decade plus their updating surveys.

In many cases involving the delivery of services or in those surveys involving youth, the best method for identifying the Spanish speaking is by visual count. A visual count is presently being utilized by those responsible for counting students under title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act. The Office of Civil Rights under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare also uses a visual count.

I would like to recommend that this method be adopted for surveying of manpower training programs. Further, the visual method should be utilized when because of age or maturity, it is more reliable than self identification. In other words, I am simply proposing that self identification is not adequate in all surveys.

Let me stress that all agencies should collect data on the Spanish speaking not just the Bureau of Census and the Department of Labor. Data should be collected until the social-economic indices reflect fairly on us.

Mr. WHITE. I think this points up the problem I was trying to convey when we were discussing this.

Mr. GARCIA. With regard to my statement, I think I made it clear that there's undoubtedly a great problem in accuracy on this but what we would hope by whatever means we can is to have us counted.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that.

Mr. GARCIA. I didn't want to get into an area of contention because that was not my intention.

Mr. HINSHAW. The other suggestion, as I recall the testimony in response to a question of mine, that you believe it would be appropriate now to have put back on employment application forms racial and ethnic information because of the change in attitudes.

Mr. MADURO. I think it would be most beneficial to have that type of information for the following reason: on your application for Federal employment which is known as Standard Form 171, there is an appropriate space or box which individuals can identify the foreign language that they are familiar with and very often—and this is not in any way trying to discriminate in reverse, in the need to provide a work force that is bilingual, individuals who may have had a class or two in Spanish check off Spanish as either excellent in reading and writing and understanding capability. In trying to work with the available work force which is totally Spanish-speaking and bicultural, very often you shift into the latter category or the other category of saying who has checked off this list that he speaks Spanish—he or she who speaks Spanish may not be as appropriate as looking for the person who has both those categories or falls into the bilingual bicultural area. I'd like to just cite as an example the border patrol. Why would you send someone to the language school in Monterey to learn Spanish, when you have an existing bilingual work force. What I'm saying is that the Civil Service Commission should refine their selective certification methods in regard to Spanish-origin people.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. The thrust of what I would like to get a response to is assuming that there is some discrimination against Spanish origin and it varies between Latin Americans, Mexican Americans, Filipinos, Puerto Ricans—all of these speak Spanish or many of the groups speak Spanish, and if we were to go just to Spanish origin—and

I might just parenthetically point out a problem there because some persons in Mexico might say they are not of Spanish origin; they are essentially of Indian origin, even though they might speak Spanish—and if there is a changing attitude among minority groups, would it not be appropriate, assuming this changing attitude, to then in essence lobby the Judiciary Committee for changes in Federal laws that currently prohibit the collection of these kind of data on employment forms?

Mr. MADURO. May I supply that for the record?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; if you would. And just a further suggestion that perhaps we could solve this problem much more quickly than waiting for the 1980 census, much more quickly by having this change made and particularly I think if all the minority—not all of them, but some substantial number of minority groups were to then take the position that there's a changed attitude, I think it would be helpful to not only Congress in general but specifically the Judiciary Committee to have hearings on this question. So if you could supply some comment for the record, we would appreciate it.

[The following was furnished:]

I believe that in this time in history, it would be beneficial to the Spanish-speaking to have the forms for employment indicate ethnic background. In the past, this type of indicator was too frequently used to discriminate against us and may be used that way in some cases if restored. With a name like Lopez, Garcia, Gonzalez or Ramirez, it matters little if you indicate ethnic background or not for those who want to discriminate can readily identify you.

The benefits derived by having forms which indicate ethnic would be:

1. More accurate accounting of members of Spanish-speaking employed in each governmental agency and private company.

2. More accurate accounting of income levels and other economic factors related to employment.

3. More accurate accounting of the types of employment held by the Spanish-speaking.

These could be used to evaluate opportunities for employment and upward mobility. Information of this nature could also benefit civil rights divisions and manpower programs.

Mr. WHITE. We have one more witness.

Mr. Zermeno, you may summarize your testimony or you may deliver it in full.

STATEMENT OF ALEX ZERMENO, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COUNSEL DE LA RAZA, ACCOMPANIED BY KLAUS MAY, RESEARCH ANALYST

Mr. ZERMENO. I would prefer to summarize at this point. I think everybody at the last few days of hearings has been getting some of the technical points in methodology on the census.

I'd like to introduce Klaus May, who is a research analyst and been working with us for some time.

We'd like to address the issue, the resolution, by basically saying that we agree with the position of the Civil Rights Commission in terms of the enumerators and in terms of the identifier question. However, it's our feeling that it doesn't stop there.

We wish to address the whole question of methodology of the census. If you have some comments on it we'd be happy to respond to questions. Our concern is what happens after you have a count—good, bad, or undercounted, or not counted.

The figure given previously on the revision of the count as of March of this year dealt with an additional 1.5 million people. Well, the statements made when that report was given is that the revision does not account for the undercount. There was a change in the methodology. The revision was not reported as a response to the undercount question. It was a question of methodology that was changed within the census. We still have the problem of undercount, that 1.5 addition. We can't project beyond that what the real count is.

The argument on census has gone on for centuries or generations, let's say. To us, it seems like centuries. We know the Supreme Court decision and the State court decisions back in our history that classified us as white. We also are familiar with the cases in Texas dealing with education, the Del Rio school district down there, in the merger in which the court decided Mexican-Americans are an identifiable minority, and it went on to describe what that meant in terms of the school district. You're probably familiar with that.

So the question is not the undercount in our opinion. The question is counting "where it counts." That's really at the policy level in this country, both legislative and executive.

We have been working for some time on this matter and have a draft report that we're doing on the impact of limited Federal statistical data and information policies on Spanish Americans. Basically, it is a review of the kind of data that's collected by Government. We took a sample of it. We raised the question that the information lacks a common identifier first of all. If the census could get a common identifier in which we agree with, such as Hispanic origin, which allows the person to identify himself, and then subcategorize Mexican American, Filipino, Central American, whatever—

Mr. WHITE Panamanian?

Mr. ZERMENO. Whatever he wants. I think that is the kind of common denominator we need. We have to have this carried beyond the census undercount issue.

Moreover, information gathered by some of our Federal agencies are probably more useful in the distribution of Federal resources than the census data. The census data is fine when Congress appropriates. They set a formula and that's fine. There's no question there. But once that money gets distributed down to the local level, whether it be State, county, or city, we then have a question, which you raised earlier with the previous witnesses, but it's the question of allocation at the local level. We're seeking an equity position within the policy-making, as well as within the services that result from that policy. The question of "if you have a universe of 5,000 poor who do you give it to?" All we're asking for is equality at that base, and I don't think we're in a position to determine that unless we can identify who that universe is.

We get wrapped up into a number of issues. There's the whole question of minority; the whole question of nationality or origin, the whole question of language and all other indices which are used on us. I think this adds to the confusion, to the point that no one knows who they are in terms of statistics.

Personally, I know who I am, but I can't tell you what my chances were to have been born alive. I can't tell you how long I expect to live because we have no birth or death rates that are identifiable to us.

We, as a civil rights organization that is interested in bringing about some improvement in our community, are concerned with the question of how do we use this data and with what's available for us to advocate Congress or an agency. We are forced to go back to the rhetoric that I think is worn out, and I don't think anybody listens to it very much any more. I'm getting a little tired of it myself. We are also forced to play the patronage game. I think we saw some examples of it, unfortunately, a couple years ago. You couldn't make your case on facts, on statistics, whether it would be at the local or national level, so you're forced to start getting into a patronage system. We're going back to the old patron system as long as we don't have some facts that are respected and credible to all of us.

This has put us in a tremendous handicap. In some cities like in El Paso, I don't think we have too much of a problem because we have just got numbers there. It would overwhelm somebody if necessary. You give the example of southern California, the San Diego area. Certainly those communities in some cases are strong enough, but you get into San Francisco where the Spanish-speaking population is estimated to be 10 percent—and it's a city I'm familiar with because it's where I worked prior to coming to Washington—and we have a battle within the disenfranchised or disadvantaged and it's a cutthroat political battle where much of your Federal resources and energies are expended in politicizing the Government services that are supposed to be provided.

In fact, that is what's happening in the absence of a Federal policy. What we're asking this committee to consider and have subsequent hearings on is a Federal policy that deals with how you get quality information on the Spanish American—without such information and as we are right now. The end result is a de facto exclusionary policy, where we're forced to make up for lack of figures with everything else we can think of and still not scoring. This is our thinking.

Even if you had 100 percent count of the census at that point, that instance when the total count is taken, it's a very limited value beyond that point, because without having a death rate or a birth rate you can't put it into the computer. It just doesn't work. That's the major ingredient on estimating our population, not only census. But we are very concerned with the demanded information system used by the Federal agencies.

These are the channels of communication for programs to report to their agencies who they are serving and to what degree are they serving. We can make no judgment if those services are in fact reaching someone that qualifies within the total universe of need, and beyond that, if the Spanish-speaking within that universe are getting their equal share. So again, the whole MIS system comes into play.

Now when we talk about the management information system we must refer to OMB. We must refer to OMB because OMB approves every form used for the questionnaire. OMB has the responsibility to coordinate all the executive branch's collection of data. The most alarming thing is that it has recently come out with your "Social Indicators, 1973" report which breaks down a series of characteristics into black and white category.

Now in reading that report you will note on their charts which state that black is defined as black and white is defined as white and others.

Yet that's the footnote, but the actual chart says white and then black and others, and the footnote contradicts the actual chart.

So it isn't—and I hope we avoid in these discussions getting into any racial connotations—but the question is whether whites are getting the resources that statistics show ought to be going to the Spanish-speaking, and I think our concern with this report coming from OMB is they are stating that this is how they are going to assess the social and economic needs of the country which then—I feel can only presume at this point—means they're going to use that as a planning instrument to prepare their policies on social and economic programs and to come to Congress with a budget based on that.

Now Congress is getting its own "OMB." At least at this point—it's in a defensive position, so again, we're getting to that point now.

I guess much of this has been covered in other testimony but I'd like to just raise a question at this time that our concern is basically for the standardization of the identifier. We can agree with the Spanish origin. This is a policy question and must be dealt with either by the executive branch or Congress if we are to establish a common identifier.

I think the other question is that the executive branch institute the same identifier, and use the same identifier in their management information system. Then we could come back and have not only census dealing with that, but we could also—which you will use for your appropriations in setting up your formulas—deal with the actual services being provided through that process.

The inclusionary issue, including the Hispanic American in the policymaking decisions of this country is a policy question. Now there are certain instruments that we have talked about, methodology of census and all these questionnaires. Those are technical points. But the whole policy question is, "Is the Spanish origin person to be included in as an identifiable group within the social and economic planning of this country and the policies that come out of that?" I don't think we have the instruments at this point to do that, but first there has to be a commitment to that policy. We have to get the technical skills which exist. I don't think it's a "pie in the sky" thing and then we evaluate what comes out of those instruments.

The fact is that OMB directs and coordinates this collection of data, approves all surveys, approves all forms that the executive branch uses, and then forwards it to the Domestic Council for its policy decisions. I'm not questioning whether we're counted or not. It's a question of whether we're identified in the count.

Mr. WHITE. I think that's a good distinction.

Mr. ZERMENO. How can the planning of this country deal with our needs? As I said earlier, we get hung up in "Are we a minority in terms of counting us, or are we counted as a minority as a language, as a nationality, which is origin, and the other ones they use for us?"

So basically, that's my point, to try to summarize it.

Mr. WHITE. You're differentiating really between economic and policy as to ethnic group, aren't you? In other words, there are economic programs that count everybody, but you feel that for policy purposes in order to ferret out the specific problems of the minority group or persons of Spanish origin that they should be identified.

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes. I feel that the issue of the Chicano and—we have personal issues—to be a Chicano is my personal decision, and what I feel as a Chicano is my personal decision.

Mr. WHITE. The term would have certain political tones to it.

Mr. ZERMENO. Right, or the Puerto Rican or whatever it may be, that's a personal decision I make, but the economic welfare of my community or myself is a different issue. The question I think you asked of the previous witness, on the question at what point the census should stop counting—well, my point is that until we stop being different in terms of economic indices, when we have the education level of the median of this country, which isn't too high in this country for anybody, and other similar factors, then we can discuss that issue.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Zermeno, I think you've got a good point there, but I'm going to play the Devil's advocate for a second here. There are some who say as long as you choose to be identified and choose to be separated out by some identity, then you cannot amalgamate or assimilate into society. Do you think this has some validity? In other words, if those of Spanish origin go about and say, "I'm Spanish origin; I'm Mexican-American, Chicano or Hispanic," or whatever, then they will continue to be something slightly different than simple Americans; because we're all Americans.

Mr. ZERMENO. I think I want to be different. I think most of us want to be different.

Mr. WHITE. Different than just simply American?

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes. I'm an American first of all.

Mr. WHITE. But you want to be different.

Mr. ZERMENO. I want my ancestry, my cultural background recognized as such.

Mr. WHITE. Of course. However, if it enters into the political areas, too, of self-identity or individual and separate identity, then in a sense it works in a counter force to the assimilation that you speak of in terms of finally terminating the census. Now if it reaches a point where there is no longer any discrimination as to economics, then you have really fulfilled the mission as to the census decisions and certainly this resolution.

Mr. ZERMENO. Right.

Mr. WHITE. But would you, after assimilation into this country and there is no differentiation economically, would you want to continue the identification of Spanish origin groups?

Mr. ZERMENO. Within the census?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. MAY. When that point comes, then you'll have to make a decision on that, but we don't anticipate that this will come within the next 10 or 20 years or a generation.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I think it's a good point, though, to consider because in the long run planning—

Mr. ZERMENO. I think some of the reapportionment effort in California in the last few years, I think the masters or the ones who finally made the decision—they are called master—raise the question of the minority to the whole reapportionment question.

Mr. WHITE. Now I want to go to one other point, Mr. Zermeno. All the witnesses who have come up have questioned the use of Spanish-speaking as not appropriate. Then they have talked about

Spanish origin. And as I have been listening to the testimony I'm going to analyze this and I'd like you to analyze it with me.

Who are you really trying to reach? Are you trying to reach people who have had some Spanish ancestry on the entire globe, like Spanish Morocco, or any of these places, or are you really trying to reach those who have come from South America, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and others? In other words, the Western Hemisphere. Who have the problems?

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes; I would think had we known—if we knew and I'd have to qualify this because we don't know, but I'm assuming that the Spanish from Spain have probably—and I'm guessing—are probably at the same level as, or equivalent to the median of this country.

Mr. WHITE. I have never up to this time seen a Spaniard from Spain who has had the economic problems or the assimilation problems.

Mr. ZERMENO. You should see the shepherds of California. They have them, but that's a small group.

Mr. WHITE. But they are blonds, with blue eyes, and sometimes the second generation seems to have no problem.

Mr. ZERMENO. Right.

Mr. WHITE. What I'm driving at is this. While it seems a bit cumbersome, wouldn't it be more accurate to say Western Hemisphere Spanish-speaking origin because then you're confining it to an area which is the economic area that you're speaking of?

Mr. ZERMENO. Why not Spanish origin and under that put subheadings?

Mr. WHITE. If you say Spanish origins, wherever the Spanish empire existed—I'm talking about Africa, the Pacific area, New Orleans, up the Mississippi River—there are all types of areas that have Spanish origin. Ireland has some Spanish origin.

Mr. ZERMENO. This country was originally founded by a Spaniard who navigated us here.

Mr. WHITE. So if you're talking in terms of ethnic background, that's one thing. If you're talking about economic background as characterized by ethnic experience, then I think—

Mr. ZERMENO. I think I would agree with the Western Hemisphere because if we're looking to use census data that we get for economic purposes to assess our economic levels, to assess our educational levels and all this, I think this is where it's at in this country.

Mr. WHITE. And your Spanish-speaking designation or Spanish-origin designation has a built-in error in it that is misleading as far as your purposes go.

Mr. ZERMENO. That's correct.

Mr. WHITE. So I think we need to consider that when the time comes.

There's one other question that concerns me. It was testified by earlier witnesses today that there was approximately a 16.6 percent undercount as determined in March of 1973. Now we had a witness yesterday who testified that the rate of growth of the Spanish-speaking or Spanish-origin population in this country was approximately 4 percent.

Now if the census were taken in March or April of 1974—approximately then—

Mr. BULLOCK. The current population survey; the census was taken in 1970.

Mr. WHITE. All right. So April of 1973, we had 3 years involved, and if that's 4 percent each year, that's 12 percent; and so 12 percent from 16 makes about a 4- or 5-percent error, which isn't totally bad. Any error, of course, is unfortunate, but that's not as radically wrong as it would look on first blush. Do you see what I'm driving at?

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. If in fact the 4-percent growth is valid and if in fact there was a 16-percent undercount as compared to the figures of 1973, well, they say we've got 16-percent growth—I guess that's the way it was put—how would you observe that?

Mr. ZERMENO. The problem is I don't accept any of those figures. First of all, the census itself gave us another 1.5 million in their recent CPS.

Mr. WHITE. That's 1.5 million as of 1970 or as of 1973?

Mr. ZERMENO. As of 1973, but it did not in any way deal with the question of undercount.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, Well, what did they give you first?

Mr. ZERMENO. 9.2 million and then up to 10.5.

Mr. WHITE. Well, if 12 percent of that—

Mr. ZERMENO. We're the fastest growing minority in this country, according to the census.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; I can believe that.

Mr. ZERMENO. And I think we are anyway.

Mr. WHITE. That's 1,140,000, if you accepted a 4-percent growth. That would be more than it would have increased from 1970 to 1973, according to my figures.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Zermeno, I want to ask a question that I asked before but I'd like to get a comparison on the record that would indicate a unanimity of the witnesses at least.

Before the advent of the civil rights push some years ago there was a strong effort and it was successful to remove from public and private employment application forms references to racial and ethnic background. Do you believe that with the current situation that we have and perhaps with the need to monitor the success of some of these programs, affirmative action programs and other similar types of programs, that it would now be acceptable and desirable to now allow or even mandate the return of racial and ethnic background information on public and private employment application forms?

Mr. ZERMENO. Most definitely. I am very much for that, assuming the assurance of the confidentiality of the information. But in terms of aggregate, in order to plan, it's the only way you can do it.

Mr. HINSHAW. All right. Yesterday one of the subcommittees on which I serve, approved a subcommittee report dealing with the problems of aliens in this country illegally and after some year and a half of study it seems apparent that most of the illegal alien problem is concentrated in the New York area and the southwest, principally in the greater Los Angeles area.

Is perhaps part of the reason for the undercount of Spanish-origin persons due to the illegal alien problem of those that might be coming across the San Diego-Mexican border into the Los Angeles area and greater southern California area with perhaps the attitudes of these

persons that might have come across the border illegally reluctant to talk with those and, therefore, you can't find out adequately who might be illegal and who might be legal in this country as well as the difficulty of the language problem itself?

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes. I think that certainly would have something to do with it. But the problems that the aliens face in answering the questionnaire is very similar to that of the resident or the citizens in some cases. My father, for instance, is an alien resident. He's not a citizen. He's been in this country since 1920. He registered just prior to World War II when everyone had to register. He has difficulty—or had difficulty—he's sort of over it now—dealing with bureaucracy, forms, government, language. I would suspect that 20 years ago if we got a questionnaire in our home, if there was such a thing then, I'm sure he could not answer it, even though he was here legally. He had a mistrust for government and I think you find this in many of us. It's a question of going to government now and seeing if we can work with it.

The other question—I had experience in working in San Francisco and the illegal alien question is not just in reference I hope to the southern border—

Mr. HINSHAW. No; it's not.

Mr. ZERMENO. Because I know when San Francisco was building its rapid transit system there we were getting a number of illegals from Canada but they were not identified. They've got a social security card and that's all the employer asked. So we had the problem of protecting jobs for the citizens. It was automatic that you question somebody who looks different or who has an accent, but to question a Canadian was unthought of.

Mr. HINSHAW. The illegal alien problem that we discussed in our other subcommittee dealt not only with those coming across the southern border but coming across the Canadian border, Chinese aliens jumping ship both in San Francisco and in the New York area, and it deals with many different groups from many different countries.

In your earlier comments I think you indicated—at least you inferred a need to identify Spanish origin for an entirely different reason, and I will give you some of my reasons in a moment. You indicated that you could not have predicted the statistics probability of your birth and your death because there are no birth and death rate statistics kept.

In certain of the Jewish origins, I think particularly in Eastern Europe, and for blacks with sickle cell anemia, there are particular types of health problems which occur for these groups. If we were to have accurate birth, death, and health statistics for Spanish origin and then subcategories within Spanish origin, might we not also be able to discover some kinds of problems that would be related to health that would totally justify the added cost of collection of data as opposed to just the economic problem?

Mr. ZERMENO. Certainly. For a while I served on an Aging Advisory Committee to the Senate Select Committee on Spanish Speaking. One of the questions raised was that we ought to lower the retirement age for the Spanish speaking because he dies earlier and he's already paid his contribution in so he ought to be able to draw it earlier. The black community has done some very good research in

this area, beascially out of Duke University, where they have set an age comparable to the white which I guess is a little more than 65 now. They have set an age at 57 which their statistics have been able to make a damned good case for.

Now I don't know if they're going to buy it, but they made a good case. They understood the needs of their community in terms of health. We want the same option. We want to be able to understand at what level do we ask government to put money into the Spanish-speaking community.

In terms of aging programs which we consider to be one of the most discriminatory programs that exist because, one, they don't recognize the life style of most of us; and second, they are only available after a certain age when most of us aren't around; but they are built on someone else's standards, someone else's facts. We figure we contributed to the tax rolls, that in terms of—

Mr. HINSHAW. That leads me to my next question because I was very intrigued with the comments of the previous witnesses, Mr. Maduro and Mr. Garcia, in relation to visual identification. I pointed out that I was called upon to identify some categories. I think you recall that question. And Mr. Maduro commented that Spanish origin can go from black to blond and blue-eyed and it's very difficult to identify. Mr. Garcia thought that we should use the visual identification. I would be interested in your comments in trying to use visual identification with perhaps no other identifier.

Mr. ZERMENO. I'd be against it. I have been put up against the wall and checked for my—I had to bring out my draft card too many times. No. I'd be against it. I think it's a question of self-identification. I think one of the reasons—and going into the civil rights movement a few years back within the Spanish-speaking community—one of the reasons there's greater acceptability now of accepting the facts is that I'm American just as anyone else, but I'm different and I want this country to recognize me as being a different type of American in a broader sense.

Mr. WHITE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The fact is, during the argument on the illegal alien bill, one of the complaints by some of the Mexican-American community was that it would cause great embarrassment and discrimination for employers to inquire of employees if they were illegal aliens by reason of maybe different pigmentation. So I think this certainly bears out Mr. Zermeno's arguments.

Mr. HINSHAW. If we were to use Spanish origin as the main category on public and private employment forms, do you think it would be desirable then to have the subcategories that we could identify, for example, Mexican Americans or Chicanos, whichever term might be appropriate for the nation of origin—Filipino, Latin American?

Mr. ZERMENO. I don't think universally. I think we could probably be able to get that out of samples at this stage of the game. You probably wouldn't have to go into fine detail.

Mr. MAY. I would like to add to that. As you are well aware, there has been a large influx of Cubans. The average age of a Cuban is estimated somewhere around 34 to 35 years. Now the Chicano and Puerto Rican median is somewhere around 18 and 19. This has a

bearing on the types of legislative and other responses that are made to a different population. So we do need in certain areas, at minimum, these different categories.

Mr. HINSHAW. One further question that I don't think we have touched on in any of the hearings I have been involved with. If we were to have self-identification—and I will use a hypothetical example a person who was born of pure Irish, if you can find such a thing, and pure Mexican American, if you can find such a category, and he were then faced with this self-identification, he could choose either one perhaps.

Do you believe the Spanish origin should be applied to that person as a matter of policy trying to identify the problems that that person might face, assuming for a moment that that person had a Spanish name like Garcia or Zermeno and also had a pigmentation that would identify him as perhaps being in that category?

Mr. ZERMENO. Spanish origin—my assumption here is based on the fact that if he identifies with the Spanish origin community in all probability he's doing it because he can't identify with some other community, and there is a question of economics. I'm assuming—this is my training—I assume he sees himself as being part of that poor Spanish-speaking community and he's going to identify himself with that for whatever reason, not necessarily because he's poor, because there's something rewarding for him to identify there.

Now if he could identify as being Irish and he saw himself as being Irish, well, let him identify himself as being so.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. I have one point I'd like to make. You know, with every good result in legislation, often there are bad results, and you spoke about the need for better statistics for age of longevity in the Mexican-American. The problem is they could raise your insurance rates immediately.

Mr. MAY. We don't have insurance.

Mr. ZERMENO. That's all right. We'd come and ask to be subsidized.

Mr. WHITE. Has Mexico been able to supply any kind of data in the area of health that might be of assistance in this area?

Mr. ZERMENO. There have been some outstanding research projects with Mexico primarily dealing with nutrition in relation to education. One of the questions that we have uncovered in doing this research is that the census conducts studies of other countries. Unfortunately, for some reason, all of them happen to be basically European with some in the Far East and Middle East. There have been no studies conducted by the census in South, Central, and Latin America.

Mr. WHITE. Done by whom?

Mr. ZERMENO. By our U.S. Census Bureau.

Mr. WHITE. That's a good point.

Mr. ZERMENO. I think there's another question that ought to be asked in terms of affirmative action by census, not only in its own employees but census contracted out much of the 1970 census. We'd like to know who they contracted to and what was their staffing pattern.

Mr. WHITE. You mean on the domestic scene?

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes, on the domestic scene, not the foreign studies. So we're talking about a much broader picture and we're talking basically—and let me get on my soap box for a minute—we're talking primarily unless this country will recognize that people can be different, can this country have a pluralistic society? Maybe that sounds esoteric to other people but some of us feel like we can. I like to be recognized as an American who happens to be from Mexico and who has some differences. Too much of our surveys, research, and everything has been oriented toward the European and it's understandable why. It's the whole question of language, for example. It's an English-speaking country. Our educational system is structured and really imported from Great Britain and puts its highest value on the English language. One who does not speak English is considered to be less than an English-speaking person. Unfortunately, we don't value too many foreign languages so we don't learn to respect someone else's language, but I think the question we wish to address here is that it's not just a question of improving the technology or methodology of census. It goes beyond that in order that the information systems used by the executive branch for the various programs, can be correlated to a census so that we can compare what's happening.

The thing is that everyone uses different indicators and everyone has a different way of identifying us. Now somebody at some point has to say that this Government, this country, wants the Spanish origin, for good or bad—there will always be objections to it one way or the other—as one common identifier that not only the census has to use, but that the agencies who do their planning basically from their data, not census, have to use the same identifier so we can compare them.

Mr. WHITE. Well, thank you very much.

Mr. MAY. If I may add something to that. In 1971, your subcommittee did a study on Federal statistical agencies and it was pointed out then that the Bureau of Census had a budget of somewhere around \$120 or \$122 million and that HEW had a budget of somewhere around \$108 or \$109 million. Now our whole focus has been very much on census and the CPS, how it's used in Agriculture and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but there are agencies in HEW—the three centers on educational statistics, health statistics and social statistics, as well as the Social Security Administration—that have enormous data capabilities and they have done virtually nothing in dealing with Hispanic Americans and it would seem that rather than merely dealing with the three agencies that have been discussed so far, these other agencies should be considered for some kind of inclusion so that there's a beginning made toward standardizing data systems in a number of agencies.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I think this committee is moving in that direction and we intend to do something further in this area as time develops.

Thank you very much, Mr. Zermeno. We appreciate your coming before us. It's been very helpful to us.

[The prepared statement, submitted by Mr. Zermeno, follows]:

STATEMENT OF ALEX ZERMENO, ACTING NATIONAL DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

Chairman White, distinguished members of this Committee, my name is Alex Zermeno. I am here at your invitation to speak in behalf of the National Council of La Raza. I am a Mexican American—variously referred to as Hispanic Ameri-

can, Spanish Speaking, Brown or Latino. I am one of some 10.6 million people which the Census Bureau labels Spanish speaking or Spanish origin.

But I cannot say to you today that I—or my people—literally count in this country.

For the governmental institutions mandated to maintain and collect social data on this country have sorely failed the citizens termed Spanish speaking.

A cloud of controversy has hovered over the Census Bureau estimates of Spanish speaking. As a people, we Hispanic Americans have been embroiled in a debate as to the accuracy of this country's chief data collectors for some two generations.

The charges of undercount have been loud and abundant. Private organizations have formed to take their own Latino Census in various Southwestern states.

We agree that there have been vast shortcomings in the counting of our people. But the National Council of La Raza believes that it is now time for us, as a nation, to go beyond that debate.

We feel it is now time for us to address the harder, more significant issues behind that count.

Our concern goes beyond the immediate benefits that are derived from improved population counts, employment statistics and other social and economic data inherent in this nation's information processing enterprises.

The National Council of La Raza's chief concerns rest with the manner in which: Our nation and its public leaders conduct the affairs of this society to meet the nation's social and economic interests—including the interests of Hispanic Americans, and; the extent to which national interest is the dominant factor of those who make policy and decisions.

As the National Council of La Raza, we have a vital interest in those policies which further or hinder the production of sound information upon which the government and others base policies and make decisions and take other important actions which affect the national interest.

For that reason, we are submitting to you today a preliminary draft of a research paper, "Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans," which will be released at a later date and entails a report on the poor health of this nation's information systems policy in regard to the Hispanic American population—an element of our society which has not been properly identified, and thus, has been excluded from vital data and information gathering processes.

In short, it is an appeal for a governmental policy of inclusion, not exclusion for Hispanic Americans. The National Council of La Raza's position is that public information is public property and that the public has a right to quality information.

It is our belief that public institutions have an obligation to provide sound information—not misinformation, useful information—not statistical atrocities.

The public has a right to know the facts and conditions facing our society in order that it may measure how well the nation's policies are meeting the nation's needs and interests. This holds just as true with regard to the Hispanic American taxpayer and consumer. Both the people and their elected leaders need to have sound information to insure sound judgment.

The absence of a federal policy for quality information on Hispanic Americans can, and does, result in defacto exclusionary policies, patterns and practices which work against the Hispanic Americans. Such policies aid and abet the segregation of Hispanic American interest from the economic and social policies of public and private institutions.

As the National Council of La Raza's paper clearly shows, our federal government today does not have a policy of advancing the well being or the interest of the more than 10.6 million Hispanic Americans. National policies which do exist in the social, economic, political and cultural spheres do not systematically include considerations for the well being and interests of the nation's second largest minority.

That judgment is less the result of the harsh experiences of the struggle by Hispanic American communities, organizations and leaders for a share of public funds to solve outstanding needs in the barrios. The judgment is based on the iron logic of the very processes with which government develops and institutes social and economic policies.

What is at stake goes beyond the equitable allocation and distribution of federal, state and local funds based on the maximum accurate statistical counting of Hispanic Americans—equity and equality of consideration.

Ultimately, a policy based on "no count" is more damaging than a policy based on "undercount."

An accurate count of the Hispanic American does not by itself lead to improvements in national policies—it merely indicates the magnitude of the problem. The real issue is now the public institutions can be made to efficiently and effectively begin to manage the public's affairs in a manner that insures the inclusion of Hispanic American interests.

Facts and conditions on Hispanic Americans are hidden in the information, data and statistics used by government in making public policy and managing public affairs. Even when usable information on interests and needs of Hispanic Americans are not systematically identified and accurately defined by or within the government's information systems.

For statistical purposes, the Hispanic American is generally included within the white population categories. Yet for policy making purposes—particularly when allocation and distribution of resources is at stake—the Hispanic American usually is included in a minority classification or is not included at all.

The factual condition of this nation's information systems is such that in making national policies, only black and white interests are defined statistically. To the extent that national policies are so defined, the existing management or public affairs can only reflect these interests and not those of Hispanic or other Americans.

The best example of the problem is to be found in the Office of Management and Budget itself. The OMB, we note, has developed a set of social indicators upon which the needs of this country are to be assessed. It is precisely this kind of information which is used for purposes of legislation and allocation.

Yet its report, *Social Indicators 1973*, has no reference to the Hispanic Americans of this country. We can only assume that the Hispanic Americans will not be an identifiable group which will receive the benefit of future social planning and resources.

Such data, therefore, is rendered useless in attempting to honestly plan the social needs of a population which historically and literally has not been counted.

Neither the current premises of the information systems nor the processes for using the information allow for the systematic consideration of Hispanic Americans.

It is because of this lack of data that the Hispanic American community has been forced to deal in a political climate that smacks of the old patron system and forced to return to the worn out rhetoric of the past in dramatizing the needs of its people.

The dangers of a no-policy system in regards to Hispanic Americans are blatantly present in the Watergate allegations about the buying of Chicano votes and the awarding of government contracts to minorities on a responsiveness-to-party basis.

The significance of information systems is underscored by the increasing reliance placed upon them as technical and management tools for policy making, planning, budgeting and evaluation purposes by the government at all levels. Statistics and data gathering are key components of the advances in information and management technology.

Thus, it is vitally significant when we say to you today—that with the possible exception of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's Mexican American Education Project, there were no other major or basic and applied research activities during the decade sponsored by the federal government focusing on the Hispanic Americans. Nor can one point to any major basic research activity either in the public or the private sector which directly addresses that particular population.

In brief—\$150 billion worth of research for the advancement of knowledge in this country has failed to bring forth any significant data or information relevant to the Hispanic American in this country.

Thank you.

[The letter which follows was received for the record, subsequent to Mr. Zermeno's appearance before the subcommittee:]

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1974.

Hon. RICHARD C. WHITE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics,
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WHITE: During your recent hearings concerning H.J. Res. 406, you requested that we submit additional materials which might help shed light on the issues before your subcommittee. In response to this request, I am submitting copies of the following for inclusion in the record of the hearings:

1. "Findings and Recommendations on Federal Statistical Programs," in *Federal Statistics*, Report of the President's Commission, 1971.
2. "Population Statistics and Research," Chapter 15 in the *Final Report* of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, March, 1972.
3. Findings and Recommendations of the December, 1972 Report of the Inter-agency Racial Data Committee, *Establishing a Federal Racial/Ethnic Data System*.
4. Findings and Recommendations, *To Know or Not to Know*, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1973.
5. Findings and Recommendations, *Counting the Forgotten*, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1974.
6. *Consistency of Reporting of Ethnic Origin in the Current Population Survey* Technical Paper 31, Bureau of the Census, February, 1974.
7. "Accuracy of 1970 Census Population and Housing Characteristics as Measured by Reinterviews," by Charles Jones, et al., Bureau of the Census, in *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section—1973*, American Statistical Association.
8. "Introduction," "Appendix A, General Information Concerning Data," "Appendix C, Definitions and Explanations of Subject Characteristics," and "Appendix D, Accuracy of the Data," in *Persons of Spanish Origin*, Subject Reports, PC (2)—1C, June, 1973.
9. Excerpt from "Introduction" of *Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States*, Subject Reports, PC (2)—1G, July, 1974.
10. Excerpt from "Characteristics of the Low-Income Population—1971," in *Current Population Reports, Consumer Income*, Series P-60, No. 86, December, 1972, pp. 20.
11. "Introduction," and excerpts from *Social Indicators 1973*, Office of Management and Budget, 1973.
12. Chapter on "Civil Rights" in *General Revenue Sharing*, September, 1973, pp. 18-20.
13. "Information for Local Manpower Planning," by David Snedeker, National Association of Counties, Presented at the National County Manpower Conference (November 19, 1973).

The latter contains much useful information on data/information systems available and accessible to local government planning agencies.

14. In addition, if possible, we respectfully request that the record of the hearings include the following items:

- a. *Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin: March 1972 and 1971*, Population Characteristics, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 249, April, 1973.
- b. *Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1973*, Population Characteristics, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 264, May, 1974.
- c. *Report on Accuracy of the 1970 Census Enumeration*, House Report 91-1777.
- d. *Investigation of Possible Politicization of Federal Statistical Programs*, House Report 92-1536.

Finally, enclosed is the final edited copy of *Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans* (National Council of La Raza, June, 1974).

I sincerely hope that the inclusion of both recent testimony and documents (such as above 1-14) may be of great value to those concerned with having a handy compendium of materials that can aid in the needed additional in-depth understanding of and work on federal statistical policies by Hispanic Americans and others.

We would be pleased to meet with you and your colleagues to further discuss matters pertaining to the above listed documents as they relate to the Hispanic American perspective.

Sincerely,

ALEX ZERMENO,
Acting National Director.

[The publications set forth in the above letter are retained in the files of the subcommittee. The paper entitled "Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans," is included at the end of these hearings.]

Mr. WHITE. The committee will come to order. Ms. Landeros, insofar as you were not a scheduled witness, we are going to give you about 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF MS. DELFINA LANDEROS

Ms. LANDEROS. My name is Defina Landeros and I work with the Bureau of the Census. I'm a statistician working with the Population Division.

I came here on my own. I took the day off and came here just to listen to the testimony being presented before the committee. I was a listener until I decided to present a point of information to the committee that might satisfy a question, particularly the one he raised with regard to language.

Mr. WHITE. You just go ahead.

Ms. LANDEROS. There are many problems involved in counting the Spanish origin. There are methodological problems. There are problems of mistrust on the part of the Spanish origin community, mistrust of Government agencies. There's also some ignorance about the value of being counted in the Spanish origin community. There's a myriad of reasons why we're getting possibly less numbers than we should be getting according to the Bureau of the Census figures.

All these problems seem to eventually be related to economics, economics not only affecting the Spanish origin community but also economics affecting the agencies that gather the data.

In my everyday contact with the people I work with at the Bureau of the Census we discuss the unfortunate disadvantages of being understaffed. We have about eight different projects that we need to work on, they are very big projects, one of them is improving the coding of Spanish surname. Our Spanish surname list, I feel is not as adequate as it should be. We need to do much more research in that area, and much more research in the area of undercount, and community relations. There's a lot of work that needs to be done in our office but we need a larger staff.

Well, something is being done about understaffing but it seems like it's coming about very slowly. Meantime, these problems are there just glaring at us.

In the community relations branch of the Bureau of the Census only one lady takes care of all ethnic groups and she goes to conferences for the Indians; she goes to conferences for the Chicanos; she goes to conferences for the Puerto Ricans, conferences for the blacks. She takes care of all the groups, the ethnics and the racial.

Mr. WHITE. What is her name?

Ms. LANDEROS. Emma Moreno. She's a community relations liaison.

And the reason I started out saying there are various problems relating to the counting of the Spanish origin is because we're somehow shortchanged in all the areas. We're shortchanged in our staff. We're shortchanged in the community relations staff. For instance, if we had some kind of a mechanism which would get down to the grass-roots level and start relating to the Spanish origin people about the importance of being counted.

Mr. WHITE. Ms. Landeros, we're going to be free-wheeling here and I suggest we ask questions without worrying about 5 minutes or recognition.

Do you think this is a condition that exists throughout the entire agency, the lack of personnel; or do you think it's characteristic only of this area which you speak of, the ethnic data area?

Ms. LANDEROS. It's probably characteristic of many areas. I'm personally aware only of mine, the ethnic area, and the fact that we have very few staff and there's a lot of work to be done.

Let me just point to other things that I think we brought up that I think are very important. The Center for Vital Statistics, the National Center for Vital Statistics, there's basic communication between our agency and the Center and from my observation—I'm not in a position to know much of what's going on——

Mr. WHITE. What is your classification?

Ms. LANDEROS. Statistician.

Mr. WHITE. What is your classification level?

Ms. LANDEROS. GS-9.

Mr. WHITE. OK.

Ms. LANDEROS. So in my opinion it is very important that it be communicated to the Center for Vital Statistics or some legislation brought about for the Center for Vital Statistics to point to the States or to ask the States to start collecting data on the Spanish surname or start coding Spanish surnames. This will help us in demographical analysis. So far as I know, this is just being considered. It's being considered, I think, on the lower levels. Some personnel, some staff in the Center for Vital Statistics is compiling a report to present to his director, but I don't know about any communication at the higher levels with regard to this topic.

Mr. WHITE. Have you noticed any increase in activity, say within the last year, in your department, an increase in methodology or increase in staff? In other words, is the condition improving or worsening or steady?

Ms. LANDEROS. It improved but now it seems to be steady. There was an ethnic branch and that was divided into the staff for the black that would take care of the racial people; and then a staff allocated for the Spanish origin and a staff was allocated for the other ethnics. And we have an assistant to the chief of population that was recruited to direct the Spanish staff and then two assistants were hired, myself and another person were hired to help him. But even with that, there's a lot of work to be done and we need many more staff members and we need a lot more people to work with the community relations person because if they're not doing their work in the community in terms of relating to the people, like I mentioned before, in terms of communicating to them what we have available in terms of Spanish origin data and hearing their needs and also trying to do away with that mistrust that exists in the community, then our figures are not going to be as accurate as they would otherwise be.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me ask a question in this regard. Assuming that the Census Bureau were to hire bilingual persons, particularly for the Spanish origin, and in their contracting out for the enumeration if they were to make sure that there were Spanish-speaking interviewers, do you believe that this language ability or competency alone would overcome the distrust that the community might have toward government and the Census Bureau?

Ms. LANDEROS. It would help a lot but that isn't the only way. It's just one aspect of how to get around this problem, one little aspect.

Mr. WHITE. If I may interrupt, how would you get around the problem in other ways, too? What would you suggest to supplement what Mr. Hinshaw is talking about?

MS LANDEROS. One way would be a vast community relations program.

MR. WHITE. You mean periodicals and bulletins about the purpose of the Census Bureau?

MS. LANDEROS. Exactly, but not only that. Using all the media, just having a greater communication with a large number of community activists, community leaders; the Bureau going to the community and setting up meetings. As it is, we are kind of operating on a haphazard basis. If there's a conference that's being held someplace and by chance we happen to be invited, we go and participate in that conference. The Bureau has not taken any initiative steps itself to coordinate this community relations program.

MR. WHITE. Could you recommend that the Department take the initiative or ask the Census Bureau Director if you all could send out bulletins to designated leaders that could be designated by the Commerce Department showing the Census purposes and opportunities from the data collection? Would that be a help?

MS. LANDEROS. It may be.

MR. WHITE. Could you do that or is there any kind of directive prohibiting it?

MS. LANDEROS. I don't know. Like I said, I'm just speaking out my own opinion within my limited knowledge. I'm not speaking as a representative of the Bureau.

MR. HINSHAW. I'd like to perhaps ask Mr. Zermeno his reaction to the same question which I asked you. That is, if we had bilingual persons who speak Spanish, would this tend to overcome itself the problem of the undercount or overcome the distrust that the community might have for government?

MR. ZERMENO. Certainly. It would certainly help. I would have to agree with her, though, it's not just every 10 years go pick a bunch of people and get them out there. I think there's a major distrust of Census and especially now with the decentralization where we have to argue on the basis of the 1970 census for local allocations at local community levels. Our feelings are that, that the census is not correct, so why should we have to use it?

MR. HINSHAW. Following up on another aspect of the same question, supposing a person of bilingual ability would go in. Would the Spanish-speaking communities trust to a greater degree a bilingual questionnaire or might they just view that with more suspicion because this is another effort to conceal the true motive of sending out a questionnaire, or would that be of material help?

MR. ZERMENO. I don't know. Maybe she could answer that better.

MR. HINSHAW. I'm just thinking of the attitudinal standpoint.

MS. LANDEROS. The only way I could answer that question is my own attitude. If I received something that's written in Spanish, I take a positive attitude toward it.

MR. ZERMENO. Somebody showed interest in you.

MS. LANDEROS. Yes. They decided to write to me in Spanish. I am impressed when an Anglo person tries to speak to me in Spanish. I figure he's trying, at least, to communicate with me.

MR. HINSHAW. One further followup question along this line. Recognizing that the Census Bureau perhaps cannot take the lead and overcome this distrust apart from employing bilingual persons

and having bilingual questionnaires, it would seem to me—and I'm asking this in the form of a question—it would seem to me that to the extent that Spanish speaking persons themselves or "leaders" within the Spanish speaking origin community feel that this is a problem and believe it to be a problem, should not the leadership in overcoming this mistrust fall within that group of leaders within any given community?

Mr. LANDEROS. They should, but it takes both the leadership and the Bureau of Census and Government agencies to communicate with each other and so that the Bureau can communicate what they are doing and the community can communicate to the Bureau what their needs are.

Mr. WHITE. Let me ask a question. Both of you spoke of mistrust and, of course, this has followed through much of the testimony we have received. How far down, in terms of generations, does this mistrust follow? In other words, are you talking about second and third generations or are you talking about beyond third generations? I know the first generation obviously would have distrust, but what about the second and third generations?

Ms. LANDEROS. It follows as far as there exists certain processes in the society whereby the Spanish origin people are being discriminated against in one form or another or being abused.

Mr. WHITE. Would that relate to the census forms, too?

Ms. LANDEROS. It does.

Mr. WHITE. How do you feel about that, Mr. Zermeno?

Mr. ZERMENO. I think maybe the second or third generation won't have mistrust on the basis of a discriminatory kind of distrust, but I think their distrust is "Why the hell go through the process? We're not going to be considered in public policy anyway, so we're going through some charades here if, in fact, this doesn't mean something for my community later on."

I think this is the difficulty in getting people to place any value on the census for being counted. They don't recognize the value of it and I think part of it is the serious question of has there been any value in being counted of Spanish origin and if there has been can you see it, can you identify it? The whole question is what's the value of being counted?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman there raised his hand.

Mr. SANTIESTEVEAN. My name is Henry Santiestevan. I'm the past national director of the National Counsel of de la Raza and you will excuse me for intruding myself, Mr. Chairman, but you gentlemen sparked up my imagination when you began to discuss the functions of the Census Bureau and it may be appropriate for Congress to begin to think about reconceptualizing the Census Bureau itself.

I'm thinking in the context of the trust in government theme which has been touched on here several times. Beyond its meaning as it relates to our own people, it relates to everybody, and the problems arising out of current history, so to speak. The Post Office, I suppose, is the arm of the Federal Government that is most familiar to all of us and it's the ever present symbol. Perhaps if we begin to think imaginatively about the Census Bureau and about some way of decentralizing it to bring—

Mr. WHITE. Our trend was just the reverse actually, to try to make it funnel all census data into—but you're talking in terms of reaching out to the community?

Mr. SANTIESTEVEAN. Exactly.

Mr. WHITE. Well, we're interested in that, too.

Mr. SANTIESTEVEAN. I think it has a tremendous symbol value. The Census Bureau has a strong symbol of being objective and therefore can carry a strong weight of trust and, as I say, I have no blueprint naturally, but it may be time for Congress to start thinking imaginatively about the Census Bureau itself and how we're using it as a nation.

Mr. WHITE. Well, you know, the European situation is to have census representatives in virtually every community and the church fulfills this mission, but in this country we haven't done that.

Mr. SANTIESTEVEAN. That's what I'm talking about.

Mr. WHITE. Since we're short on time, would you like to complete your statement or have you completed what you wanted to say?

Ms. LANDEROS. Just one or two other things. In these hearings, the basic issue is economics. I would like to know why can't our agency expand the Current Population Survey in order to get larger Spanish origin numbers? This would mean getting more funds to cover the overall expense but it would also mean obtaining a wider variety of reliable estimates on the Spanish origin.

And then it would give us up-to-date data at least every March. So far, we can't break that data down to the State level. We are attempting to do this but we can't do it for all the States. For instance there is a sizable community in the Midwest that's crying to have data on the State level and they can't use it because the ratios of Spanish origin are so small that the Spanish data becomes simply not reliable. We can't give them figures. So this is one thing that I would like the chairman and the subcommittee to consider.

Another thing that I would like the subcommittee to consider is possibly initiating hearings on this whole question of whether the Spanish origin should be classified as white and Spanish origin or just Spanish origin.

Mr. WHITE. What do you think in terms of what I was speaking of, in terms of the Western Hemisphere? Would your statement indicate that you feel it would be good to confine it to Western Hemisphere?

Ms. LANDEROS. I have been thinking about that but it needs more thinking.

My reason for bringing this out is because at the present time the Spanish origin population is a subset of the white racial category when comparing "whites" and "Spanish" origin so that on a national level the true differences when you try to compare characteristics such as income, unemployment, and so forth, are not so bad. The true differences are invisible. But when you compare lower levels the true differences may be far worse than they appear to be, and so if we really want to talk about where persons get affected more, it's in the local levels, the community levels.

So, to me, it's very important that the Spanish origin population not be a subset of the white racial category.

Mr. WHITE. Does that complete your statement? Because I'm going to allow Mr. Hinshaw a question.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, I don't have any further questions, but I would like to suggest to the chairman that he consider having the Director of the Census Bureau, Mr. Barabba, review the statements of the persons who have been testifying and review the transcript and comment on the testimony that we have had and the reaction. I know that the Census Bureau has already presented some testimony, but I think it might be helpful to us to have an analysis of the statements.

Mr. WHITE. And we would have this available through counsel's office if any of you wish to look at the statement. I think it would be well to contact Mr. Barabba. Did you suggest that he appear in person?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. I think just review the transcript and comment as he might choose on the testimony.

Mr. WHITE. All right. Then I'll ask counsel to contact Mr. Barabba and invite him to make comments.

[The following letter was received for the record:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1974.

Hon. RICHARD C. WHITE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of July 8, enclosing the testimony of Miss Delfina Landeros before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics. Although Miss Landeros is a relatively new member to the staff, having joined us in November 1973, and thus may not yet be fully knowledgeable about many aspects of the Bureau's work, she has enunciated a number of serious and important issues concerning the Bureau's activities relating to providing both timely and accurate data for persons of Spanish origin.

Many of the points raised by Miss Landeros were covered in my recent testimony before your Subcommittee. As I noted then, the Bureau has, in recent years, greatly increased the amount and variety of statistical data available on persons of Spanish origin, both from its censuses and current surveys. Further, in recognition of the importance of and need for data on the demographic, social, and economic characteristics of this group, the Bureau has established a Spanish Origin Statistics Staff to coordinate work in this area and to interact directly with users of these data.

These developments, however, are only illustrative reflections of what I consider to be of overriding importance—namely, the explicit commitment of the Bureau to open communication with the Spanish origin community, to learn of their needs for data and to inform them of what is available, and to develop on our part an understanding of and possible solution to the problems which hinder our achieving full cooperation and complete enumeration of the Spanish origin population in our surveys and censuses. To this end, we are attempting to ensure that all of our various subject matter advisory groups contain representatives of and experts in the problems of persons of Spanish origin. Further, we have made extensive efforts to have Bureau representatives attend and participate in conventions, meetings, and conferences concerned with problems of the Spanish origin population. For example, in the last year, we have participated in more than 20 meetings directly related to this problem area.

Finally, even though some six years remain before the 1980 census, we already have initiated discussions with representatives of many different Spanish origin groups which will lead to the establishment of a continuing group to advise, consult, and participate with the Bureau in the development of our 1980 census program as it relates specifically to the population of Spanish origin.

In closing, let me assure you that the concerns expressed by Miss Landeros are shared by all of us in the Bureau.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BARABBA,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

Mr. WHITE. Without further business, this committee is now adjourned. [Whereupon, at 12:01 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

[The statements and letters which follow were received for inclusion in the record:]

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE
STATE OF COLORADO

Over 2½ years ago, my able colleagues from California and New York, Congressmen Roybal and Badillo, expressed grave concerns over the Census Bureau's March 1971 census report. In November 1971, numerous Mexican American organizations filed suit in Federal court in San Francisco charging the U.S. Bureau of the Census with deliberately undercounting Spanish surnamed citizens. This resulted in the Census Bureau acknowledging that it had undercounted the Spanish surnamed in California by at least 50 percent and that at least 3.1 million persons of Spanish origin resided in California as of 1970.

Belatedly, it was acknowledged that the black population had also been undercounted by at least 7.7 percent (a national undercount of 1.9 million). The U.S. Civil Rights Commission's report indicates that the Bureau recognized the similar socioeconomic condition of the Spanish speaking group but that a specific recount of persons of Spanish extraction was not sought. If Spanish speaking Americans and other minorities are to advance and receive proper recognition, it's essential that we have accurate information and fill the statistical void.

Insensitivity and indifference are charged against the Census Bureau by the Spanish surnamed representative organizations from the east to the west coast. What is the basis of the complaint and what do we as representatives of the people wish to do to ensure that due process prevail? It has been observed that "statisticians, as much as any single group, help shape public policy simply because societies never really become effectively concerned with social problems until they learn to measure them."

Charges of insensitivity and indifference of the Census Bureau have particular significance when we reflect that for two centuries the census has collected and compiled the "essential facts of the American experience." The census has been quietly transformed into a continuously flowing source of information about the American people, and American society is now more and more dependent on it. It's difficult to find any aspect of public or private life that isn't touched and somehow shaped by census information. Because of this, the importance of an accurate census on the Spanish surnamed cannot be ignored.

The previous charges have been fully supported in reports and testimony by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report, "Counting the Forgotten," and the "Official Census Report" by the Mexican-American Population Commission of California. As essential as data and statistics are to the functioning and administration of government, it's difficult to comprehend the lack of initiative demonstrated by the Census Bureau on this particular issue of providing an accurate accounting of the Spanish surnamed citizen in this country. Also, over the years national Spanish speaking representative organizations such as the 47-year-old League of United Latin American Citizens, the 27-year-old American G.I. Forum, the Raza Association of Spanish Surnamed Americans, the Mexican American Population Commission, the Mexican American Political Association, and the National Council of La Raza have consistently pushed for an accurate census count.

This Nation's Spanish speaking are at a serious disadvantage because of the lack of meaningful statistics to determine their actual status. Data on their participation in the labor force in private industry and government, the number of working mothers, the need for day care, and the number of young people is needed to ascertain their specific areas of unmet need. This economic and social information is vital if the Federal Government and other governmental units are to properly identify and resolve difficulties experienced by the Spanish speaking community. If we are to substantively come to grips with the problems of poverty, deprivation, poor education, and housing, unemployment, and underemployment, disease, and malnutrition, certain fundamental data is required.

How can we possibly develop legislation designed to address areas of unmet needs of my Chicano Spanish surnamed constituents if we don't first have the data? It's estimated that the Spanish surnamed population in Colorado increased from 9 percent to 12 percent between 1972 and 1974, but if the undercount represented in California is an indicator, the population of persons of Spanish origin in Colorado may be much more substantial than we realized.

My district, Denver, is the regional headquarters for the Federal bureaucracies, and is beneficiary of much Federal Government activity. Colorado's population increased 26 percent in the sixties and has the sixth-highest growth rate in the country. The impact of these figures on the political, social, and economic picture of the State is clear; yet their true significance for the citizen of Spanish extraction is yet to be assessed.

If citizens of Spanish origin are to advance and receive proper recognition, it is essential that we have accurate information. The Spanish surnamed citizens know the urgency of this problem. It is reflected in inadequate housing, education, employment, health, and transportation. It is incumbent upon Members of the Congress to assure through this legislation, H.J. Res. 406, that these citizens be fairly counted as a vital segment of this Nation. They have demonstrated a deep and abiding loyalty to this Nation and its ideals. Indicative of this is the Mexican Americans armed service members who have earned the highest number of Medals of Honor ever received by any one segment of our multicultural society.

The full enumeration of our American population is not simply an optional public service provided by government for the use of sales managers, sociologists, and regional planners. It's a constitutionally mandated process whereby political representation in the Congress is distributed. It isn't a matter of convenience, but of the highest seriousness.

In conclusion, H.J. Res. 406 is needed. If we don't enact this legislation with full support, the citizen of Spanish origin will continue to be undercounted and therefore unrepresented in policy and programs that daily influence their lives. By acting to end the neglect of these citizens who are often bilingual, and bicultural, we act for the benefit of the Nation. I call upon each of you to work toward recognizing that an accurate counting, reporting, and publishing of the data on the Spanish surnamed is a very vital part of our democratic process.

STATEMENT OF HON. JEROME R. WALDIE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I welcome this opportunity to express my complete support for H.J. Res. 406, a bill which would require the Federal Government to make special surveys of the social and economic conditions of the Spanish origin population in the United States.

As the controversy over the 1970 census confirms, there are no accurate figures on the demographic, economic and social conditions of the Spanish speaking Americans. Because of incomplete or faulty data on this group, the Spanish-speaking have failed to secure their proportional share of the benefits and assistance programs for which they may qualify, but are shouldering their share of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship in addition to facing ugly discriminatory problems.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights discovered that until the 1970 census, the Census Bureau had used no uniform measure which would enable a nationwide estimate of the total population of Spanish origin persons. In 1970 the Bureau made an attempt to measure the group, but poor methodology resulted in inaccurate data. As a result, shortly after the release of the Census data, interested groups, such as the Mexican-American Population Commission of California, offered evidence demonstrating the shortcomings of the collected information, and showing that the census had underestimated the total Spanish origin population by as much as ten percent.

The Commission emphasized the need for current and accurate statistics on Spanish origin persons by Federal agencies, state and local governments, private organizations and individuals to aid in the protection of voting rights, the administration of assistance programs and the assurance of equal employment opportunities. Voting age data is needed to determine whether the Spanish speaking have had their franchise infringed because of language problems. Instrumental in the allocations of Federal aid are the particular characteristics of a population as determined by the Census Bureau. An undercount could result in insufficient funds or no funds to finance programs for which the community qualifies or would have qualified had accurate information been available. Incomplete data also could misdirect the stimulation of employment opportunities by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

H.J. Res. 406 will go far to increase and improve the statistical knowledge of the Spanish origin community. With this information, we can ensure greater success for future efforts in their behalf which are dependent on accurate information.

STATEMENT OF HON. DON EDWARDS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I wish to thank you for providing me with an opportunity to address you regarding H.J. Res. 406. I would like to join my colleague from California Ed Roybal in commending the subcommittee for its efforts to assure the accurate collection of data on the Spanish speaking.

In one of the most comprehensive studies on this subject, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission has asserted categorically that "only limited data are available on Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and other persons of Spanish-speaking background, and that data available are confusing and lack credibility." The Commission's findings, published in April in "Counting the Forgotten: The 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish Speaking Background in the United States," demonstrate the need for a more accurate system of obtaining and disseminating data on this nation's second largest minority. I believe that H.J. Res. 406 goes a long way towards correcting the deficiencies of the current systems.

My own work as Chairman of the Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary has corroborated that the Federal government's data on Spanish speaking Americans is inadequate. Two years ago my subcommittee held hearings on the Federal employment problems of the Spanish speaking. We are in the process of additional hearings on this topic now. During our deliberations, there has been considerable discussion regarding the degree to which Spanish speaking persons are underrepresented in the ranks of Federal employees. Much of the controversy stems from disagreement regarding both the actual number of Spanish speaking persons living in the United States and the number participating in the country's labor force. Representatives of Spanish speaking organizations adamantly dispute the 1970 census figures on Spanish speaking persons, while some government agencies cite those same figures to show that the Spanish speaking are close to achieving ample participation in Federal employment.

The Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, in issuing a unanimous report on the Federal Employment Problems of the Spanish speaking, was unable to state precisely the number of Spanish speaking Americans in the United States. Instead, we could say only that estimates on the percentage of the population of Spanish descent varied from the Census Bureau's figure of 4.4 percent to the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People's claim of 7 percent. There is some irony in the fact that two agencies of the Federal government could present such widely divergent estimates of the national Spanish speaking population. Of course, these kinds of discrepancies in data present methodological problems for a congressional committee overseeing equal employment opportunity for a given group. But the problems for the group seeking that equal opportunity are far greater.

An inaccurate count in population can undermine the political leverage of a minority group. It can affect federal funding, the delivery of services, the creation of special programs. The Federal government, in representing the interests of its minority population as well as those of the majority of its citizens, must make every effort to insure that these inequities do not pass uncorrected.

The Bureau of the Census is charged with collecting accurate data on the United States' population. Nowhere in its mandate is the Bureau directed to collect less complete or up to date data on any one segment of the population than on another. The Census Bureau has, however, done just that. Its data on the black and Spanish speaking populations has for many years been inadequate. Recognizing this in part, the Bureau has acknowledged its undercount of black Americans and has made estimates of its statistical error. No similar attempt has been made by the Census Bureau on behalf of Spanish speaking Americans.

Since the executive branch has failed in this area, it is incumbent on the legislative branch to undertake corrective action. I therefore sincerely urge that this Committee act favorably and quickly in considering H. J. Res. 406.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear before you and the other distinguished members of this committee. I am here to speak in support of the proposal before you, House Joint Resolution 406, relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Spanish-speaking Americans.

In my district I am very proud to claim as constituents a large Spanish-speaking population, including a sizable contingent of refugees from the Communist tyranny in Cuba, many citizens from Puerto Rico, and residents and citizens from Latin countries in North and South America. This Spanish-speaking community greatly enriches our area, our culture, and our economy.

The problems of my Spanish-speaking constituents are similar to those of the Spanish-speaking everywhere in this nation. They are common to immigrant groups in general—problems of a strange language, of ethnic discrimination, and of ignorance of the various Federal, State, and local programs and benefits available to them.

When we welcomed the Spanish-speaking as immigrants to our shores, we accepted a responsibility to help them adjust to our society, to become assimilated, and to acquaint them with the obligations and also the privileges of American citizenship. To do this we need to know much more than we now do about the size and composition of our Spanish-speaking population and about their economic and social status. Such data as we now have too often are incomplete or out-of-date, and sometimes even misleading. Because of the gap in our statistical knowledge, and because of the indispensability of such knowledge, I wholeheartedly support the goals and approach of the resolution before this committee.

One step in the right direction, but only a first step, is a new statistical series being published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics of quarterly data on the employment and unemployment of persons of Spanish origin and color. The series began with the first quarter of 1974. It will be published regularly from now on by the BLS under a program sponsored by the U.S. Labor Department's Manpower Administration. Prior to this quarterly series, data on Americans of Spanish origin were collected only once a year, with very little detail available on a consistent and continuous basis.

One example of the sad state of statistics as they relate to the Spanish-speaking may be found in the recent 1970 Census of Population. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recently completed a study of the 1970 Census count of persons of Spanish-speaking background in the United States. The Commission's conclusions appear in its 112-page report entitled "Counting the Forgotten," dated April 1974. The Commission labels as inadequate the Census Bureau's efforts to count the Spanish-speaking. "We believe there is strong evidence that the Spanish-speaking background population was substantially undercounted in the 1970 census," the Commission states in its report. According to the Commission, some surveys have claimed the undercount to be as high as 39 percent.

Obviously an undercount of the Spanish-speaking population would mean a significant decrease in the amount of Federal assistance many communities would receive if accurate data were available. Civil Rights Commissioner Frankie M. Freeman says the effect of the undercount is that Spanish-speaking persons are being deprived of the benefits of Federal programs to aid specific minority or ethnic groups. She notes that the government used official 1970 Population Census figures in determining programs under the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Current and accurate demographic, social, and economic statistics on persons of Spanish-speaking background are needed by Federal agencies, State and local governments, private organizations, and individuals for a variety of purposes including the protection of voting rights, the administration of Federal and other public social programs, and the assurance of equal employment opportunity. Congressional support is urgently required if the need for these statistics is to be met. For this reason, I urge speedy passage of Resolution 406 through this committee and the House. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. J. PICKLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE
STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished colleagues, I am pleased to have this opportunity to offer my full support to the legislation before us today and to the efforts of this Subcommittee to secure an accurate account of our Spanish-speaking citizens.

H.J. Res. 406 is, in my view, a most needed piece of legislation. Reports that our Spanish-speaking citizens have been undercounted in the 1970 census began to come my way almost immediately after the tabulations were announced by the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau itself has already raised its 1970 tally by over 15%. Some surveys fear the miscount may be as large as 39%. The U.S.

Civil Rights Commission, after an extensive investigation, has concluded that the Census Bureau made inadequate efforts to court our Spanish-speaking citizens.

This is not just a technicality.

The census is used for countless calculations which affect the daily lives of these people. Revenue sharing funds are affected. Education and health funds are affected. Almost every federal, state, and local program affecting minority groups is geared to the census count.

If the fears are true that the miscount of our Spanish-speaking citizens may be as high as 39 percent, then we are faced with a travesty of duty. We must seek to correct this matter and to find the most accurate figures we can.

I think clearly a special effort is in order. This may include stepping up bilingual efforts in places where Spanish-speaking people live. This most certainly will include stepping up the door-to-door follow-up of mailings. Even if a person is cognizant of the census and of its importance, he can do little if the form is in a strange language. And if this count is not made, his chances for becoming fully successful in our nation are slim indeed.

Again, I support this effort and this bill. I hope the Subcommittee and the Committee will see fit to act on it speedily.

STATEMENT OF HON. HERMAN BADILLO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly gratified that the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics is holding these hearings regarding the collection and compilation of data relating to the social and economic conditions of Spanish-speaking Americans. There is little question that the Bureau of the Census did a grave disservice to the nation's Spanish-speaking community by presenting a wholly inaccurate picture in its 1971 findings and I appreciate this opportunity to submit a statement in support of the legislation pending before you.

For far too many years Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans and other Hispanics have been denied access to many of this country's institutions and have been callously barred from the mainstream of American life. Our community has not been afforded the opportunity to share the benefits this country has to offer on the same basis as other citizens and we have often been prevented from fully and equally participating in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the United States. This state of affairs has been exacerbated by the absence of accurate and current data on the status of the Spanish-speaking and, as a consequence, our unique and particular needs have generally been ignored and we often fail to receive the proportional share of assistance to which we are justly entitled because of serious informational gaps and the lack of meaningful statistics and data.

Beyond any question, if Spanish-speaking Americans and other minorities are to advance and receive proper recognition it is essential that we have accurate information. It is a tragic commentary that the material furnished by the Bureau of the Census is neither realistic nor accurate and that this agency has consistently undercounted Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Cubans and the remainder of the Spanish-speaking of this country. What is even worse is this agency's intransigence in taking affirmative steps on its own to correct these gross inequities and to move to compile and disseminate accurate statistics.

Over two and a half years ago my good friend and able colleague from California Ed Roybal, and I expressed our very grave concerns over the Bureau's March 1971 census report on the Spanish-speaking to then Director George Hay Brown. In a letter to Dr. Brown we noted not only the serious undercount which had been perpetrated by the Bureau but commented on a number of inconsistencies and a certain statistical illogic. Observing that the undercount could be as high as 50 percent we wrote that: "If correct, this would strengthen our efforts to gain equal opportunity for the Spanish speaking in the Federal government. It could open up 100,000 more Federal jobs nationwide and justify additional Federal funding totaling \$10 billion over the next decade."

Congressman Roybal and I called upon the Census Bureau to conduct a door to door census in a few sample and representative areas conducted by bilingual/bicultural persons to verify the validity of the 1971 survey and requested a public statement from the Bureau acknowledging the serious objections which had been raised from numerous sectors of the Spanish-speaking community over the 1971

findings. We also asked that the Bureau disclose the methods and approaches employed in developing and conducting its Spanish survey. As one might expect our request was met with bureaucratic indifference and silence. The Bureau was not about to admit that its highly touted methods had failed and that it was not presenting an accurate description of the Spanish-speaking.

Four months later, I again contacted Dr. Brown to express my very deep concern over the Bureau's preliminary figures on the number of Puerto Ricans in the City of New York. I present herewith, for inclusion in the hearing record, a copy of my letter to Dr. Brown in which I urged that the Bureau undertake a special count in a particular section of New York with a view toward securing a more detailed and accurate assessment of the Puerto Rican population of the City of New York. I was not surprised when Dr. Brown replied that it would not be feasible to make a special canvass as I had suggested, another example of the Bureau's unwillingness to seriously consider the very damaging repercussions which would ensue. Further, I was very distressed to learn that the Census Bureau only provided data on first and second generation Puerto Ricans in New York City and that it ignored those persons who were born here of parents who are Puerto Rican but were also mainland-born. Not only does this policy discriminate against a large segment of the Puerto Rican community but it also needlessly adds to the identity problem which many mainland-born Puerto Rican youth experience. I am unable to understand why the Bureau limited its identification of Puerto Ricans to only first and second generation persons. Certainly when a person applies for a job, housing, education, health services or seeks aid from some public agency he is classified as a Puerto Rican, regardless of how long his family has resided on the mainland. I simply cannot accept the premise that bureaucratic statistics can arbitrarily exclude a segment of the community from its ethnic and cultural background.

Another extremely important factor which the Census Bureau has consistently failed to take into account is the fact that Puerto Ricans residing in Puerto Rico are American citizens. These nearly 3 million men, women and children maintain a very close relationship with the mainland Puerto Rican community and there has historically been a continuous migration and return migration between the two locales. Thus, in order to provide a precise and up-to-date description of the Puerto Rican American the Census Bureau must include the residents of Puerto Rico in all of its enumeration and reporting projects. This, however, is something which the Bureau has adamantly refused to consider and I was incredulous when a Census Bureau official once informed me that the agency does not routinely include Puerto Rico in its reports. As a consequence you have a situation in which there are over 4 million Puerto Rican citizens yet only a little more than 25 percent are included in the Census Bureau's statistical data. This situation not only further complicates problems experienced by the Puerto Rican community but effectively prevents our people from receiving full and proper consideration for numerous Federal, state and local programs.

The inadequacies of the Census Bureau's report on the Spanish-speaking population and the agency's basic insensitivity and indifference to the status of the Spanish-speaking community have been accurately and perceptively reported in a recent study conducted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. This report—"Counting the Forgotten"—supports the claims which Congressman Roybal, myself and others have made about the Bureau's failure to accurately study and report on the Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban and other Hispanic peoples in the United States and upholds much of the data which was assembled by groups such as the National Puerto Rican Forum and the Mexican-American Population Commission of California proving that the Census Bureau's 1970 enumeration and related data grossly undercounted Spanish-speaking Americans.

This nation's Spanish-speaking have been placed at a serious disadvantage because of the lack of meaningful statistics to determine our actual status—such as data on the labor force, total employment and unemployment, hours and earnings—and to ascertain our specific needs in certain areas. Such economic and social information as called for in H. J. Res. 406 is vital if the Federal Government—as well as other governmental units—are to properly identify and resolve the difficulties experienced by the Spanish-speaking community. If a real commitment to aid the country's Hispanics in achieving assistance and guidance on the same basis as other citizens is to be made and pursued, we must know where we stand and must have the basic facts on which to build viable, workable programs. Our governmental establishments must have pertinent and faultless information in order to effectively identify the urgent and special needs of the estimated 15 million Spanish-speaking citizens. Certain fundamental data is

required if we are to come to grips in a meaningful fashion with the problems of poverty, deprivation, poor education and housing, unemployment and underemployment, disease and malnutrition which are plaguing the Spanish-speaking.

I commend this Subcommittee for holding these timely and important hearings and urge that you move without delay in reporting out this vital legislation.

Thank you.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. April 20, 1972.

HON. GEORGE HAY BROWN,
Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: With further reference to our previous exchanges of correspondence I am writing with regard to the article which appeared in this morning's NEW YORK TIMES concerning the Census Bureau's preliminary figures on the number of Puerto Ricans in the City of New York.

As the article accurately indicated, there is a great deal of controversy surrounding the figures which the Bureau has apparently released and charges have been made that Puerto Ricans have been severely undercounted. Obviously the figure of 811,134 persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage is at significant variance with the New York State Labor Department's estimate of 1,051,200. There are also important discrepancies between your figures and those compiled by the City of New York and a number of private agencies.

In view of the great importance attached to census figures—particularly in insuring that the Puerto Rican community receives its full and fair share of governmental assistance at all levels—and the fact that the final Census Bureau statistics will serve as the benchmark for some ten years, efforts must be taken to promptly and effectively resolve the aforementioned inconsistencies. I strongly urge, therefore, that the Census Bureau immediately undertake a special count in that portion of the Borough of the Bronx south of the Cross Bronx Expressway, as this is the section of New York City generally considered to have the largest single concentration of Puerto Ricans.

One definitive set of data must be established and any possible discrepancies removed. I would be pleased to discuss this matter with you at your convenience. Meanwhile, I hope that you and your staff will give full and immediate consideration to conducting the special count I have proposed.

Sincerely,

HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, H.J. Res. 406, under consideration by this Subcommittee is extremely important legislation for Spanish-speaking citizens in our country. This bill calls upon the Department of Labor in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, as well as the Department of Agriculture to immediately begin to undertake the collection and compilation of data which provides indicators of the social and economic conditions of Spanish-speaking citizens in urban and rural America.

In order for the 15 million Spanish-speaking citizens in our country to be able to share whatever benefits may be available on an equal basis with other citizens we must have complete and accurate data on the status of this group. Information that is precise and correct is needed if the Federal government is to take meaningful action to eradicate the problems of minority groups such as poor education, inadequate housing, disease, and unemployment.

I have always been concerned with regard to the accuracy of the material furnished by the Bureau of the Census on Spanish-speaking Americans, and the recent report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Counting the Forgotten" substantiates my earlier suspicions.

This report points out that in the 1970 census the Bureau of the Census did not use a uniform measure to identify all persons of Spanish-speaking background in this country, but rather based its information on a variety of indices administered on a sample basis. It also indicated that the Bureau did not provide adequate materials to Spanish-speaking households to enable them to respond

accurately to the census questionnaires. It further points out that the lack of bilingual census takers also contributed to the lack of accurate data on Spanish-speaking Americans.

Because of the Census Bureau's procedures, which appear to be insensitive to the Spanish-speaking population, the report concluded that the Spanish-speaking were probably undercounted by appreciably more than 7.7 percent.

I believe that the report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights proves the need for more accurate accounting of the second largest minority group in our nation, and I hope the Subcommittee agrees that H.J. Res. 406 is needed to insure that the Spanish-speaking community receives the proportional share of assistance from the Federal government to which it is entitled.

STATEMENT OF HON. LINDY BOGGS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Lindy Boggs, a member of Congress representing the Second District of the State of Louisiana, and I am appearing in support of H.J. Res. 406. To enumerate some of the economic problems facing the Spanish-speaking in my district, I have asked Martha Grundy, the Louisiana State Director for the League of United Latin American Citizens to submit the following testimony:

"New Orleans, the second largest port city in the United States, has always had a Latin Community. The City was under Spanish rule from 1762-1802 and vestiges of the Spanish influences are reflected in the architecture, the customs, and the legal structure of the city.

"The Spanish explorer, De Soto, brought the first group of Spanish to New Orleans, but until the early 18th century, there were no permanent Spanish-speaking settlements. In 1762, in the Treaty of Fontainebleau, France ceded New Orleans to Spain.

"The first Spanish governor to set foot in the Spanish colony of New Orleans was Antonio de Oyoa, in 1766. The first rebellion of an American colony against European authority occurred in New Orleans in 1768—the outcome was that Oyoa was sent back to Spain.

"At the same time that English colonies were declaring independence from England, Bernardo de Galvez seized Pensacola and assisted the Americans greatly in the American Revolution.

"Baron Francisco de Carondelet governed from 1792 to 1797 and can be remembered mainly for his efforts toward urbanization of New Orleans. For safety measures, Carondelet required that every roof be tiled and he implemented street lights at night and night watchmen (serenos).

"Other vestiges of Spanish influence on New Orleans can be seen in the architecture such as the Cabildo, the original Spanish legislative building, now used as a State Museum. In fact, there is only one building in the French Quarter constructed before 1800 that is of French architecture—the rest are Spanish. The Louisiana Civil Code of Law was also influenced by the Spanish Civil Code.

"In 1802, New Orleans was ceded back to France, and in 1803, New Orleans was purchased by the United States in the Louisiana Purchase.

"Although New Orleans has always had a Latin Community, it has increased substantially in recent years. In the 1950's, a vast number of Hondurans and other Central Americans immigrated into the city, seeking a higher income, a better job, and a better life for their families. New Orleans now has the third largest Honduran population in the world, and Hondurans are the largest single Latin American group in the city. During the 1960's, New Orleans became the home for a substantial number of Cuban exiles. Because of the Latin flavor of the city, Cubans quickly assimilated into the culture and economy of the city. Today, according to U.S. Immigration figures, they are the second largest Latin American group in the city.

"One of the main problems facing the Latin Community in New Orleans, influencing both the social and economic status of the Spanish is the inadequacy of the U.S. Census to enumerate effectively persons of Spanish-speaking background. Although the U.S. Census figures state that there are 44,430 persons of Spanish language in New Orleans, it is estimated that as many as 120,000 Latins live here. This discrepancy is due to the fact that: (1) the Census was taken through the mail and many Latin Americans, especially those who have just come from a country overrun by Communism, have a strong suspicion of government

and did not reply; and (2) the questionnaire form was written in English, and as many as 65% of the Spanish-speaking speak little or no English. The short form received by the majority of the population in the census count contained no questions on language, cultural background or immigration status although it did ask about nationality of parents. The long form did not contain any additional information relevant to the Spanish-speaking. A third reason for the Census undercount is that many of the Latin American immigrants were highly mobile, moving from one area of the city to the other. Also, a significant number of Cubans immigrated to New Orleans during the early 1970's, after the Census was taken.

"The Annual report of the Immigration Service helps little because it contains no figures on Latin Americans listed as immigrants into particular states. Additionally, the New Orleans Office of the Immigration Service keeps no permanent immigration records but forwards them to Washington.

"Because potential sources such as the Census Bureau and the Immigration Service could not provide hard data on the Latin American population, other sources had to be sought. According to a 1970 estimate by the Consulates of the Latin American countries in New Orleans, there were 65,410 Latin Americans living in New Orleans. According to an advertising study conducted by WJMR Radio Station, a predominantly Spanish-speaking station, it was estimated that there are as many as 95,000 Latins in the city. Furthermore, an ad in the September 4, 1970 edition of a local Spanish-speaking newspaper, "La Prensa," stated that, according to Spanish Population Data, there are 109,400 Latins in Metropolitan New Orleans. A large percentage, 89.2% of all Latins living in the Metro area live in Orleans Parish. The average of the figures provided by the Consulates, WJMR Radio Station, and La Prensa, place the Latin American population for Metropolitan New Orleans at 89,931.

"Because New Orleans was at one time under Spanish rule, the Latin Community has never been the object of blatant discrimination as found in other parts of the country. One of the problems that does face at least 75% of the Spanish population is the inability to speak English. The response to this problem by governmental agencies at every level, local, state, and federal has been almost non-existent. Because many Latins are over thirty years of age, it is more difficult for them to learn English than it is for their children. There are quite a few English language programs in the city, but few Spanish-speaking can afford the time and/or the money to attend.

"Two bilingual education programs exist in New Orleans at the elementary level, and two English as a Second Language Programs exist at the secondary education level. Figures released by the New Orleans Department of Education state that approximately 1,600 Spanish-speaking children attend public schools, while the Archdiocese of New Orleans estimates that 2,200 Spanish-speaking children are enrolled in Parochial schools. Either the Spanish-speaking children are not being properly counted or they are not attending school.

"Because many governmental agencies lack bilingual personnel, Latin Americans who are unable to speak English confront problems in the Courts, with the U.S. Immigration Service, with the New Orleans Police Department, with Charity Hospital, with the Fire Department, the Telephone Co., the Employment Service—the list is endless. It is the responsibility of city government, social agencies, educational institutions, and all other agencies dealing with the public to recognize the need and obligation to have bilingual personnel as part of their normal operations.

"Because of the undercount of Spanish-speaking persons in the 1970 Census, the Latin American community has been excluded from many federal grants, aid, and programs. Unemployment and underemployment are another major problem affecting the Spanish-speaking. According to the 1970 U.S. Census, unemployment for Spanish-speaking males 16 and over is 5.7%, compared to an average rate of 4.5%. The average income level for Spanish-speaking families is between \$3,000 and \$7,000 a year. A total of 10.1% of the Spanish-speaking have incomes under \$1,000 a year, with a mere 3.3% having incomes of \$25,000 and over. The fact that the Spanish-speaking person is desperate to become employed is apparent in the low number receiving public assistance or welfare—a total of 288 families receive any kind of public assistance. The underemployment rate for Spanish-speaking is estimated to be 23%.

"In contrast to the immigrants of the early 1900's, recent immigrants to the United States, including those to New Orleans, have for the most part, been highly skilled or professional workers. Again, the inability to speak English has hindered them in securing employment in their skills or professions.

"The response of state and city government to the problem of unemployment and underemployment could be accelerated if proper information were provided. Currently there is not one Spanish-speaking person employed by the Louisiana Department of Employment Security to assist persons of limited English-speaking ability. The New Orleans Skills Center, under the La. State Department of Education, has an English as a Second Language Program, which enrolls a total of sixty persons a year—barely scratching the total unemployed and/or underemployed Latin Americans. There are no manpower training and placement programs designed to meet the needs of the Spanish-speaking in New Orleans.

"The Latin Community in New Orleans, as opposed to other ethnic groups in the city, has not organized itself along political lines. It is estimated that at least 60% of the Latin Americans are not U.S. Citizens, and many of the citizens are not registered voters. The Spanish-speaking community has no representation in city government at any level. If the Latin American community could become politically united, they could become a strong and effective force in the government of the city.

"In conclusion, the Spanish-speaking in America have made significant contributions to enrich American Culture and have served their nation well in times of war and peace. They deserve the basic rights and opportunities granted to every American. I fully support H.J. Res. 406."

I commend Miss Grundy's excellent testimony to the Committee for favorable consideration.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. WILLIAM R. ROY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

I am pleased to have the opportunity to give my complete support for H. Res. 406 which is presently before the House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics. This bill will provide the means of identifying the Spanish-origin American population and the particular social and economic conditions characteristic to this population.

As a doctor, I am very concerned about the poor health status attributed to the Spanish-origin American population. This is, in part, due to the lack of planning and development of programs which are adapted to this sector of our population. This lack of planning has, to some extent, stemmed from a shortage of information. There is not a consistent statistical compilation of data. Of the three Federal agencies which collect and analyze health information on various ethnic groups, the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), the Bureau of the Census, and the Center for Disease Control (CDC), each classifies Americans of Spanish origin differently for the purpose of statistical analysis. This results in poor planning and insufficient documentation on which to apply for program funding.

It is for these reasons, I urge the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics to report favorably on H.J. Res 406.

AMIGAS DE LA RAZA,
Sparks, Nev., May 30, 1974.

Hon. DAVID TOWELL,
Federal Building, Reno, Nev.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TOWELL: We are very happy to hear that hearings will be held by the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics on May 28 on H.J. Res. 406, which calls upon the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, as well as the Department of Agriculture, to immediately begin to undertake the collection and compilation of data which provides indicators of the social and economic conditions of Spanish-speaking citizens in urban and rural America.

For years individual members of this organization have experienced the lack of professional agencies which are geared to help the Spanish-speaking people. For example, many Spanish-speaking people are receiving Social Security forms, Welfare forms, Income Tax forms, to name a few, but do not understand what the questions are all about, in short, do not understand the English language. And because the English language presents a barrier to many, it is difficult for them to engage in any type of conversation with professional people who have no knowledge of the Spanish language or culture.

Another serious area that we are concerned about, is the realm of education. It is no secret that many of our young people are held back in grades or simply ignored in the class room because of their ineptness to speak English grammatically correctly.

We wholeheartedly support these hearings if the end result means that some of these incongruities will be dealt with. If at any time in the future this organization can be of any assistance to you or your staff, please advise us of such.

Most sincerely,

MARY ANN MARQUEZ MCNEILL,
President, Amigas de la Raza.

CONCILIO HISPANIC AMERICAN OF NEVADA,
Reno, Nev., May 16, 1974.

Congressman DAVID TOWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAVID: Per your letter received May 16, 1974, I am hereby sending you the following information to be presented before the committees of Census and Statistics on May 28, 1974.

David, what I am relating to you comes strictly from my involvement in the Spanish Speaking Communities in Northern Nevada.

SPANISH SPEAKING EMPLOYMENT

There is a great need for greater emphasis put on recruitment of Spanish Speaking in Northern Nevada for Federal, State, County, and City governments. I have taken the privilege of forwarding to you surveys that I personally have taken and that show Spanish Speaking are not being represented in Federal, State, County and City governments.

Employment availabilities are not being announced extensively as they should be. Employment opportunities are not reaching the Spanish Speaking Communities per se. Spanish Speaking are not aware of "career training programs" that would benefit the Spanish Speaking in acquiring employment with the above agencies.

Spanish Speaking are lacking the avenues of resource information, whereas the Spanish Speaking know where to go to get assistance in employment.

Another item I have found in my involvement in the Spanish Speaking Communities is when Spanish Speaking go to acquire employment is their fear of taking tests. They have been instilled with the "why bother going to take the test, I am going to flunk it anyway." They have become conditioned to "their parents made it without good paying jobs" and they can make it also.

I have found that their fear is so instilled that I have personally hand-carried applications and applicants for job interviews, you have to motivate them, because they have that instilled fear, "what will they ask me, and what do I answer."

Yes, they want to acquire meanful employment, but they are scared and three-fourths of the time they just don't know the first thing about the process involved in getting suitable employment.

EDUCATION

What Spanish Speaking students are encountering is unique. Such as there is a total lack of communication between the School System and the home. Educators say there are not any problems with their Spanish Speaking students. But the problem is there, and it is a grave problem and it should be carefully investigated and rectified. The problem being that in many cases the Spanish Speaking students parents only means of communication are their native tongue Spanish. The student is not able to express enough to his parents that he is encountering difficulties at School with the concept of the English Language. The parents cannot express themselves in English to the School District because his only means of communication are Spanish. I have personally seen the frustrations that a Spanish Speaking student encounters when he is trying to express to his instructors something he cannot understand, and the instructors not being able to speak Spanish cannot really communicate with the student and the problem goes unsolved.

Educators are under the impression that because a Spanish Speaking student can speak some English that he is comprehending what he is being taught and that is not so. I personally tutored Spanish Speaking students at a local high

school, these same students were failing and some barely passing. With extensive tutoring these same students brought their grades up and one young man made the honor roll and was voted highest academic student for the sophomore classes at this particular school. Yet this same young man has dropped considerably this year, because there is not anyone there who is willing to take the time to tutor him and most of all motivate him in the right direction.

It is essential that bi-lingual community aides are recruited to act as liaisons between the communities and the school district itself. Because until this is done, there will be a total lack of communication between the Spanish Speaking Communities and the School System. Spanish Speaking students are being hindered and the problems should be alleviated before they become reality.

Another item of interest is that Spanish Speaking students are not being taught to be competitors at an early age, whereas most anglos are taught that in order to succeed you must compete with your peers at an early age. This is the Spanish Speaking environment is not a world of competing. Emphasis is not being put on Education and it is a matter of "you don't need an education to get a job, I made it without Education and you can make it also."

I had a man come once to my place of employment because he had received a traffic citation and he did not even know what he had signed his name to. But he was afraid of going to jail and wanted me to write a letter to the judge explaining that he knew very little English and all he wanted to do was pay the fine and not go to jail.

A city policeman told me that a couple had had an accident because the man could not read English and took the wrong turn. The patrolman at the scene of the accident had a heck of a time explaining to him why he had had the accident in the first place.

Also in courts of justice, there should be a bi-lingual person available to act as interpreter between the parties involved.

Hospitals should have interpreters available, because in emergencies it could mean a matter of life and death for the non-speaking English person.

Driver's license Division should also have bi-lingual persons employed there because there is desperate need for this sort of person when he is dealing with issuing driver's license for Spanish Speaking persons. I can not see and comprehend what good and value it is to have a test in Spanish, if none of the Driver license instructors cannot speak Spanish, let alone read or write Spanish either.

David, I do hope this information is of some value. Since I am always concerned that the Spanish Speaking are not being equally represented in many areas.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEMARY GALLEGOS TUCKER,
Coordinator.

EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 29, 1974.

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate the opportunity provided for me by your letter of May 9, 1974, to share with your subcommittee a few thoughts which I consider important. The fact exists that past censuses were not able to reach large numbers of Mexican-Americans living throughout the United States. This is of obvious importance since the census is used to determine target groups for many educational, economic, and social programs, both federally and non-federally funded.

One recommendation I would make is that the census taker assigned to a given barrio community be a bilingual, Spanish-speaking, trusted member from that area. Perhaps community distrust—where it exists as a result of previous immigration department and alien interaction—could be alleviated by reviewing the selection process maximizing the hiring of persons sensitive to the problem. Elementary school advisory boards should be able to recommend persons who could adequately meet this need.

Along this line of thought, it might be advisable to establish a public relations campaign reassuring the populace that information collected during census polling would not be used as a basis of testimony against the person(s) polled. This effort might encompass the use of local and national television in addition to written materials available in both English and Spanish conveying such a message.

Certain questions which have undoubtedly been raised by your members are repeated for emphasis here. What is the parentage of the mother and father?

Where were they born? Was another language other than English used in the home? Do they speak Spanish?

While I personally will be unable to attend your hearings, I do commend you and your committee on addressing itself to an important need. It will require an informed leadership and a dedicated effort to begin to alleviate the social and economic conditions of Spanish-speaking citizens in urban and rural America.

Sincerely,

ARMANDO M. RODRIGUEZ,
President.

[The findings and recommendations from the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February 1973, and the paper entitled "A National Council of La Raza Report on Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans," June 1974, were received for inclusion in the record:]

"TO KNOW OR NOT TO KNOW," REPORT OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, FEBRUARY 1973—FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

1. Federal Agencies are responsible for insuring that there is no discrimination in their programs and that the assistance they provide reaches the intended beneficiaries. In most cases, however, Federal Agencies have not assigned specific responsibility for determining whether or not the distribution of program benefits is equitable.

2. Federal officials frequently base their confidence in the equitable operation of their programs upon inadequate evidence, such as absence of complaints, existence of impersonal mechanisms for decisionmaking, and personal knowledge of program operations. They have not generally been instructed that racial and ethnic data must be used to measure equitability in the distribution of program benefits.

3. Federal officials are often resistant to the collection and use of racial and ethnic data because they consider their collection illegal, subject to misuse, or an invasion of privacy, and insufficient information has been provided to contradict those beliefs.

4. The collection of racial and ethnic data to promote equitable distribution of Federal assistance is consistent with the Constitution and with Federal law and where it is necessary to eliminate discrimination it may be mandated. It has been endorsed by private organizations and Federal Agencies and most of the larger minority group organizations.

5. In general, the possibilities of invasion of privacy and of misuse of racial and ethnic data are less than the damage created by lack of information to document the extent of discrimination and are overcome by legitimate Government interest.

6. Racial and ethnic data serve important functions in several stages of the process of the distribution of Federal assistance.

a. Although the needs of particular racial and ethnic groups may vary, Agencies have generally not measured these differences nor taken them into account in program planning.

b. Agencies have not generally measured the extent to which their programs reach various racial and ethnic groups, and consequently have made only limited efforts to correct any deficiencies in the allocation of resources.

c. Although program impact may vary according to racial and ethnic group, Agencies have not generally measured these differences in evaluating program performance.

d. Where Federal assistance is distributed indirectly to beneficiaries through recipients, i.e., intermediaries, racial and ethnic data are necessary to measure the extent to which their operations are nondiscriminatory. Agencies have generally not collected racial and ethnic data for the purposes of reviewing the activities of recipients of Federal assistance.

e. Agency officials have not generally collected racial and ethnic data for the establishment of goals and timetables to achieve equitable distribution of program benefits and to measure progress toward these goals.

7. Few Agencies have required the collection and use of racial and ethnic data. Where such requirements have been made, sufficient data are generally not collected for analysis of the extent of nondiscrimination in Federal programs.

a. Almost no data are available on the race or ethnic origin of persons eligible to benefit from particular Federal programs.

b. A limited amount of data on the race and ethnic origin of applicants is available, although data often are not tabulated for rejected applicants.

c. A limited amount of data on the race and ethnic origin of beneficiaries of Federal programs is maintained. However, data on users of federally funded facilities, which are open to the general public, are almost nonexistent.

d. Data by race and ethnic origin on the amount of benefits received, on the characteristics of beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries, and on program impact are rarely collected.

8. Despite the existence of some requirements for the collection and use of racial and ethnic data, Agencies have generally not collected nor analyzed data for such important program areas as:

a. Negative program effects, such as cost or inconvenience to individuals as a result of program operations, which are often disproportionately borne by the minority community;

b. Secondary benefits, which occur as an indirect result of the primary program goals, but which are sometimes of sizable value and often less likely to reach minority beneficiaries than they are to reach majority beneficiaries;

c. Activities in which minorities have traditionally not participated, often because eligibility requirements or qualifications have effectively excluded them.

9. Where racial and ethnic data are collected, they are often collected for an insufficient number of racial and ethnic groups as, for example, black, white, and other.

a. American Indians, Asian Americans, blacks, persons of Spanish descent, and others, have been identified as groups with distinct needs and problems.

b. Even among these categories, problems and needs vary significantly. The two largest groups included within the category of Spanish descent are Mexican American and Puerto Rican; among Asian American groups, Chinese and Japanese.

c. Other groups which are statistically important in particular geographic areas include Cubans, Filipinos, Koreans, individual American Indian tribes, French Canadians, Portuguese, and Italians.

10. There has been a great deal of controversy over the preferable method of collecting racial and ethnic data. Even among Agencies with policies requiring their collection, there is no consensus as to whether this is better accomplished by observation or self-identification.

a. Self-identification is generally more accurate than observer-identification. In cases where designation of several specific minority groups is necessary, self-identification is imperative for accuracy.

b. Some Agencies have favored observer identification because of the belief that requests for self-identification constitute an illegal invasion of privacy. Whatever invasion of privacy occurs, however, is not dependent on the method of observation and, further, is overcome by legitimate Government interests.

c. Use of self-identification permits an individual to utilize the criteria of self-perception or perception in the immediate community.

11. In some instances racial and ethnic data can be obtained by the Agency from existing records, data collected by other Federal Agencies, or general purpose data collection agencies.

a. An adequate system of Federal data collection on participation in Federal programs by racial and ethnic groups is dependent upon comprehensive collection and compilation of minority group data by general purpose data collection agencies. It is essential that vital, economic, health, social, and population statistics be available concerning individual minority groups within this country.

b. Coordination among Federal Agencies has been poor and there has been little sharing of racial and ethnic data. Comparability between program data and that from such Agencies as the Bureau of the Census data is often low.

c. General purpose data, i.e., statistics gathered to increase information about a particular subject rather than for program administration, are sometimes not collected or compiled by race and ethnic origin; where they are so collected, the categories for collection are generally restricted to black, white, and other.

12. Agency officials need guidance with regard to the optimal frequency of data collection and the required amount of detail necessary to obtain comprehensive data, but few such guidelines have been provided.

a. The optimal frequency of data collection is chiefly dependent upon the expected rates of change in program statistics and the timetables which have been set to reach program goals.

b. The detail required depends upon the analysis to be conducted. Where Federal assistance is distributed through intermediaries, data upon which to evaluate the extent of nondiscrimination for each intermediary must be available.

13. A principal responsibility of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is to evaluate the effectiveness of Federal programs and make an assessment of the extent to which they reach their intended beneficiaries.

a. Federal program evaluation is one of the major aspects of the budget examination process and is accomplished principally through the review of budget submissions, the conduct of budget hearings, and the preparation of Special Analyses of the Budget.

b. A performance management system has been developed for the indepth evaluation of particular program areas.

c. OMB has recently placed emphasis on civil rights, but it has not yet instituted systematic evaluation of the extent to which Federal programs are reaching minority beneficiaries nor has it required such evaluations by Federal Agencies.

14. OMB is also charged with setting statistical standards for Federal data collection.

a. Throughout the Government, a variety of racial and ethnic categories are in use, collection methods are haphazard, and few guidelines exist for safeguarding data.

b. OMB is currently considering standardization of racial and ethnic categories, but has given little consideration to other technical areas.

15. OMB is responsible for coordination of Federal statistical activity.

a. There is substantial overlap between the data needs of some Agencies and the collection and/or production capacity of other Agencies.

b. While OMB has sponsored some coordinating activities between the Bureau of the Census and Agencies with programs of Federal domestic assistance, these activities have had only limited success. No other main efforts have been made at interagency coordination of data collection.

RECOMMENDATIONS

General

1. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should exercise strong leadership in the development and enforcement of a policy for the collection and use of racial and ethnic data.

a. OMB should require the collection and analysis of racial and ethnic data in all main programs of Federal assistance for the purpose of determining if such assistance reaches beneficiaries of various racial and ethnic groups on an equitable basis.

b. OMB should establish governmentwide standards for the collection and use of racial and ethnic data, which would provide a framework for Agency guidelines and insure consistency in Federal policy.

c. OMB should approve and annually review the guidelines adopted by each Federal Agency.

2. Where they have not already done so, each Federal Agency should issue a policy statement supporting the collection and use of racial and ethnic data as necessary to combat discrimination against minority groups in the distribution of Federal assistance.

a. Under the direction of OMB, Federal Agencies should issue guidelines explaining in detail how racial and ethnic data collection and use are to be accomplished.

b. Federal Agencies should provide technical assistance to program managers in the design of racial and ethnic data collection systems, in the analysis of the data collected, and in setting goals and timetables for remedying any deficiencies.

c. Federal Agencies should publish data on participation by racial and ethnic groups, showing the results of data analyses for each of their programs. Unpublished aggregate data should also be made available for use by other Federal Agencies, private organizations, and institutions.

THE DATA SYSTEM

1. An adequate racial and ethnic data collection system should require that program managers be responsible for knowing the number of potential beneficiaries, the number of applicants, and beneficiaries of their programs by race and ethnic

origin. Data collection should be required for all negative program effects and all substantial secondary benefits.

a. Where Federal assistance is administered through a recipient, sufficient detail must be available to permit an evaluation of the operations of each recipient. Where there are a number of subrecipients, data should be available separately for each of them.

b. Where possible, estimates of the race and ethnic origin of potential beneficiaries should be obtained from data collected by the Bureau of the Census or other general purpose data agencies. Where no sources exist for data on the target population, sample surveys should be conducted to estimate program eligibility by race and ethnic origin.

c. Data on applicants and beneficiaries should be obtained on application forms used in the distribution of Federal assistance or in the recipients' activities. Data should be maintained on both successful and unsuccessful applicants. Where no applicant or participant records are maintained, surveys should be required on a regular basis.

2. As a minimum, the categories of American Indian, Asian American, Black, Spanish Descent, and Other should be required for use in programs of assistance and in general purpose data collection.

a. Separate data should also be obtained for Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, and Japanese, unless a valid reason for failing to do so can be demonstrated.

b. Additionally, programs should be required to make provision for the collection of data on Cubans, Filipinos, Koreans, individual American Indian tribes, Portuguese, French Canadians, and other major concentrations of disadvantaged racial and ethnic groups, when data collection takes place in the local communities in which significant numbers of these groups reside.

3. Where data are obtained on application forms or other records, the collection should be continuous, and tabulations should be made on an annual basis as a minimum. Where data are obtained by survey, they should be collected annually.

4. Standards for racial and ethnic data collection should be established to insure that these data are of a uniformly high quality.

a. Where possible, racial and ethnic identities should be made by the applicant or beneficiary. The data collected should be validated on a sample basis through visual observation, to insure that accuracy is maintained. Identification by an observer should be permitted only to supplement, and not fulfill, Agency requirements for racial and ethnic data collection.

b. Persons should be permitted to identify themselves as they perceive their race or ethnic origin or as it is perceived by those in their immediate community.

c. General purpose data collection Agencies, especially the Bureau of the Census, should insure that adequate minority group statistics are collected, tabulated, and published. These Agencies should work closely with OMB and Agencies administering Federal programs to insure comparability and high quality in all minority group statistics.

5. All data collection should be accompanied by appropriate safeguards against the misuse of the data collected.

a. Racial and ethnic data on individuals should not be made available on forms used for decisionmaking.

b. The disclosure of individual identities should be prohibited in any sharing of racial and ethnic data.

6. Supplementary data should be available for concomitant analysis with racial and ethnic data.

a. Data on personal characteristics relating to the need for Federal assistance and to eligibility for Federal assistance should be collected for potential beneficiaries, applicants, and beneficiaries.

b. Data on benefits received and program impact should also be available by race and ethnic origin.

7. The system should specify particular functions of racial and ethnic data.

a. Recipients, i.e., intermediaries, should be required to evaluate their operations through the collection and review of racial and ethnic data.

b. Potential recipients for Federal assistance should be required to submit data reflecting the race and ethnic origin of the population to receive Federal assistance and to provide data against which the target population can be compared, such as data on the race and ethnic origin of persons in the geographic area served by the recipient.

c. Racial and ethnic data should be used for scheduling compliance reviews on particular recipient's activities and in the conduct of those reviews.

d. Racial and ethnic data should be used to set numerical goals and timetables to remedy any defects in the distribution of Federal assistance to minority beneficiaries.

e. Racial and ethnic data should be used in program planning, program evaluation, and allocation of resources.

8. For each recipient of Federal assistance, and for each Federal program the system should measure, where appropriate, the extent to which:

a. Federal assistance reaches the intended beneficiaries of each racial and ethnic group;

b. The intended beneficiaries of each race and ethnic group apply for assistance;

c. Applications for assistance made by each racial and ethnic group are accepted;

d. The amount of benefit reaching beneficiaries of each racial and ethnic group is commensurate with each group's needs;

e. Full integration of activities and facilities takes place;

f. The goals of Federal programs are achieved for each racial and ethnic group.

9. Data collection or use deviating from the guidelines prescribed for the racial and ethnic data system must be authorized in writing by the Secretary or Chief Administrator of an Agency unless conducted as a supplement to that system.

The Office of Management and Budget

1. OMB should make use of the budget examination process to insure that Federal Agencies are informing themselves of the extent to which their programs reach minority beneficiaries on an equitable basis.

2. It should require that data on the number and race and ethnic origin of potential beneficiaries, applicants, and beneficiaries, as well as data on the amount of benefit distributed by race and ethnic origin be contained in Agency budget submissions.

3. Budget examiners should be directed to review any indications of deficient service to minority beneficiaries, referring to data stored within the Agency concerned and instructed to insure that remedial steps are taken.

4. OMB should study the possibilities of establishing a central data storage and retrieval mechanism to eliminate duplicate efforts in racial and ethnic data collection. For example, the idea of assigning a number to each person which would subsequently be used by Federal Agency officials to retrieve racial and ethnic information would obviate this problem and is worthy of study.

5. OMB should strengthen existing mechanisms for coordination between the data needs of particular Federal programs and data collection by the Bureau of the Census. It should also establish mechanisms to facilitate sharing racial and ethnic data among Federal programs.

6. OMB should publish in the *Special Analysis of the Budget* summaries of racial and ethnic data included in Agency budget submissions so that information about the extent of Federal assistance to minority beneficiaries will receive widespread circulation.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA REPORT ON IMPACT OF LIMITED FEDERAL STATISTICAL DATA/INFORMATION POLICIES ON HISPANIC AMERICANS, JUNE 1974

PREFACE

"Classically and traditionally one should start with definitions," commented The Honorable HEW Secretary, in his speech, *Creativity and Collaboration in Government—The Budget Process* (Franklin Nelson Doubleday lectures, May 23, 1974). However, as our study shall illustrate, it is the National Council of La Raza's contention that this very concern for definitions, so carefully structured and articulated by our political institutions and their official spokesmen, serve to obscure instead of clarifying issues.

For too long, the Hispanic American has been buried in the anonymity of statistics and semantics which neither apply to them nor characterize them. In the 50's they were categorized as Spanish surnamed or Spanish speaking; in the 60's new terms entered into vogue as the younger activists popularized "the brown people" or "La Raza," in an attempt to give higher visibility to the problems of this population. As we enter the decade of the 70's, we bring with us the continuing quest for those identifiers that will establish—for others—who we are. For the Hispanic Americans, irrelevant criteria have been set up which are applicable to only a small segment of their population, if at all, and which is based on foreign rather than their own political and economic realities.

The problem of the Hispanic American issue is not with the terminology—as long as the terms reflect and facilitate the rational, rather than romanticized or non-classical tradition and application. A useful case in point is described by historian Harry Kantor in the Ideology and Program of the Peruvian Aprista Movement (Washington, D.C., 1966):

“Because of their emphasis upon looking realistically at Latin America, the Apristas spent much energy discussing what name should be given to the area south of the Rio Grande. They look upon this area as a homogeneous entity and they give the name Indoamerica. This name, they say, is truly descriptive of the area, for it takes account of the two parts contained therein: the indigenous, the aboriginal, all that was present before 1492, and the European contribution.”

Kantor notes the many and strong objections by the Apristas to the terminology generally used by those north of the Rio Grande to define the Indoamerican. “They (the Apristas) are for the use of Indoamerica.”

“The point they emphasize is that the use of this name leads to a clearer understanding of the area. Indoamerica suggests the two component parts of the area, and the use of the term, the Aprista insists, would prevent exclusive concentration upon the needs of the Europeanized section of the population.”

A different, yet parallel view is expressed by Mexican philosopher-historian Jose Vasconcelos, who in his *La Raza Cosmica-Mision de la Raza Iberoamericana* (Mexico City, 1966) has sought to focus our attention on the depth of injustices and extent of irrationality flowing from classical and traditional European-dominated definitions and meanings. Poignantly he writes:

“Each race that arises needs to develop its own philosophy, the *deus ex machina* of its success. We, ourselves, have been educated under the humiliating influence of a philosophy conceptualized by our enemies, which—even though expressed in a righteous manner—exalted its own ends and frustrated ours. From this fate, we, ourselves, have come to believe in the inferiority of the Mestizo, in the unredeemability of the Indian, in the condemnation of the Black, in the irreparable decadence of the Oriental.”

Vasconcelos and the Aprista movement both reflect the classical and traditional thrust of the Hispanic American community. Our present study draws attention to how political systems have attempted to apply their own definitions to our community. While many others seek to resolve this issue by addressing the semantics and terminology, we hope to illustrate how it is really a matter of political and economic considerations, and how these definitions reflect—within the social statistical systems and the management information systems—the racial and ethnic premises operating within the American social and political structures. This NCLR Report, *The Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans*, is, therefore, designed to focus attention on the adverse effect on the Hispanic American created by officially sanctioned, yet traditional European-dominated terminology.

In the classic sense, government has largely failed to deal with the rights, needs and interests of the nation's second largest minority. Until government begins to clearly define the issue of the Hispanic American in rational terms, political assumptions and bias will continue to play the primary and determinative role in policy- and decision-making regarding our community. These are the underlying themes of the report.

ALEX ZERMENO,

Acting Director, National Council of La Raza.

INTRODUCTION

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

The National Council of La Raza (NCLR) is a private, non-profit, non-partisan Chicano organization with headquarters office in Washington, D.C., and a program office in Phoenix, Arizona.

As an advocate, this Mexican American Civil Rights organization is a conduit of Chicano positions in the private and public sectors on both programmatic and policy fronts in a variety of areas including housing, economic development, education and health.

NCLR has communicated Chicano concerns and moods to such Federal agencies as the Office of Management and Budget, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Revenue Sharing, Small Business Administration and various health services agencies and the Office of Education within the Depart-

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare. NCLR also has been invited to testify before various Congressional hearings where it has clearly voiced a number of priority Chicano concerns.

Through the NCLR's publication, *Agenda*, a monthly newsletter and quarterly magazine, we have continually articulated Mexican American issues and concerns. One such concern has been the lack of adequate data gathering and information systems of the Federal Government.

NCLR's concern goes beyond the continuing debate on the inefficiency with which the Bureaus of Census and Labor Statistics address themselves to the needs, interests and rights of the Hispanic American population of our Nation. It goes beyond the immediate benefits that are derived from improved population counts, employment statistics and other social and economic data inherent in these information processing enterprises.

The Council's concern addresses the manner with which our Nation and its public leaders conduct public affairs to meet the Nation's social and economic interests, including the interests of Hispanic Americans, and, the extent to which national interest is the dominant factor of those who make public policy and decisions.

Recognizing that an essential component of responsible and forthright public affairs or public policy is sound information, the NCLR, therefore, has a vital interest in those national policies that further, or hinder, the production of sound information upon which government, and others base policies and make decisions and take other important actions which affect the national interest.

The following is a report on the poor health of this Nation's information systems policy in regard to the Hispanic American population, an element of our society which has not been properly identified, and thus, has been excluded from vital data and information gathering processes.

The position of NCLR is that public information is public property, furthermore, that the public has a right to quality information. Public institutions have an obligation to provide sound information, not misinformation; useful information, not statistical atrocities! The public has a right to know the facts and conditions facing our society in order that it may measure how well the Nation's policies are meeting the Nation's needs and interests. This holds equally true with regard to the Hispanic American taxpayer and consumer. Both the people and their elected leaders need to have sound information to insure sound management. The absence of a Federal policy for quality information on the Hispanic Americans can, and does, result in de facto exclusionary policies, patterns and practices which work against the Hispanic Americans. Such policies aid and abet the segregation of Hispanic Americans interests from the economic and social policies of public and private institutions.

THE CHALLENGE: A DOMESTIC POLICY ON THE HISPANIC AMERICAN

Presently our Federal government does not have a policy of advancing the well-being and interests of the more than 10 million Hispanic Americans. National policies which do exist, in the social, economic, political and cultural spheres do not systematically include consideration for the well-being and interests of the nation's second largest minority.

The above judgement is less the result of harsh experience of the evident and long-standing struggle by Hispanic American communities, organizations and leaders for a share of public funds to solve outstanding needs in the barrios. Such judgement is based on the iron logic of the very processes with which government develops and institutes social and economic policies. What is at stake, therefore, is something beyond the equitable allocation and distribution of federal, state and local funds based on the maximum accurate statistical counting of Hispanic Americans—equity and equality of consideration. Ultimately, a policy based on no count is infinitely more damaging than a policy based on undercount. An accurate count of the Hispanic American does not by itself lead to improvements in national policies—it merely indicates that the problems may be larger than have previously been recognized. The real problem is how the public institutions can be made to efficiently and effectively begin to manage the public's affairs in a manner that ensures the inclusion of Hispanic American interests.

Management has been recognized as the basic problem and is so noted in *The United States Budget—Fiscal Year 1975* prepared by the Office of Management and Budget of the Executive Office of the President. A fundamental element to an understanding of the present Administration's domestic policies is found in its focus on improving the management of public affairs:

"The recommendations contained in the budget are part of a broad effort by the Administration, working with Congress and with State and local officials, to improve the workings of government on all levels. The New Federalism is a crucial element of this broad endeavour. A second, complimentary element consists of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal programs in carrying out Federal responsibilities."

Only indirectly or occasionally, however, do the documents of the Budget define what is entailed in improving the workings of government on all levels and improving efficiency and effectiveness.

Sound management is based on sound policies which, in the case of government, are in large measure defined by the fundamental laws and constitutional processes of the nation. Sound policies are based on sound interpretation of the laws and on information about the facts and conditions to which the interpretation is applied. Interpretations are based on sound management and its interplay with each of the other branches of government—executive, legislative and judicial. Information is the basis for sound management. However, one cannot manage the facts in the sense that facts and conditions can be changed through negotiations and "pragmatic" compromises of data and statistics. This, unfortunately, is the very problem confronting Hispanic Americans.

Facts about, and conditions of, the Hispanic Americans are hidden in the information, data and statistics used by government for making public policy and for managing public affairs. Even when useable information on the Hispanic American is available or accessible, the interests and needs of Hispanic Americans are not systematically identified and accurately defined by or within the government's information systems.

For statistical purposes, the Hispanic American is generally included within the white population categories. Yet for policy-making purposes—particularly when considering the allocation and distribution of resources—the Hispanic American usually is included in a minority classification or is not included at all. The factual condition of the nation's information systems is such, that in making national policies, only black and white interests are defined statistically. To the extent that national policies are so defined, the existing management of public affairs can but systematically reflect these interests and not those of the Hispanic or "other" Americans.

The clearest illustration of the above management problem is to be found in the Office of Management and Budget itself. Thus, we note, for instance, that the Office of Management and the Budget has developed a set of social indicators upon which the needs of this country are to be assessed. It is precisely this type of data and kind of information which is used for purposes of legislation and allocation. Yet its report, titled "Social Indicators 1973," has no reference to the Hispanic Americans of this country. We can only assume that the Hispanic Americans will not be an identifiable group which will receive the benefit of future social planning and resources. This condition of non-existence in data used for policy-making exists throughout the Federal management information systems. Thus data released from the Census Bureau, labor statistics and other recognized population measures either do not include or do not adequately portray the Hispanic American as an identifiable ethnic group. Such data, therefore, is rendered useless in attempting to plan the social needs of a population which historically and literally has not been counted. Neither the current premises of the information systems nor the processes for using the information allow for the systematic consideration of interests of the Hispanic American. It is because of this lack of data that the Hispanic American community has been forced to deal in a political climate that smacks of the old patron system and forced to return to the worn out rhetoric of the past in dramatizing the needs of its people.

That our Federal government does not have a policy of advancing the well-being and interests of the Hispanic American is apparent from the existence of the biracial information systems in the Federal agencies—from the Domestic Council, Council of Economic Advisers and Office of Management and Budget on downward to such important agencies as the National Centers for Health, Social, and Educational Statistics as well as the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The existence of these biracial information systems reveals a blatant misuse and misunderstanding of the facts and conditions of this nation. Further, it indicates the systematic non-utilization of available and accessible data on the Hispanic American and a policy that allows for the underutilization of information systems when the issue of the Hispanic American is raised. Whatever the case may be, the interests and needs of the Hispanic American are excluded.

This condition is by no means confined to the Federal policy-makers. The bi-racial approach to problem solving also prevails in the private sector. Thus, for example, the National Urban League, by its charter mandated to enhance opportunities for minorities, prepared a study on the relationship between the Census undercount and general revenue sharing funds under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. The report, *Estimating The 1970 Census Undercount For State and Local Areas*, made public during July 1973, pointedly notes:

"The National Urban League's 1970 Census Project experience revealed, for example, that the undercount rates for persons of Spanish descent were probably much larger than those for blacks. Yet our method, which is based on the Census Bureau's estimates, fails to explicitly take account of the undercount among Spanish-speaking groups."

The outcome of the study is that only Black and white interests become statistically defined, although the same areas found by the Urban League to have the highest number of undercounts, are also the areas with the highest Hispanic American population.

Although the Urban League specifically notes that the non-white population excludes "certain Spanish-speaking groups, like the Chicanos, (who) are often referred to as 'browns'," and that "a disproportionate number of persons of Spanish ancestry classified themselves as 'other races' on the 1970 Census forms" other private sector policy-oriented research groups are less cautious in their definitions of minorities and non-whites. Whether included in such definitions, or not, the interests of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and the other Hispanic American groups are not defined. Facts about, and conditions of, the Hispanic Americans remain hidden in the information. Thus the resulting management policies and decisions reflect facts and conditions which have little or no relationship to the Hispanic American constituencies of the United States.

With the advent of modern management information systems through computer technology and statistical and systems analysis, the question of how such technological innovations will be used to enhance, or hinder, the development of Hispanic Americans, has been posed on a more frequent basis of leaders in our many communities. Considerable concern has mounted in Hispanic American sectors and communities regarding our society's seeming inability to channel these technological developments in directions that (1) respect the broad range of human needs, and (2) specifically aid in advancing the development of Hispanic Americans and their Barrios. The belief is now widely held that the continuation of certain technological trends and those policies that guide the utilization of technology—particularly through management information systems—provide enormous advantages to some sectors, but pose grave dangers to the various minority groups, particularly the Hispanic Americans. With few exceptions, the central question asked of management information systems is what they would do, or are doing, to the economic and institutional interests of those who are deciding whether or how to exploit these systems, rather than what they would also do, or are doing to the economic and institutional interests of all those public sectors who are affected by such systems. In that regard, none of the statistical services agencies have ever undertaken, or published, an analysis of their impact on policy-making and management of public affairs and how this affects Hispanic Americans.

Although it is recognized that the Federal government cannot do everything and that money alone will not solve all of this nation's problems, it is also recognized that government has certain obligations to all sectors and communities of this nation—including those of the Hispanic Americans. These obligations are the consequences of our rights as Americans and as human beings, as well as the desirability and wisdom of responding to the needs of our communities. Above all, however, in terms of what government represents today as a management information system encompassing the whole nation, the obligations are the consequences of the need for sound planning for the national interest and the national welfare. The systematic exclusion of, or limitations on, the interests of the more than 10 million people who happen to be Hispanic Americans, is not sound national interest policy. Such a policy undermines the natural development of both Hispanic Americans and the Nation—economically, socially, politically and culturally.

The effect of poor planning and lack of research data are most apparent in the current allocation of social program resources, as evidenced by the distribution of revenue sharing funds and the damaging effects on Hispanic American programs. The examples of neglect are blatant, but they merely reflect the absence of a

sound policy on the Hispanic American by our government. The absence of such a policy can only result in inefficiency and ineffectiveness by management on all levels, federal, state and local.

What is clearly necessary is an examination of the important role played today by information systems at the highest levels of government, particularly within the Domestic Council and the Office of Management and Budget. Such an examination needs to facilitate the establishment of a national policy posture which recognizes and systematically includes the consideration of the rights and interests of the Hispanic Americans who are statistically defined. This national policy posture needs to have a multi-racial and ethnic perspective and a multi-cultural perspective which abandons the biracial (black/white) and mono-cultural perspectives which presently prevail at the policy levels. Within such a policy posture, the improvement of the accuracy of data and information on the Hispanic American can then be more readily enhanced, and, the appropriate procedures for the inclusion of the Hispanic American in data used for policy-making and decision-making by management can take place.

This brief report focuses on the importance of the management information systems, shows how past warnings have been generally disregarded in the area of social indicators and reveals the extent of confusion surrounding the issue of Hispanic American interests and definitions.

It then reviews the operations of the Office of Management and Budget and elaborates on how it has used its delegated authority to provide direction to the issue of racial/ethnic data policies.

An assessment of three major statistical services systems in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare provides a further illustration of the extent of lack of direction provided by OMB on statistical policies. It offers an understanding or appreciation of the concerns voiced about the exclusion of Hispanic American interests in the basic social services in which the Federal government plays a major role in terms of research, direction and finance.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS IN DOMESTIC POLICY

PERSPECTIVE ON INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

The significance of information systems is underscored by the increasing reliance placed upon them as technical and management tools for policy-making, planning, budgeting and evaluation purposes by government on all levels. The trend toward such reliance has increased over the past few years and stands to further increase with regionalization, decentralization and revenue sharing thrusts. These are accompanied by advanced management techniques—management information systems and management by objectives approaches—which have increasingly become part of the normal operations of governmental institutions. Statistics and data gathering are key components of the advances in information technology and management technology. Economic and social statistics form the basis of information systems through which management makes economic and social policies and decisions. Thus, accurate data and information are vital political tools in the efficient and just advancement of social and economic interests.

In 1969, a Panel on Technological Assessment of the National Academy of Sciences addressed itself to some of the implications of technological development in a report requested by Congress. It noted that "in recent years concern has mounted over society's seeming inability to channel technological developments in directions that sufficiently respect the broad range of human needs."

Of particular concern to the Panel was the following:

"As they consider the possibility of exploiting or opposing a technological opportunity or development, individuals, corporations, and public institutions attempt to project the gains and losses to themselves of alternative courses of actions, and seek a course designed to maximize gains while minimizing the losses. The difficulty is that self-interest analysis of this sort may ignore important implications of particular choices for sectors of society other than those represented in the initial decisions. In their pursuit of benefits for themselves or for the particular public they serve, those who make the relevant decision may fail to exploit technological opportunities that, from a broader perspective, might clearly deserve exploitation. Likewise, as they seek to minimize costs to themselves, the same decision-makers may pursue technological paths that, from a broader perspective, ought to be redirected so as to reduce undesirable consequences for others."

This ad hoc Panel of the Academy's Committee on Science and Public Policy repeatedly stressed the above concerns:

"The very essence of the panel's concern about the narrowness of the criteria that currently dominate technological choices is a conviction that the present system fails to give all affected interests effective representation in the crucial processes of decision."

The Panel specifically "warned against the loose assumptions that have generally characterized discussion of our problem—the assumption, for example, that one can speak intelligibly and unambiguously about maximizing aggregate welfare"

Only three months after the release of this National Academy of Science report, the President announced the formation of a Task Force on Science Policy. Chaired by Dr. Ruben F. Mettler, President of TRW, Inc., the Task Force reported on the Federal Government's science policy in its April 1970 Science and Technology: Tools For Progress. The Report noted that:

"Our national progress will become ever more critically dependent upon the excellence of our science and technology. A vigorous, high-quality program aimed at advancing our scientific and technological capabilities (including the social, economic, and behavioural components) is vital to all national goals and purposes. Such a program is especially vital to . . . the health of business, labor, and the professions; to the quality of our environment; to the personal health and welfare of all; to the scope and quality of our educational processes; and to the culture, spirit, and inspiration of our people generally. The effectiveness of essentially all our social institutions, including particularly Government itself, is deeply influenced by the quality of our science and technology. The Nation, therefore, has a fundamental need for excellence in science and technology."

The President's Task Force on Science Policy specifically rejected a course of action in which technology would dictate social purpose—"On the contrary, we wish to emphasize the importance of seeking to optimize utilization of science and technology in the service of social, political, and economic goals."

With respect to the defining of goals for the national science policy, the Task Force report noted:

"The central crisis is one of management, of leadership, of inspiration, with an eye to the future as well as the present. Generalized goals must be broken down into specific sub-elements and specific realistic milestones established; specific responsibilities must be assigned with clear-cut processes of review, specific attainable criteria and standards with quantitative as well as qualitative substance must be promulgated; and all of these should be projected over suitable periods of time (e.g., ten to twenty years), with specific machinery for review and re-projection. Such long-range national programs should, of course, have the benefit of searching Congressional debate and formal legislative approval as appropriate. Frequently heard reasons why ten- or fifteen-year national programs cannot be established (e.g., the yearly budget cycles, the short-term nature of legislative and executive terms, the unwillingness to commit future administrations) are not convincing."

The report adds that:

"It is the view of the Task Force that a special effort is needed to make fuller use of the tools of science and technology in quantitatively projecting long-range requirements associated with our many pressing social, urban, and environmental problems."

The special contribution which science and technology can make, according to the Task Force, is in the area of defining the long-range goals, and in solving the central management problems inherent in broad long-range programs:

"Detailed quantitative development of qualitative goals—which engineers and scientists are especially equipped to do—can aid in choosing wisely among alternatives. It can also help define the subelements of a particular program with sufficient clarity to permit each of the widely dispersed elements in our society to grasp its part, and to assist in reviewing and reprojecting the program needed."

Among the specific suggestions relating to the above, made by the Task Force on Science Policy, are:

"Provision of substantial financial and intellectual support for efforts now underway to develop a system of social indicators."

"Investigation of the procedural and technical problems involved in the devising of a national data system for scientific purposes, designed to provide useful data while still protecting individual and institutional privacy."

"Wide participation by industry, labor, and the professions generally in the special social problem research groups."

Repeatedly emphasized as a major challenge to science policy of the Federal government is the incorporation of the social and behavioural sciences into the role of contributor to social and economic solutions. Similarly, heavy stress is laid on long-range projections and plans for a broad-scale attack on social, urban and environmental problems. Such projections and plans, the Task Force recommends, "should include sufficient quantitative detail, including costs and schedules of results to be achieved by particular points in time, to permit integrated review for adequacy and consistency."

At least four major points are advocated in *Science and Technology: Tools For Progress*:

- (1) The report asserts the role of engineers and scientists in social and environmental policy-making, particularly in the urban problems context;
- (2) The recommendations stress the need for long-range planning within the context of a clearly delineated management by objectives approach;
- (3) The management approach is to involve a partnership of interest groups, including government, business, organized labor and the professions;
- (4) The policy-making machinery created will need a data system for scientific purposes, and, a system of social indicators through which advances can be measured and goals can be set.

Absent from the above report is the emphasis on caution in policy-making enunciated in the Panel on Technological Assessment of the National Academy of Sciences, including the role of affected interests not represented in crucial processes of planning and policy-making. Though tools of science and technology are intended to enhance the well-being of all within the urban context, and suitable quantitative instruments are to be developed toward attaining that end, no attention is given to the role played by the subelements of society beyond that role assigned to them by the managers and the plans.

Within a year after the presentation of the two Reports by the Panel on Technological Assessments and the Task Force on Science Policy, Daniel Bell—then Chairman of the Academy of Arts and Sciences' Commission of the Year 2000—made the following remarks as moderator of a congressionally organized panel that addressed itself to the issue of management of information and knowledge:

"A postindustrial society is organized around information and utilization of information in complex systems, and the use of that information as a way of guiding society. Without the organization of information, we can no longer know where we are going to be going, and as an old Talmudic aphorism puts it, 'If you don't know where you are going, any road will take you there.' There is another and even more important fact about a postindustrial society. It is not just a service society in terms of where people work. It is not just an information society on the basis of organizing the flow of knowledge. It is also society uniquely dependent upon the compilation of theoretical knowledge. Now every society has always been dependent on knowledge in order to grow. But it is only in the last decades that we have become uniquely dependent on the codification of theoretical knowledge in order to know where we are."

The role of information and information systems, within the context described by Congressional Panel on Science and Technology, the Academy of Sciences' Panel on Technology Assessment and the President's Task Force on Science Policy can but raise basic questions about the role various minority groups will have in the postindustrial world and the benefits they derive as a consequence of its advances. Whatever the role, it is clear that such groups must find, or build, the best possible road for themselves. It is also clear that the extent to which this can be attained depends very much on the quantity and quality of the information readily available and accessible to all minority communities for social, economic and other developmental activities. The organization of information into "management information systems"—representing a fusion between management science, computer technology, and statistical data collection and processing—by the Federal government, as well as other public and private sectors is of vital interest to the Hispanic American, as is the issue of "social indicators" repeatedly noted within the scientific and management circles of the highest levels of public and private sectors.

The importance of population statistics and research has been repeatedly noted by the commission on Population Growth and the American Future, chaired by John D. Rockefeller III. In its March 27, 1972 Report to the President and Congress, Population and the American Future, it stated:

"A nation must observe the changes in the number and distribution of its population, evaluate these changes, attempt to affect them in ways that will be useful, measure the impact of steps taken, and adapt and redefine the issues to fit the course of the future that it seeks."

"Viewed in this fashion, a policy program represents a course of conduct that requires a continuing feedback of information and appraisal to produce an intelligent and responsive program as experience grows. Statistics provide the descriptive element of the universe of policy concerns; research provides the analytical insight into causal relationships and consequences of the phenomena that statistics reveal and measure. Both statistics and research must underline the formulation of policy and the design and evaluation of programs.

"Public policy in regard to population cannot be intelligently conducted in the absence of timely statistics of high quality on a broad range of subjects. This Commission has received excellent cooperation from federal statistics agencies, but all too often what they could offer was inadequate to the task."

In its chapter on "Population Statistics and Research" the above Commission made numerous recommendations, general as well as specific, relating to "the enrichment of our knowledge on the social and economic side of demographic questions", including the desirability and necessity of information on the various ethnic subgroups of the nation.

A somewhat similar note was struck earlier in the 1969 Report of the Panel on Social Indicators that had been formed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, in 1966. This distinguished group of social scientists on the panel included James Coleman, William Gorham (of the Urban Institute), Karl Kaysen (The Institute for Advanced Study), Samuel Lubell, Daniel Moynihan, Selma Mushkin, Harvey Perloff (Resources for the Future), and numerous other leading social scientists. The Panel's study, *Toward a Social Report*, makes the following observations:

"Only a fraction of the existing statistics tell us anything about social conditions, and those that do often point in different directions. Sometimes they do not add up to any meaningful conclusion and thus are not very useful to either the policymaker or the concerned citizen."

A major concern of the Panel was that "the lack of particular types of statistical information stands in the way of better policy choices." Later, the study notes:

"We need to encourage the collection of new and more socially relevant data. If a balanced, organized, and concise set of measures of the condition of our society were available, we should have the information needed to identify emerging problems and to make knowledgeable decisions about national priorities."

Toward a Social Report briefly noted a specific concern relative to minorities:

"We have often spoken of the condition of the Negro Americans, but have not had the data needed to report on Hispanic Americans, American Indians or other ethnic minorities.

"If the Nation is to be able to do better social reporting in the future, and do justice to all of the problems that have not been treated here, it will need a wide variety of information that is not available now. It will need not only statistics on additional aspects of the condition of the Nation as a whole, but also information on different groups of Americans. It will need more data on the aged, on youth, and on women, as well as on ethnic minorities. It will need information not only on objective conditions, but also on how different groups of Americans perceive the conditions in which they find themselves."

The issue of social indicators is closely related to the issue of productivity, and, in many ways, deals with the same concerns expressed by the panels and commissions quoted earlier in the report. The concern for productivity has led to the establishment of the National Commission on Productivity in June of 1970, and, the holding of conferences, such as the National Science Foundation sponsored Colloquium on the Relationship of Research and Development and Economic Growth/Productivity, in April of 1971 at the request of the Office of Management and Budget.

In the Proceedings of the above Colloquium, Leonard Lederman of the National Science Foundation Office of Economic and Manpower Studies noted that "all available evidence indicates that Research and Development is an important contributor to economic growth and productivity. The contribution of Research and Development to economic growth is positive, significant, and high." While primarily concerned with the impact of technological innovation, the Proceedings of that conference indicated an acute awareness of the impact of technology and technological needs on the labor force, on education, the delivery of quality services—especially in health care—on transportation, pollution control, housing, and other areas, as well as the economy of the nation in general. In the discussions, Lederman stated that "Research and Development, it can be argued, is a classical case of political theory of government doing those kinds of things that are economically and socially high in returns for society."

What is significant about much of the current activity in assessing the importance of productivity research and development is the continued absence of any consideration of the relationship of research and development impacts on the different minority subgroups in America. The issue of high return for society naturally raises one question: Is the equitable share of these returns to be merely for certain fractions or groups in that society? The participants of the Colloquium, according to published proceedings, did not broach the question of any return for the various minorities although a need for increased civil research and development efforts was repeatedly stressed.

The same questions can be raised about the work of the National Commission on Productivity, composed of major labor, farm, business, and local, State and federal officials. Although the Commission deals extensively with such matters as, the implications of changing labor force participation rates, development of leisure and living standards, the shift to services, environmental concerns, productivity in health care and food services, and, measuring the productivity of industry, Labor, and local government services, little if any significant consideration has been documented to the bearing all this has on minorities, and particularly Hispanic American communities. All of its work involves extensive acquisition of new tools for measuring "inputs" and "outputs" in industry, and in the public services areas. It is not clear, however, if and how the interests of the different minorities will be taken into account in these productivity measurements, or whether these new tools of measuring, and the evolving policies for improving economic productivity will have a positive social and economic effect on Hispanic American groups and their communities?

The Productivity Commission does have a policy which declares that "A society that seeks the benefits of productivity growth is obligated to safeguard those who would otherwise suffer from its adverse effects." Yet nowhere in this or other of its published reports, have safeguards been instituted for the equal protection of the rights and interests of the Hispanic American worker, consumer and taxpayer.

Thus, within the context of social indicators and productivity measurement, the National Council of La Raza firmly believes that only by a thorough reevaluation, improvement and expansion of information systems will our society begin to insure that an equitable rate of return becomes a real possibility for the Hispanic American population in this country. The current absence of accurate information to allow the public to measure social and economic policies and programs on the national, regional, state and local levels virtually guarantees inequities for certain affected parties (to use a term that the Productivity Commission appears to apply solely to industry, farms, labor and the governmental sectors).

THE ENORMITY OF THE FEDERAL INFORMATION ENTERPRISE

The Federal information systems enterprise engulfs thousands of agencies. Virtually every program and every grant agency has a research, planning and evaluation component. The 1972 Federal Statistics Directory, 23rd Edition, published by OMB in December of 1972 listed some 500 statistical information services agencies in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury. A quick review of the Directory yields the following information on the number of such services per department—although it should be added that federal reorganization activities may have resulted in considerable changes since its publication.

The number breakdown below is therefore an approximation:

Agency:	Number of statistical services, subagencies
Department of Agriculture-----	86
Department of Commerce-----	138
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	190
Department of Labor-----	78
Department of Treasury-----	31

As noted by Julius Shiskin, Chief Statistician of OMB, in his Foreword to the Directory, "the primary emphasis is on headquarters operations in Washington." Regional offices and many intra-agency branches are not included. The Departments of Agriculture, Bureau of Census, and Bureau of Labor Statistics constitute only a small segment of the total information enterprise of the federal government. As the Foreword to the Directory points out: "The responsibility for coordination of this activity is placed in the Office of Management and Budget by Section 103 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950." OMB has both the legislative authority and the responsibility to insure that optimal performance flows from such coordination.

Despite OMB's mandated role, only the most cursory statistical research on the Hispano population of the United States is evident. The handful of reports which do exist, come from the Bureau of Census. There are no in-depth and on-going federal analyses of this nation's invisible Hispanic population.

It would be folly to suggest that among the brain trust and intellectuals influencing the previously mentioned 500 systems agencies, and within that, the thousands of other federal offices, the talent and capability to produce sound data and information on Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, do not exist. Thus, one can only wonder why the products (the reports, studies, analysis and statistical indicators) existing for the general population, and in many cases only identifying the Black population of our country, do not exist for the more than 10 million Hispanic Americans.

If our nation's information systems were merely makework programs of no consequence but to idle intellectuals and eggheaded speculators, the questions that are raised would be of no consequence. The issue, however, is of a more serious nature. The issue involves questions of policy formulation and evaluation, the measurement of cost effective approaches, and, reduction of waste in federal funds. But above all, it involves a better understanding of what America is in social and economic terms. In this context, the non-existence of the Hispanic American in the information systems prevents an understanding of a large sector of the population and the solutions to meet outstanding interests and needs.

For statistical or policy purposes, Hispanic Americans do not presently exist in most agencies of the government. The development of an accurate statistical existence in the Bureau of Labor Statistics which can be and will be used in policy formulation and program evaluations, for instance, is of apparent, albeit only very limited value. The question that needs to be answered is, why such a statistical existence of the Hispanic could not be represented across the board in all federal agencies? As evidenced by the thousands of federal research and planning agencies and branches, outside of BLS, the Census Bureau, and USDA, the nation's policy needs go far beyond the employment data of BLS, accurate census data, and data on rural Americans.

Clearly, the problem is something more than unemployment indicators, census undercounts, foodstamps and the like. There are, after all, more than 40 statistical services offices in the Census and Labor Statistics bureaus and more than 80 in the Department of Agriculture.

POLICY ORIENTED RESEARCH: CONSEQUENCES OF BIRACIAL METHODOLOGIES

In his study of Think Tanks, (New York, 1971), Washington-based writer, Paul Dixon, has illustrated that, "In the last decade \$150 billion has been spent on . . . basic research . . . applied research . . . and development . . . commonly referred to as R&D . . . giving weight to the traditional assertion that Washington's biggest export is paper, all these reports, studies, and surveys resulting from federal research . . . Such R&D activity created a policy-making framework with far reaching implications. However, with the possible exception of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's Mexican-American Education Project, there were no other major or basic and applied research activities during the decade sponsored by the Federal Government focusing on the Hispanic Americans. Nor can one

point to any major basic research activity, either in the public or private sector which directly addresses that particular population. In brief, \$150 billion worth of research for the advancement of knowledge, has failed to bring forth any significant data or information relevant to the Hispanic American in this country.

A review of the research activities and publications of major research and development operations in the country reflects a decided neglect of data and information which would aid in planning and decision making guides for this nation's policy-makers with regard to the Hispanic American population. Illustrations of such neglect are found in the leading policy-research oriented operations and products of the better known research institutes such as the Brookings Institution, The Urban Institute, Resources for the Future and the Upjohn Institute. Similarly, the Hispanic American absence prevails in research and publications sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, numerous government commissions-e.g. National Commission of the Financing of Postsecondary Education, President's Commission on School Finance, National Commission on Productivity, Commission on Population Growth and the American Future and other public and semi-public institutions. These examples clearly indicate the enormity of the knowledge gap of Hispanic American data facing policy-makers and the general public.

Perhaps one of the most recent examples of a suggested policy posture, which has systematically excluded consideration of Hispanic-Americans, is the June, 1973 Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. The Report, *Youth: Transition to Adulthood*, is based on data and information that does not differentiate among the various subgroups of the nation, even though Panel Chairman, James Coleman, and various other well-known social scientists, including Norman B. Ryder of the Office of Population Research Princeton University, served on the Panel. The entire perspective of this acclaimed 200-page document is irrelevant to minority ethnic groups, since neither multi-ethnic, nor related class (economic) differentials exist in this report.

As a result, this study on youth raises questions about the absence of consideration for some 6 million children and youth of Hispanic American origin. This, in turn, challenges the validity of the conclusions, premises, methodology, recommendations, and commitment to accuracy or facts as presented by that Panel.

The Youth Report is only one of the numerous widely read and acclaimed studies produced over the past decade under Federal government auspices using the advice of leading private sociologists, political scientists and public affairs experts. Other recent major illustrations of the neglect of Hispanic-Americans is found in the widely acclaimed HEW report on blue-collar worker alienation, *Work in America*, and the widely disseminated Final Report of the President's Commission of School Finance—*Schools, People, and Money: The Need for Education Reform* (March 3, 1972). In both cases, noted professionals of high caliber were called upon to help bring national focus to vital policy issues and concerns.

Although these reports indicate an awareness of the issue of social and economic injustice, discrimination and disadvantage, careful analysis, however, bears out the contention that the basis for formulating recommended courses of action do not include the interests of the various and different minority groups.

The issue above is definitely not a matter of, "Counting the Forgotten" Hispanic-American, as suggested by a recent U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report bearing that title. Educational statistics on Hispanic-Americans exist and are accessible. Further, if data or information was not made available, the question of its lack of availability should very well have been raised, and recommendations addressing this matter might have justifiably been included. This did not occur. What exists in terms of comments by public leaders on the significance of the Hispanic-American question is largely confined to isolated comments by a very few commissions created by government, an equally small number of isolated private scholars, a number of Congressional representatives, or leaders and spokesmen of the various Hispanic-American communities.

The issue is no longer, if indeed it ever was, a matter of "simple ignorance" or lack of "available data" on the part of government. It is quite difficult to ignore Hispanic-American interests and desires for inclusion in national productivity advancements, on the premise that "we in government simply do not have any accurate data and, therefore, cannot include considerations for your legitimate concerns." Neither the black nor the white population of this country could be accounted for, if that contention were the real premise. There are many

acknowledged information gaps and inaccuracies in these sectors! Such gaps or inaccuracies have not prevented the nation's social scientists, demographers and others from extensively studying and developing policies which relate to white and black social sectors, as indicated by a review of Rand, OMB, BLS and Urban Institute publications. Further, in each case there is an awareness of the existence of other racial groups. Indeed, in some cases—such as the HEW Panel on the Social Report and the National Commission on Population Growth specific note was taken of the existence of various groups, and the need to systematically address their concerns.

Considerable research has been undertaken relative to the nation's black minority, and, the result of such research has been used to educate, inform, sensitize the public, and, to assist in the deliberations of the courts, legislative bodies and executive branches at the state, local and federal levels. A good illustration of this is to be found in activities by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission; during the U.S. Supreme Court deliberations on *Brown v. Board of Education*; and in the U.S. Office of Education's Coleman Report.

Virtually all of the previous mentioned private institutes, and many others, have claimed to foster research on "minorities." Many have received substantial funds for conducting such research. A closer look at their products, however, reveals a consistent definition of the interests of minorities and non-whites in terms of the black population. Similarly, the study of the "poor" or disadvantaged has been consistently posed in terms of black and white by such institutions. The same is the case with regard to the study of "race." Only occasionally are non-black minorities identified and their characteristics noted—generally with the superficiality that defies utilization for policy-making purposes. One example of this is found in the series of Studies on the Governance of Metropolitan Regions, edited by Lowdon Wingo of Resources for the Future, Inc., and in *Minority Perspectives* (1972) by Dale Rogers Marshall et al. This Paper's only "minority perspective" is that of the black minority. Although one chapter deals with "the attitudes of minorities" and explicitly notes that "unfortunately, evidence on attitudes of Mexican-Americans, Indians, and Puerto Ricans is almost non-existent", the term "minorities" continues to be used—in the words of the author—"to emphasize the need to find out more about other minorities' views of metropolitan reform." The article then makes clear that "this discussion focuses on blacks", yet also continues to insist that this sufficiently encompasses the perspectives of "the minorities."

The misuse of the term "minority" by scholars is found in other areas as well. The most advanced form of research on the race and minority issue by leading institutes and universities still yields little more than a one-sentence mention of specific subgroups, or the term "Negroes and others," with the implied definition that "others" includes Chicanos, Boricuas, Native Americans.

The December, 1973 Report of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, titled "Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States," commits similar errors, but develops its own solution to the problem, such as, "whites and other Caucasians (which includes Mexican-Americans)", and fails to even note the existence of the other Hispanic-Americans. (See p. 144 of above Report.) The Hispanic inclusion within the "other Caucasian" category, of course, makes any statistical projections and assumptions about white enrollment, white student aid needs, and the like, wholly inaccurate; and makes inaccurate any comparisons between and among whites and non-whites by this Commission.

In its report on Estimating the 1970 Census Undercount for State and Local Areas, the National Urban League Data Service is confronted by a similar problem. The report, presented at the Annual Conference of the National Urban League on July 23, 1973, notes that on April 25, 1973 the U.S. Census Bureau assessed the size of the undercount in the 1970 Census to be 5.3 million persons, or 2.5 percent of the U.S. population. Of these, the Census "estimated that 1.88 million blacks were missed in 1970", an undercount rate of 7.7 percent; "3.45 million white persons were said to have been missed in the 1970 Census." The League's Data Service report further states:

"The method used by the Census Bureau to derive its estimates of the undercount is based on a technique of developing the estimated U.S. population independent of the Census, and then comparing the Census counts to the expected numbers. But the estimated population is developed by using national data on births, deaths, medicare enrollment, immigration—emigration, past census data and analysis of age-sex-race distributions. Since reliable statistics on births, deaths and net immigration cannot be compiled from current records, the Bureau

indicated that it could not prepare reliable national undercount estimates for persons of Spanish ancestry. Experience revealed, for example, that the undercount rates for persons of Spanish descent were probably much larger than those for blacks. Yet our method, which is based on the Census Bureau's national estimates, fails to explicitly take account of the undercount among Spanish-speaking groups."

In an accompanying footnote to the above statement, the following clarification is provided.

"It is important to note that, because certain Spanish speaking groups, like the Chicanos, are often referred to as 'browns,' many persons mistakenly believe that they are included in the Census Bureau figures for non-whites. This is not the case. Unless they classify themselves as black, persons of Spanish ancestry are automatically classified by the Census Bureau with whites. A disproportionate number of persons of Spanish ancestry classified themselves as other races on the 1970 Census forms."

The National Council of La Raza observes that neither the Census Bureau, nor the Urban League Data Service provide within their statistical systems, any indication on the extent of "other races" self classification. For example, the Bureau of Census has stated in its introduction of the June 1973, Persons of Spanish Origin: Subject Report (pc(2)-I c; Table I p. IX), that there are a total of 459,934 Spanish Origin blacks, 26,859 Spanish Origin Indians, and 122,302 Spanish Origin "other" persons. There is no indication how the Bureau arrived at the above mentioned statistical breakdown, when the only identifier appearing on the Census questionnaire to identify the Hispanic American population is listed as:

"13b. Is this person's origin or descent—Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, Other Spanish, No, none of these."

When based on only these six identifiers, it is unclear what other determinants are used to arrive at the aforementioned racial or ethnic definitions and statistics relating to black, Indian and "other" sub-groupings. Or, for that matter, the categorical breakdown appearing on its Table I of the same Subject Report:

"TABLE 1.—PERSONS OF SPANISH ORIGIN BY RACE, FOR THE UNITED STATES, 1970

"Race	All persons of Spanish origin ¹	Persons of Mexican origin	Persons of Puerto Rican origin	Persons of Cuban origin
"Number: Total.....	9,072,602	4,532,435	1,429,396	544,600
White.....	8,466,126	4,446,584	1,323,537	522,623
Negro.....	454,934	24,148	75,920	17,151
Indian.....	26,859	15,988	1,038	161
Filipino.....	2,381	1,156	130	355
Other.....	122,302	44,559	28,771	4,310
Percent distribution: Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White.....	93.3	98.1	92.6	96.0
Nego.....	5.0	.5	5.3	3.1
Indian.....	.3	.4	.1	.1
Filipino.....				.8**
Other.....	1.3	1.0	2.0	

¹ Includes Central or South American and other Spanish origin not shown separately."

The National Council further observes a continuation of discrepancies in the Census Bureau's conclusion that, "93.3% of all persons of Spanish origin were reported as white." Another contradiction can be found upon reviewing the previously mentioned Urban League Data Service Report on Census data. It states that, "a disproportionate number" who were classified as white by the Bureau of Census had identified their origin as "other races". Although such classification is not provided for, either in the census questionnaire, or the Census Report. That study does not make clear how within Census Bureau statistics, those identifying as "other races" are in fact automatically included in the white category, and if so, the criteria for such automatic inclusion. Additionally, it is not clear whether such "other races" classification had the same automatic

statistical consequences in the Urban League study. The above questions become significant when we attempt to examine the criteria for identifying the population count of those states with the largest number of Spanish origin people such as New York, California and Texas, which are—according to the Urban League's study—States with the largest "non-white population" undercount. Similarly, Metropolitan areas with large numbers of Spanish-origin people, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Newark, Trenton, Houston, etc. are also areas with the largest non-white undercounts. The Urban League Data Service's report on the Census undercount does not, however, differentiate the extent of the non-black percentage within the non-white category it has used for the purposes of its analysis.

The significance of Estimating the 1970 Census Undercount for State and Local Areas, is that the Urban League's apparent access to the 1970 Census Forms forced it to conclude that:

1. a disproportionate number of Spanish-origin persons classified themselves as neither black, nor white;
2. The term "non-white," although including non-blacks, is analysed as if black and non-white are synonymous; and
3. the Urban League accepts the view that the Spanish-origin person undercount is probably larger than for blacks.

• Though there is an explicit awareness of the problem posed by current classifications and definitions, the above report, does not appear to recognize the inappropriateness of the term non-white as synonymous with black, even in view of Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-46, Exhibit K, Race and Color Designations in Federal Statistics which is a policy rejecting the use of the term "non-white":

"The designation 'non-white' is not acceptable for use in the presentation of Federal Government Statistics. It is not to be used in any publication of statistical data or in the text of any statistical report."

Such use is also statistically inaccurate, for as noted on page 150 in its comment on "Race Differentials", the 1974 Economic Report of the President by the Council of Economic Advisors, less than 90 percent of the so-called "non-whites" are black! The statistical significance of that 10 percent is considerable.

The conclusions of the above study are based on the utilization of statistical analysis from available white/non-white data. This analysis/interpretation, in making a case for a redistribution policy of the General Revenue Sharing funds particularly, reflects the application of a fundamentally biracial white-black methodology, to an admitted multi-racial/ethnic condition.

In the previously mentioned cases, those of the private R & D institutions and quasi-public commissions which generally bring together outstanding leaders from outside of government (many of which come from the private R & D sector), the heavy reliance on the federal information system is obvious. The products of the commissions and institutes strongly suggest that such information provided to and requested by policy-research groups and policy advisory groups is so limited that it is utterly useless with regard to the Hispanic-American. In virtually all cases there is a drastic confusion over definitions. Thus, in the above instances, the "Spanish-speaking" are defined as: "Mexican-Americans," and "other Caucasians," while in other examples, "Spanish speaking" becomes identified as, "other minority," "Negro and others" and "other races." Thus, the Hispanic American becomes a statistical nonentity for policy purposes in the area of economic considerations, while at the same time, appearing to be nowhere, and everywhere in all definitions and classifications.

In no case, however, are the actual interests of the Hispanic American subgroups included in terms of policy posture in whatever definition is applied.

The consequences of these definitions are that solutions to social and economic needs are being developed on a biracial basis, which excludes those who are defined as neither white, nor black. The solutions do not, in fact, contain either the conceptual or the practical framework of the multi-cultural and multi-ethnic America. The fundamental social and economic policies of the nation are being developed on theoretical models that are biracially-oriented and fortified by statistics that are, on the whole, biracially-oriented.

The biracial approach for social and economic theory and policy-making is most evident and clear in the past and present practices and policies of the Office of Management and Budget of the Executive Office of the President, which filter down towards every agency of the federal government, in turn impact upon nearly every State and local governmental agency, and ultimately affect virtually every major private institution's data and information systems including the media and communications apparatus in the country.

The nation's intelligentsia, its public affairs scholars, its leaders of social and economic research and its advocates of reform, rely heavily on the information that government makes available or accessible. In turn, the nation's intellectuals and writers are heavily relied upon by the general public and by government to help define national solutions. Yet the failure of scholarship and the presentation of facts about the conditions and make-up of American society is nowhere more evident than in the incredible mono-cultural insensitivity so pervasive today among scholars. This insensitivity towards the full context of the racial-ethnic question has served to reinforce the inordinate parochial perspective of the Federal agencies, depriving many agencies the opportunity to institute vital basic and applied research and sound developmental activities from which the community-at-large can benefit.

HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL SKETCH

Throughout the world one finds ethnicity and race a significant and often determinative factor in the governmental and private sectors' formulation and implementation of social, economic, political and cultural policies. This is no less the case in the United States of America.

United States history is very much a history of the politics of race and ethnicity—beginning with the acceptance of its Constitution and its policies on the negro and the Native American people. That history provides a key to the understanding of the development of this nation.

The issue of race is a complex one and was so recognized by the Founding Fathers. History has not simplified that issue—if anything, it has made it more complex. The acquisition of new territories added to the dimension of the issue and the politics of race, although this seems part of a distant and hazy past having little bearing on the postindustrial society. Yet, the dimension and the implications of New Spain—as the Western Hemisphere lands were once called—form a major part of the politics of race and ethnicity in the United States.

The Spanish-speaking issue in this country continues to be fostered in terms of ethnicity and immigration, as if the historical development of Hispanic American people were fundamentally similar to the development of the European ethnic and immigrant history.

The issue superimposes on the Hispanic American terms which have been defined appropriate to the economic, social, cultural and political makeup and background of European immigrants—terms that are foreign to the Western Hemisphere residents.

The Spanish-speaking issue is, in fact, two-fold: One issue involving this country's historical relationship with Spain; the other, the indigenous characteristics of people of Central, South, and North America once ruled by Spain. Politically, in the sphere of foreign policy this nation has responded to only one element of this two-fold factor. The United States has developed foreign policies towards Spain and the governments of Latin American countries. It has not developed a domestic policy towards these Hispanic people indigenous to the Western Hemisphere who became part of the United States during its territorial expansion into the Southwest and the Caribbean.

The conquest of the new territories added a new dimension to race and ethnicity. For, with exceptions, these Western Hemisphere residents can trace their ethnicity back not only to the invaders from Spain, but beyond, to the indigenous Native American population, and, in many cases, to Africans as well. Caribbean and South and Central American residents and the Hispanic Americans in the Southwestern States are not only different from the European immigrants of the North in terms of culture and national origin, they also are racially and ethnically different. The consequence of history has been the melting of the three races in some areas of two races in others, and, a further melting of the racially mixed. On the whole, the influence of the Indian race is found throughout. Racial purity in terms of Black or White is not characteristic of the dominant population, although there are large numbers of Indians throughout the Central and South American states. There are, however, Caucasians, both recent European immigrants and land owners of long standing, who imposed their caste system on this indigenous population. In that the Spanish appear to constitute a small segment of the total population, it should be noted that although virtually all can claim a Spanish heritage in the cultural sense, many can, and do claim Spanish ancestry, descent or origin in the genetic sense. But, only an immigrant from Spain can claim Spanish national origin in its literal meaning. Much of the historical confusion surrounding the use of the prefix "Spanish" has been attributed to the

imposition of the European social caste system introduced into the Western Hemisphere by the so-called "Discoverer of the new world."

In terms of its domestic development, the politics of race and ethnicity of the United States has evolved from admitted violation of treaties with and policies toward the Native American nations; legal and Constitutional issues with respect to the enslaved black people; and, European national origin, social and legal issues. To a large extent, the national origin issue arising over the various Asian-American minorities, has been closely related to foreign policy matters, as is the case with regard to the Hispanic American. Apart from the particular policies adopted by the United States toward the Native American, the history of the United States in terms of race/ethnicity has been essentially a bi-polar matter of black and white, with its policies, laws, and Constitutional changes, as well as its administrative activities reflecting that political and socioeconomic historical context.

In terms of Hispanic American development, the prevailing biracial context of national domestic policies is, detrimental to the institution of policies that respond to the multi-ethnic and multi-racial context or framework of conditions in the United States. Classifications, definitions and terminology used by policy-makers are useless in such a context.

A review of past racial/ethnic policies of the United States indicates that there have been few tangible advantages to be attained through the mere inclusion of the Hispanic American within such umbrella terms as white, Caucasian or European. The beneficiaries of economic and social development continue to be European-origin ethnics and the policies continue to reflect and define their interests. A similar review of the Hispanic American experience within the umbrella terms used to identify "minority groups" reveals that such a policy defined and reflected the interests of black ethnics.

The issue of racial/ethnic definitions, data and policies is very much tied to the development of this nation toward overcoming both the vestiges of the exploitation of black people which goes back to the legal institution of slavery. The extent to which this nation is embroiled in that issue is an indication of how far this nation has yet to go to recognize and understand the nature, neglect and exploitation of the minorities in the Americas.

One historical consequence of this lack of understanding has been the acceptance of expedient classifications and policies which make the Hispanic American a part of a dual world with dual standards. The Hispanic American is defined as "white" and a "minority"—without being part of either, in that institutions, structures, policies, and practices have not been changed from "Anglo-American" to "American." Both history and the policies and politics of contemporary America, reveal that the systematic exploitation of minority people who are culturally and ethnically different continues unabated. Thus, ethnicity and race remain significant factors with regard to Hispanic Americans and the development of policies that would enhance their social, economic, political and cultural opportunities and rights within our society's structure.

PROBLEMS OF CURRENT DEFINITIONS

An assessment of the Hispanic American dilemma must take place both within the historical and the contemporary context. Parallel with the historical confusion and the confusion resulting from the utilization of biracial methodologies in policy-oriented research, there are other major complicating factors. One deals with certain basic misconceptions by the general public; the other deals with the definitions of the Hispanic American. All these factors interrelate.

When the issue of the Spanish speaking is raised in a public context, it generally becomes identified with certain stereotypes or standard misconceptions which include the following:

1. The Spanish speaking issue is primarily rural, migrant, farm worker.
2. The Spanish speaking problem is an immigrant problem facing the Spanish ethnic group, similar to the problems faced by other European national origin immigrants.
3. The Spanish speaking issue is a confusing political debate on the adequacies of the Census.
4. The issue is basically one of employing the disadvantaged unemployed, most of whom have various English language problems.

Within such a framework of public perspective, the validity of the Hispanic American as a national issue of major social and economic import, is fully undermined. Within such a framework, the Hispanic American issue becomes thoroughly

confusing, for the media, scholars, politicians and others. Adding to this confusion are the issues confronting the status of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Cuban refugees and Mexican National migrant workers. In short, no comprehensive social, economic, cultural, or political picture emerges from this complex setting.

Gradually there is developing a new understanding of the Hispanic American issue. The public has yet to fully recognize that the Hispanic American is the most urbanized minority group in the country. More than four out of five Hispanic Americans reside in urban settings. That the plight of the farm worker has achieved prominence is largely due to the dedicated work of the United Farm Workers and its leaders. That plight is, however, only one facet of the Hispanic American condition. Further, most Hispanic Americans are neither farm, nor migrant farm workers, although large sectors of the most exploited group, are Hispanic American, primarily Mexican-American and Puerto Rican.

Another perspective that tends to add to the confusion is the notion that the Spanish speaking are essentially Spaniards and Spanish immigrants. Many Hispanic Americans are proud in tracing their origins to the indigenous cultures of the Americas. The Spanish language of these native Americans is, moreover, quite different from the Castilian. The fundamental issue facing most Hispanic Americans is largely an ethnic/cultural one, a minority issue, in contrast to the solely national origins issue implied in the term Spanish.

A third confusing factor is the Census undercount debate itself. The whole debate of statistical and other information on the Hispanic American has continuously orbited around the identification inadequacies of the Census. While the significance of Census data is quite evident from the extent to which that data is used in the formulation of policies at state, local and federal levels, it is also obvious that the Census data is not the only information system being used for policy-making purposes. The focus on Census inadequacies has served to detract from the question of how such data is used by the various agencies outside the Bureau of Census, as well as to detract attention from other data systems.

The Hispanic American issue on undercount is one which affects the validity of the whole information and data gathering enterprise.

Compounding technical aspects of the undercount is the utilization of different identifiers for the Hispanic American in different parts of the country. Thus, for example, the Census Bureau notes that "in the five Southwestern States, all persons of Spanish surname have been separately identified. About 4.7 million persons living in these States were identified as having a Spanish surname." This approach at identification of the number of Hispanic Americans was, apparently, not used in other areas of the country. A second identifier involved information on the birthplace of the persons counted, but, such identification incorporated only information concerning first and second generation immigrants from such countries as Mexico, Cuba and Puerto Rico. "About 5.2 million persons in the United States were reported as of Spanish birth or parentage using this identifier." A third identifier asked for the language spoken in the person's home in early childhood. "Nearly eight million persons reported Spanish as that language." Under this identifier all other persons living with families in which the head or wife of the head of the household reported Spanish as the mother tongue were added, making the total "persons of Spanish language" some 9.6 million people. A fourth identifier involved Spanish-origin self-identification within the definitions offered. This offered a choice to consider oneself Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, Other Spanish, or none of these. In each case, identifiers offered only those definitions used by the Census Bureau and did not encompass the full range of Hispanic Americans. There was no provision on the 1970 census questionnaire for the identification of persons of Hispanic American background in the basic census questionnaire. The terms used by the Census Bureau are essentially functional identifiers, rather than identifiers for the acquisition of data on all generations of persons of Hispanic American origin. Thus, in the 5-percent sample of the 1970 Census, the term "Spanish origin" was used; in the 15-percent sample the term "Spanish heritage" was used; and in the 100-percent basic questionnaire an essentially national origin approach was used. All identifiers, by definition, excluded a number of Hispanic Americans who did not identify with or fit into definitions or self-classifications offered to respondents.

It can be ascertained that the 1970 Census was not designed to function as a Census "count" or for identifying the Hispanic American population. It merely provided information about certain characteristics of Hispanic American groups within certain classifications, which are in effect, sub-classifications. A consequence

of such a system is that it reduces the validity of comparisons between the various samples and the basic 100-percent census.

A fourth confusion relates to the issue of unemployment among the Spanish-speaking. While unemployment is a key issue, it is only one of numerous manpower and manpower-related problems facing the Hispanic American. Inherently related to the problem of high unemployment are such matters as, underemployment and misemployment, education, public services—e.g., health care public assistance, social security—housing, consumer protection and public safety, civil rights, and many other concerns of an economic nature. Unemployment is related to a mass of other issues and concerns. A key to understanding the problems facing the Hispanic American is the underutilization and neglect of the human talent, skills and resources which exist within this social spectrum. In short, the Hispanic issue relates to the whole economic and social fabric of the Nation and cannot be isolated into an issue of manpower development training of the disadvantaged.

Hispanic American issues could be summarized as being: (1) Largely of an urban nature, (2) An ethnic minority issue, (3) Functionally excluded from Federal data/information systems, and (4) of National Economic and Social Significance.

The failure to differentiate issues such as noted above has resulted in national, state and local policy postures and definitions on the Hispanic American which are archaic, confusing, and definitely detrimental to the rights and interests of the Hispanic American in General, and of each racial-ethnic subgroup in particular.

It is clearly in the interest of the public, of government, and of all minorities themselves, that a clear or unequivocal approach be taken to reduce confusion on the Spanish-speaking issues, as well as to provide for increased accuracy in information systems. Of great concern in that regard, is the definition of "Spanish speaking", "Spanish origin", "Spanish ancestry", "Spanish surname", and other such terms as presently used by the Census Bureau, Department of Labor and all other public agencies.

A brief review of current definitions will bring out certain other implications which can hardly be construed as beneficial toward a clearer understanding of the economic, social, political, or cultural interests of Hispanic Americans.

Spanish speaking

The term "Spanish speaking" is as inappropriate and meaningless, as the term "English speaking." The fact that many people speak English does not make them English. The utilization of the term "English speaking" as the key identifier rather than the present dominating ethnic breakdown in Census data would raise havoc with much of this nation's information systems. It would no doubt lead to immense complications for whites and blacks. Using this analogy, it becomes clear as to what "Spanish speaking" does to the Hispanic American whose subgrouping identity is Chicano, Boricua, and other sectors of Caribbean, Mexican, Central and South American origins.

The prefix "Spanish" is highly misleading for linguistic differences in the similar sense that a Scandinavian and "Russian speaking" category would, if such terms respectively encompassed Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, and Icelanders or Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians, etc. The Bureau of Census explicitly recognizes national origin differentials. Yet, such a differential is often not applied equally with respect to the numerous native Hispanic subgroups. Further, in the Census defined category of persons of Spanish language, one finds those whose immediate origin goes back to Mexico, Cuba and Central and South America, but not often those who are now native Hispanic-American, namely the Chicano and Puerto Rican. Spanish speaking is one denominator which unites many Hispanic-Americans. But as noted above, it is not an accurate, functional ethnic characteristic for identification purposes of that population sector in the United States, in the same manner that "English speaking" is not the accurate ethnic denominator that provides for understanding of who the other elements of the U.S. population are.

Spanish surname

The term "Spanish surname" is equally inadequate, inappropriate and meaningless. This category means as much as "English surname." By contrast, the utilization of "English surname" as the key identifier for ethnic dominating categories would also make havoc of much of this nation's information systems, and lead to immense complications, as well as raise questions about its purpose or functionality. The surname issue presents these very terminological complications to the Chicano, Boricua and other Hispanic American sectors of Caribbean, Mexican, Central and South American origins.

Compounding the problem is the fact that there are many Hispanic Americans with Dutch, French, German, Irish, English, Native Indian and other non-Spanish surnames going back many generations. Further, many have acquired non-Spanish surnames in more recent generations through marriage. Still others with such surnames are only very distant or not at all Spanish or Hispanic-American origin. Others are from Spain. To complicate things further there are Portuguese, Brazilians and Asians who have "Spanish surnames." Finally, some have Anglicized their Spanish surnames—such as Rios to Rivers; Torres to Towers; Rabagos to Russell, etc.

Comments on racial-ethnic definitions

Traditionally, several other generally used terms have been promoted by the Census Bureau and other agencies: Spanish-American, -Ancestry, -Origin, -Descent, and -Heritage. A literal interpretation of any of these definitions would immediately establish that such persons were being identified for purposes other than identification of the composition of the American population.

How many people fit such categories is not known, but, it is a comparatively small number since they are not even listed in the Census Bureau's National Origin and Language Subject Reports.

In the 1972 Annual Report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization a breakdown has been provided on "Immigration by County, for Decades: 1820-1972," and includes the following comparative statistics on immigration:

From 1820-1972 there were an estimated 233,519 immigrants from Spain; 1,707,125 immigrants from Mexico; 234,177 immigrants from Central America; and 536,786 immigrants from South America.

The largest immigration from Spain took place in 1911-1920 (68,611). Only in three other decades have there been more than 10,000 Spanish immigrants—1901 to 1910 (27,935); 1921-1930 (28,958); and the 1961 to 1970 period (52,504). The Spanish population constitutes a very small though not insignificant segment of the Spanish-American (Spanish-origin, ancestry, etc.) population. Information and research on its make-up is quite appropriate. It is probably correct to state that by definition, this may be the only significant "Caucasian" Spanish American population sector that is Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed. Yet it is this latter definition that the Census Bureau and other agencies are in fact utilizing.

It appears as though the above categories of origin, heritage or ancestry reach to the root of the problem of definitions for purposes of identification by the agencies. Thus, for example, in a 1970 study prepared for the Colorado Civil Rights Commission under the auspices of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Spanish Surnamed American Employment in the Southwest, the authors note that the "Spanish speaking Americans" are the "second oldest" minority, as well as the "second largest" minority. It then defines the "Spanish speaking" as an "ethnic minority." It goes on to state that: "Its members are of one race and one religion with the country's majority. They are white, Caucasian; they are Christian. They descend from Europeans."

The report by the Institute of Industrial Relations went to great lengths to point to the cultural origins of the "Spanish-speaking", "a culture stemming from the Greeks and the Romans." Thus having provided a racial definition and a cultural definition of the Hispanic American in general, and of Mexican Americans in particular, the report goes on to note that:

"The Spanish often mingled with and joined the indigenous populations into their society. The multifarious people who issued from this joining cannot now be distinguished by the usual designation of race, creed, color, or national origin. To the contrary, their distinction is that no one of these, nor all of them, suffices to describe their distinctiveness."

The explanation provided by this study for utilizing the terms "Spanish speaking Americans," "Spanish American" and "Spanish surnamed", in spite of the self-acknowledged ambiguity and lack of functional precision is that:

"Purely local colloquialisms such as Mexican-Americans, Latins, and Latin Americans may be offensive in some areas. The extreme sensitivity of slotting people who range, ethnically, from Indian to unmixed Spanish ancestry is apparent. This explains part of the problem of giving this group a statistical existence."

The implications of the EEOC-sponsored report's conceptualization are as revealing as they are contradictory and inadequate. On the one hand it defines Mexican-Americans as White Caucasians; on the other, it concludes that the Spanish mingled with other races are no longer Europeans, but a distinct ethnic racial, color and national origin group.

This accepted non-Caucasian and non-white admitted reality is at odds with the "White," "Caucasian" and "European" definition that is officially sanctioned. The official sanction and advocacy on behalf of "whiteness" is in fact a preferential selection from among the two major racial choices in the United States—i.e. black and white. The preferential selection of white dominance that is made through the definitions is an ill-conceived preferential choice reflecting negatively on a major ethnic element of our society which culturally and ethnically comes under the Hispanic American umbrella. Revealing, however, is the belief that Mexican culture is Greek and Roman culture, and that the Spanish "joined the native Indian population into their society." In other words, the Indians joined the white Spanish society.

Using these assumptions, the Bureau of Census June 1973 Subject Report on Persons of Spanish Origin has identified a total of 26,859 persons of Spanish origin who are "Indian," out of a total of 9,072,602 persons of Spanish origin and 8,466,126 who are defined as "white." At the same time this Subject Report of the Bureau of Census notes:

"The category of white includes persons who indicated their race as white, as well as persons who did not classify themselves in one of the specific race categories on the questionnaire but entered Mexican, Puerto Rican, or a response suggesting Indo-European stock . . . The category of Indian includes persons who indicated their race as American Indian or who did not indicate a specific race category but reported the name of an Indian tribe."

What has taken place is a terrible misconstruction of the history, culture, and society of the Hispanic American and of his contribution culturally and ethnically to the Western Hemisphere. Such definitions and rationales which have been expounded by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission-sponsored study, and in a parallel manner, by the Bureau of Census, totally ignored the overwhelming evidence of the particular non-European contribution.

The fact is most Hispanic Americans of Central, South and North American origin can be defined ethnically and culturally as neither black nor white.

It is only through the best facts that definitions must be developed to give the Hispanic groups an accurate statistical existence that is uniform and functional, yet flexible in its sub-categories to take account of the unique sensitivities of each distinct subgroup. The present definitions have allowed and contributed to the continued statistical non-existence of the Hispanic American in most areas of government and have fostered statistically useless definitions of that ethnic population. This has done great harm to the cause of advancing the economic, social, cultural, and political interests of the Hispanic American.

FEDERAL AGENCIES: CURRENT ROLE OF THE HISPANIC AMERICANS IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET: RACIAL/ETHNIC DATA POLICY

Historically, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), like many other agencies of the Federal Government working with statistical services, has recognized the limitations of the Federal information systems with regard to the Hispanic American. Such recognition has not, however, resulted in a revision of existing Federal statistical policies to overcome and eliminate such limitations.

Fundamental direction on the racial/ethnic data question is set by the OMB, which is the designated Federal administrative agent responsible for the efficient operation and coordination of federal statistical services systems, under the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, 31 U.S.C. Sec. 18b.

OMB has provided limited direction on the policies relating to racial and ethnic classifications. Its policy on definitions and classifications in information systems refer only to two racial groups: white and negro. Although authority on issuing regulations on statistical procedures was assigned to the old Bureau of the Budget through Executive Order 10253, of June 13, 1951, and though that authority was transferred to OMB under the President's 1970 Reorganization Plan No. 2, present OMB policy does not require the collection of racial-ethnic data, nor does it require the separate enumeration of particular racial/ethnic groups in those cases where racial/ethnic data is collected. The only prohibition on classifications is the term "non-white". A whole array of other classifications, designations or definitions are permissible. There is no stated OMB policy on the Hispanic American. No guidelines on definitions are provided, nor any provisions on whether Hispanic American (Spanish-speaking, -surnamed, -ancestry, etc.) should or should not be included in "white", "minority", or "negro and other" categories. One consequence is that Federal agencies use different classification systems making any comparative analyses between many agency information systems virtually impossible.

With respect to Hispanic Americans and the various subgroups in that population, the lack of a clearly formulated OMB policy with regard to the use of racial/ethnic definitions, has resulted in procedures for statistical regulation that have not served to increase the amount or quality of racial/ethnic data available or useable for Federal-wide program planning and evaluation.

The significance of decisions allowing utilization of old definitions and classifications becomes clearer in view of the recent emphasis on civil rights.

OMB has instituted a policy requiring that civil rights issues be included in the budget hearing processes and the performance management system. However, it has not instituted a policy of requiring improvements in the quality and accuracy of racial/ethnic data for use in the budget hearing processes. The importance of this factor becomes even more evident as a result of the officially established, functional relationship between OMB's Statistical Policy Division and Budget Examination Division. Further, responsibility for the clearance of the administrative forms for data gathering purposes, is now in the latter Division.

The authority of the Office of Management and Budget includes responsibility for racial/ethnic data forms used by all Federal agencies, as well as the regulation of the procedures for the use of definitions in statistical systems. Though exercising the function of racial/ethnic data and information systems as a key component of the budgetary planning process at the national level, it has yet to exercise its authority to improve data and utilize such data in the budgetary processes on behalf of the Hispanic Americans. On the contrary, it had issued for comment, proposed amendments to the March 28, 1952, Bureau of the Budget Circular A-46, which sets forth requirements on Federal statistics that gives Federal agencies two alternative racial/ethnic data system options. Proposed by then Associate Director of OMB, Frank C. Carlucci, the suggested alternatives were:

(a) American-Indian, Asian American, Negro/Black, white, Spanish descent, and other.

(b) American Indian, Asian American, Negro/black, white, and other combined with the ethnic categories of Spanish descent and other.

Neither proposed revisions request data on Mexican Americans, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cuban, Central and South Americans, or Filipinos. The proposed changes would in fact appear to be no significant change for the Hispanic American, and in some instances, even complicate matters further since the parameters of the proposed terms are not defined. Thus, OMB is allowing agencies to define their own terms, and is permitting the use of different data collection systems among different agencies, making comparing of such data practically meaningless.

It becomes obvious from the years of activities by OMB and other agencies with regard to the racial/ethnic data question, that considerable attention has been given to that question as it pertains to the Hispanic American issue. Significant factors which have not been publicly addressed are the lack of theoretical approaches to: (1) the defining of essential meanings of ethnicity, (2) terms used for ethnic designations, (3) relationship of ethnicity to economic, social and cultural structure, and (4) implications of Hispanic American ethnicity in political settings.

The above proposed alternatives by the former Associate Director of OMB, Frank Carlucci, have policy implications which have not been elaborated upon. An official statement of the impact of the proposed classifications on social and economic policies, on the budgetary review and examination processes, and, on the Federal performance management systems would help provide for the needed functional and practical definition of the proposed racial/ethnic categories.

It may be useful to note that because of the potential quantitative impact of the definition of "Spanish descent" on the budgetary and economic planning processes, a clearer definition is a fiscal necessity. A loose or ambiguous definition of the Spanish descent group can only facilitate a loose or ambiguous fiscal and management policy towards the Hispanic American and an equally ambiguous evaluation of the performance and management of public policy vis-a-vis the Hispanic American constituency.

The clearest illustration of that ambiguity by OMB is perhaps found in the "Federal Civil Rights Activities" chapter in the Special Analysis—Budget of the United States Government—Fiscal Year 1975. In this 18-page analysis of Federal civil rights activities, the only mention of the "Spanish-descent" are brief notes of:

(1) "The 16 point Presidential mandate to provide opportunities for Spanish-speaking citizens," in the context of management and executive level Federal jobs;

(2) "Steps to end discrimination against Spanish-speaking and other non-English speaking pupils" (an implicit reference to the *Lau v. Nichols* Supreme Court decision), and

(3) The activities of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish Speaking people, under the heading of "Civil Rights research and information dissemination."

No mention of Federal civil rights activities is made under the other major areas noted in the Special Analysis: Military Services Equal Opportunities, Private Sector Opportunities, Fair Housing, Civil Rights Conciliation and Prevention of Disputes and Minority Business Enterprise. Similarly, although civil rights activities for women is noted on numerous occasions, no mention is made of Hispanic American women. Although the Special Analysis does not provide for a substantive analysis of the projected Federal policies' impact on the various minorities, it does indicate the limited extent of Federal policy commitment on behalf of the Hispanic American for FY 1975.

The same condition prevails vis-a-vis the February 4, 1974 Budget Message of the President, and the Economic Report of the President of February 1, 1974 by the President's Council of Economic Advisors. The latter's specific concern for minorities extends to the black minority group alone; and its concern for women economic opportunities does not address the interests of minority women.

Both the Economic Report and the Budget are key instruments in the presentation and development of national policy postures. The advanced nature of data systems for the black minority groups and for women has permitted the systematic explicit inclusion of some of the interests of such groups, inadequate though such inclusions may be with regard to their groups. The absence of such a minimal inclusion of Hispanic Americans interests rests largely on either the Executive Office's Domestic Council, or the Office of Management and Budget, or both. The latter agency, however, is the agency responsible for the management information system (MIS) which provides the Domestic Council and the President with the information and data through which policy options are assessed and evaluated at those levels.

In November 1970, the Interagency Racial Data Committee initiated a joint effort with OMB to improve racial/ethnic data systems in the Federal government. The Committee had been organized at the request of an OEO Task Force on Uniform Civil Rights Policies and Practices, headed at that time by Frank C. Kent, Associate Director of OEO for Human Rights.

This Interagency Committee worked for nearly two years to deal with basic issues of racial/ethnic data policies, and, produced a two-volume report on December 1972 entitled, "Establishing a Federal Racial/Ethnic Data System." Throughout the report there is an emphasis on the role that the Office of Management and Budget must play if significant progress in the racial data area is to be made. Specifically noted is the following:

"The numerous inconsistencies in the agencies' present racial data practices, and the systematic nature of many of the deficiencies we observed, make it clear that some general guidance is required to make the government's racial data capability reasonably uniform and effective. Naturally, the agencies look primarily to the Office of Management to provide them with guidance and assistance in these matters, since they involve government-wide statistical and management policies."

The Interagency Committee also noted the existence of an OMB Racial Data Task Force, and the latter's support for "the ultimate connection between racial data reports and budget submissions."

Of particular interest with respect to the two task forces is the apparent absence of any role by the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People in their activities, even though a considerable amount of discussion on the Spanish-speaking took place, according to the above report and communications from OMB. Nor does there appear to have been significant, if any, input by Hispanic American civil rights and other interest groups, or participation by individual Hispanic Americans in these task forces. The Interagency Racial Data Committee's report indicates no communication with any Hispanic American organization.

As far as can be discerned from the activities of these Federal agency activities and discussions, the underlying problem is one of a conflict between the utilization of an ethnic classification for the Hispanic American, and the utilization of a national origin classification. That is, little if any serious consideration had been given to a classification for Hispanic Americans which is "neither black, nor white". A basic objection noted by some non-Hispanic American groups to the current definitions used to identify the Hispanic Americans is that the various umbrella terms do not assure equal treatment among the different nationality groups. Yet the implications of the national origin sub-classification seems not to have been thoroughly considered. For in redefining the Hispanic American iden-

tifier on the level of nationality, it places that sector of the population on the level of other national origin subgroups, rather than on the level of a "minority group".

There is distinct difference between a minority group and a national origin group—a difference recognized in terms of national economic and social policies, as well as a lengthy, broad-ranging legal history relative to civil and minority rights. The impact of a national origin policy applied to black people could be both meaningless and disastrous to black people throughout the country, if a national origin breakdown analogous to Hispanic Americans were applied to the black population. At no time, however, would one give serious consideration to a policy of national origin subgrouping for black Americans in which such subgroups, as the following, were to be classified: African origin, Cuban black, Mexican black, Puerto Rican black, Haitian, Asian black, Black native American, Dominican, West Indian black, South American black, Other Central American black, Polynesian, and other black origin.

Together, the latter sectors might number in the millions, a significant sector of the present race/color umbrella terms. The impact of a national origin approach on black Americans' rights and interests could constitute major complications for policy-makers and change the nature of present concerted economic and social development policies toward civil rights and equal opportunities for "minorities".

The inclusion of these national origin groups into a white category in the manner presently prescribed by the Bureau of Census vis a vis Hispanic American groups could (1) drastically alter the characteristics of both the white and the black population; (2) make the ethnic classification systems meaningless in terms of a more accurate reflection of interests and needs of both ethnic groups; and (3) could well create a framework within which the primary beneficiaries of economic and social policies would tend to be European white ethnics rather than those various national origin subgroups that are—for statistical purposes—included in the white classification.

In terms of national economic policies, a purely national origin approach toward resolving Hispanic American needs and interests is as inconsistent as would be a national origin approach toward resolving black American needs and interests. The consequences of such an approach would create a "double standard" for groups classified solely by national origin categories—for the national policy approach toward their rights would be fundamentally different. In the case of the Hispanic American, the current dual standard prevents the reorientation by government toward rights and needs of Hispanic Americans as either an identifiable minority group or as national origin subgroups.

Thus, for the purpose of social and economic identifiers, only black-minority and white-majority interests exist in OMB. By the current system of classifications utilized in OMB for social and economic purposes, Hispanic American, as well as Hispanic American subgroup interests, are not encompassed in either of the white or black need and interest classifications. This condition is evident from the absence of any role within social and economic indicators pertinent to either the Hispanic American or the national origin subgroups.

The key role played by the Office of Management and Budget is that of providing sound information to policy-making agencies and groups in the Executive Office of the President and to Congress, as well as State and local units of government. One major illustration of how far the exclusion of information on Hispanic American civil rights has gone within OMB can be assessed from an analysis of its publication of Social Indicators 1973. The activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare further illustrate that same condition. Even though two former OMB officials are now key officials in that Department, there is no indication of any effort to systematically advance the civil rights of the "Spanish descent people" or of the various national origin groups within that umbrella classification.

SOCIAL INDICATORS

The ethos of efficiency and effectiveness dominates the political, business, and social scenes. Management of policies, the budget, plans, programs and evaluations has become the style of recent Administrations. Efficiency and effectiveness have become popular terms from local to the national levels. Their popularity reflects the desire by administrators and the political leaders to produce programmatic solutions to social and economic needs whose products can be measurably demonstrated or verified as successful. Every government and every administration has been concerned with this issue. The enormous reorganization efforts during the present generation is the outgrowth of a long history of efforts to organize federal

government more efficiently and effectively. Virtually all legislative measures bring about changes in governmental organization, as do administrative regulations, policies, and court decisions. Other factors, such as population changes and economic conditions, also have brought on a reorganization of administrative responses. The volume of special purposes subcommittees in Congress is a reflection of the organizational responses to specifically perceived needs and interests, as are the mass of statistical service systems within federal agencies. The Hoover Commission of the 1950's, and the efforts toward instituting the "PPBS" techniques in all major federal agencies during the 1960's, are significant illustrations of a modern government's attempt to come to grips with management needs of the fourth largest nation in the world in terms of population.

The present Administration's reorganization activities are an extension of the developments of previous years' activities. Major reorganization of our administrative apparatus would have taken place regardless of which political party was in office. Hence, the issue of reorganization is not simply a matter of efficiency or effectiveness of government responses to new and old needs and interests, but also a matter of efficiency and effectiveness "for whom"? The often used term within the current Administration of "management by objectives" raises the question of who is included within the objectives?

The reorganization entailed in general and special revenue sharing and consolidation, in decentralization and regionalization, has yet to be assessed in terms of their impact on America, although they are described and defended as part of moves toward efficiency. The creation of the Domestic Council to plan domestic policy, and the Office of Management and Budget, to see that the policy and the programs that flow from it are successfully carried out, places the issue of management by objectives at the highest level of government. Under such a system, organizational assignments and authority are clearly delineated and delegated from the top downward, and the issue of who is to be part of the objectives or benefit from the objectives, becomes very much an issue of a specifically defined inclusion within the information systems upon which policies are based and objectives are plainly set out.

Within the framework of management by objectives, the role of economic and social indicators is a highly, significant, if not determinative one. Economic and social indicators provide for the statistical base which enables policy-makers to assess the existing conditions, determine what has to be done, and evaluate the impact of policies and programs. The use of the indicators-approach as a policy instrument has been stressed during the present Administration since the creation of the National Goals Research Staff in July of 1969 and the publication of its report, *Toward Balanced Growth: Quantity with Quality*, one year later. In a statement announcing the establishment of the National Goals Research Staff, the President explicitly noted the importance of "the collection, correlation, and processing of data relating to social needs, and in the projection of social trends."

The importance of the social statistics activities of the Federal government has been underscored by OMB's publication of *Social Indicators 1973*, which was developed by Daniel B. Tunstall of the Statistical Policy Division of OMB. The Census Bureau participated in the research and development of the report which is projected as a publication on an annual basis. It is a 258-page "collection of statistics selected and organized to describe social conditions and trends in the United States."

"The concerns have been defined and selected to reveal the general status of the entire population; to depict conditions that are, or are likely to be, dealt with by national policies; and to encompass many of the important issues facing the Nations."

"The concerns thus embody widely held basic social objectives."

The 1973 collection focuses on eight social areas: health, public safety, education, employment, income, housing, leisure and recreation, and population. The report states that "in almost every case, the national totals are disaggregated to show at least the age, sex, and racial characteristics of the population. The degree of detail varies from indicator to indicator and, wherever possible, has been determined by identifying these groups in the population which are most vulnerable to, or most affected by, a peculiar condition or which represent a unique situation."

The Introduction to the report notes that "the main reason for this disaggregation is to identify and compare significant groups within the population and to show their changing conditions relative to each other and to their national average". According to its authors, the report "is restricted almost entirely to data about objective conditions" and most of the data included "have been taken from federal sources; their quality can be verified by those agencies".

Although the express function of the report was to have been the identification and comparison of "significant groups" within the population to show their changing conditions, what must be highlighted about this report is that not once throughout its more than 260 pages was the existence of Hispanic Americans noted. Further, "racial characteristics" have been defined exclusively in terms of Black and White.

The journalist, Joseph R. Slevin, commenting in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* last year in an article on "U.S. Set to Publish Social Indicators", stated that "social policy planners soon will have a better idea of where the country has been and where it can hope to go". Apparently drawing upon OMB sources, he added that "officials expect that federal planners will use the indicators to measure performance of a broad range of social programs". Slevin noted that "the new guide is being put together under the direction of Dr. Julius Shiskin, Chief Statistician of OMB. Shiskin has been working on the project since he and former Daniel Patrick Moynihan came up with the idea in mid-1969."

An August 19, 1974, New York Times article, entitled "Changes in Social Attitudes Monitored in Broad Surveys of the Quality of Life", by Robert Reinhold, deals with the same item: "According to Daniel B. Tunstall, who heads the project, the idea is to provide a kind of handbook for policy makers to evaluate social needs".

The simple question of what happens to the more than ten million racial/ethnic minority people that happen to be Hispanic Americans is quite clear. OMB's "new guide" and "handbook for policy makers" simply does not encompass the existence of non-black minorities. Using the data and perspectives provided in the *Social Indicators 1973*, how will the conditions of Hispanic Americans be dealt with by national policies? The utilization of the report by policy makers can only lend itself to the systematic exclusion, that is: Hispanos are non-citizens when federal government gets down to the business of planning, budgeting, and program evaluation.

If the *Social Indicators* approach provides for an "indicator" of how policies have been, are actually being, or will be evolved in this government, one can readily conclude that Hispanos will continue to be systematically deprived of Constitutional rights. In legal terms, OMB policies, at this stage, could be construed to be a travesty on the whole concept of equity and equality "equal protection under law", particularly since they resulted from factors over which OMB does have control, legislative and administrative responsibility.

OMB had no compelling need to develop the kind of limited racial classification as it did through, *Social Indicators 1973*. Its current classification system is not merely suspect, it is also "rational" in the sense that it indicates it "opted out" alternatives to the biracial classification approach. Further, the biracial classification involves a substantial infringement upon fundamental rights of the Hispanic Americans when it is used as, or becomes, a major determinant of chances for economic, social, cultural, and political success in the nation's competitive society. Similarly, the exclusion of the Hispano American on the basis of the wealth of information of the Black and White population, or on the basis of the government's self-imposed poverty of information on the Hispano American and other non-Black racial minorities, must raise substantial questions.

The decision to allot more information to a majority or one minority, at the exclusion of another minority, merely because of the fortuitous presence of such information, is to place the burden of public social and economic policy development entirely on the resources of the excluded minority.

A federal planning, budgeting and evaluation system which classifies on the basis of "information wealth" most drastically affects the poor Hispano Americans' development who are forced to compete for attention and resources with the information advantaged sectors of society who alone have access to the particular kind of data and information prescribed as a requirement for policy-formulation and policy-making by the policy-making institutions.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The emphasis on results-oriented methods for managing is nowhere more obvious in the field of social services, than in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department's Operational Planning System (OPS) specifically include the "principles of management by objectives", as the approach to efficiency and effectiveness within all agencies, including their regional offices. The 1972 DHEW Operational Planning System Handbook delineates the role of management by objectives within agency operations. It notes that:

"Through OPS, HEW has tailored management by objectives to fit its particular needs to: define explicitly the objectives and results expected from Departmental actions and expenditures; measure periodically the progress toward achievement of the objectives; surface existing or potential problems which would prevent the accomplishment of objectives, thereby enabling management to take corrective action that increases the probability of successful accomplishment; ensure the implementation of decisions made in the processes of long-range planning, budgeting, and policy development; and ensure the implementation of new legislation and new initiatives of the administration.

"The operational objectives are the immediate steps that the Department must take to accomplish its long-range goals. Operational planning, therefore, provides the mechanism to move from general goals to the precise achievements required of the Department in a single fiscal year."

Although there is a heavy emphasis on quantifiable objectives, measurable activities, and verifiable accomplishment, there is no guidance on what measuring tools the various agencies are to use. The Handbook does not deal with the operations of the agencies' statistical services systems, or the specially created information systems that supplement HEW agency activities, which have the data base upon which the OPS rests.

In view of the significance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare activities, it may be appropriate to briefly assess the role of several of its key statistical service systems, and note the adequacy of such systems with regard to the role they might play in advancing solutions to the social needs of Hispanic Americans. The Fiscal Year 1975 Budget also encourages such a review.

Federal outlays for manpower were \$4.8 billion. By contrast, outlays for social programs involve—according to the FY 1975 Budget—more than \$815 billion dollars (including education, health, income security, civil rights, and reduction of crime expenditures). The outlays for health are approximately seven times the amount for manpower; and the outlays for education three times the amount for manpower. Income security amounts to nearly \$130 billion dollars in outlays. The combined outlays for civil rights and reduction of crime are significantly higher than the outlays for manpower development. Both the education and health outlays are higher than those of the Department of Agriculture.

The health, education, and welfare agencies of the Department of HEW perform an enormous role in the social and economic well-being of the nation. The questions raised by the management by objectives approaches are whether and how they advance the social and economic well-being of Hispanic Americans.

An assessment of the DHEW National Centers for Health, Social and Educational Statistics, should provide for an indication of the extent management by objectives automatically and systematically includes consideration for the needs and interests of this nation's second largest minority. Implicit in this is whether efficiency and effectiveness are at all possible within agency structures when the information base necessary for policymaking does not encompass useable information or any information on the Hispanic American?

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

One of the most neglected fields of research and information gathering relative to the Hispanic American is to be found in health. At a time when serious consideration is being given to various national health insurance approaches, each containing the elements of major policy changes towards health services delivery systems, policy makers are confronted by an almost unprecedented situation. For virtually very little is known of the health conditions and needs of the Hispanic Americans. The status of the more than 10 million Hispanic Americans will have a great bearing on any national insurance program.

The National Center for Health Statistics plays a vital role in providing data and information upon which—in part, at least—government bases its health policies. The numerous reports on the Center's 1969-70 Data from the National Health Survey published in 1972 and 1973, contain no information on Hispanic Americans, although the survey made explicit provisions for the identification "color" category. The result is that we now have vital statistics on such matters as home care for the aged and chronically ill who are either white or black, but no vital statistics on the 10 million people in the U.S. whose background is Hispanic American. Similarly, the Center's reports on, for example, Infant Mortality Rates: Socioeconomic Factors (March 1972); Inpatient Utilization of Short-Stay Hospitals (March 1973); and The Leading Components of Upturn in Mortality for Men: United States—1952-67 (September 1971)—which is described as "An

analysis of rising mortality among men by cause presented separately for white men and for men of other races"—and its numerous other reports based on the National Vital Statistics System contain no information on the Hispanic American.

In short, the absence of natality, mortality, marriage/divorce, health examination, health resources, and health service data virtually precludes the development of sound national health care strategies to meet the needs of Hispanic American people. The absence of such data becomes critical when making a case for increased health manpower, and accessible health care systems in the Hispanic communities. There is no systematic way of illustrating any correlation between mortality rates, unemployment, underemployment, and the like, and accessible health care delivery and manpower. What information there is, merely indicates that health manpower vocations—both professional and allied health occupations—a small percentage of Hispanic Americans. The 1970 Census was able to identify the following information on the percentage of Hispanic Americans in the health manpower field: 0.7 percent health service workers, 1.4 percent dentists, 2.1 percent registered nurses, 3.6 percent physicians, 3.4 percent health technicians.

Unfortunately, no breakdown by subgroups (Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American) is available. A comparative data on Black professionals is available, showing the following: 21.9 percent health service workers, 2.3 percent dentists, 7.5 percent registered nurses, 2.2 percent physicians, 10.2 percent health technicians.

Considerable data is available on medical schools. During 1972-73, there were 114 medical schools. Of the 47,259 students enrolled, 8 percent or 3,918 were minority students including: 2,585 Blacks, 718 Mexican Americans, 90 Puerto Ricans, 69 American Indians, 21 Latin Americans, 17 Filipinos.

To what extent this manpower development meets the health needs and vocational aspirations of the above minorities, has yet to be discerned. Nor has it yet been determined to what extent non-minority health manpower effectively services minority health needs. Lastly, the extent to which the health education and manpower development institutions provide for "equal opportunities" is only one of many issues that can and must be effectively addressed in the context of improved data on health needs of Hispanic Americans.

The pattern of information gaps pervades nearly all of the public health and mental health services, with the exception of agency employment, "affirmative action" data within the agencies. Analyses of federal health and mental health agencies may well reveal increased affirmative action efforts towards employment, but such analyses also reveal no discernable changes in the policies of these agencies towards serving the Hispanic American constituencies and communities.

In a small study on the Spanish speaking aged conducted by the National Council of La Raza for the Long Term Care Division of the Health Resource Administration, the absence of any concern for, or conception of the needs of, our elderly by the larger local nursing home institutions was described at length. Similarly noted was the breakdown of basic information structures from the national to the local levels. The most common problems facing Chicano aged were health care and bilingual professional care. Among other recommendations, the report by the National Council of La Raza, entitled, "Access to Nursing Home Care for the Spanish Speaking Aged of the Southwest" (February, 1974), mentioned as one of the several specific areas needing extensive basic research, the collection of "accurate demographic and statistical data on cultural and ethnic characteristics pertinent to the design of adequate services for the Spanish speaking elderly."

In its extensive review of research and studies on the Spanish speaking elderly, the National Council of La Raza concluded that the absence of vital statistics was a major cause of federal policy failure to relate to the needs of Hispanic Americans. Responsibility for the inefficiency of such federal agencies rests on the National Center for Health Statistics, and the dozens of other health and health-related information systems agencies in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Neither the improvement of Census data collection, nor of unemployment data, will do much to help begin to understand the needs of our aged, or the health needs of Hispanic Americans in general.

Health data on Hispanic Americans is as important as other data, yet there is no Federal policy that insures the development and the access to such data. This is no less the case with regard to the whole social statistics enterprise in the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the Social Security Administration. As a consequence, there is presently no policy towards advancing the health of Hispanic Americans and their communities. A parallel condition exists with respect to the nations social policy.

\$215.2 billion was spent on public welfare in fiscal year 1973. This would amount to approximately \$1,000 per person in America if it were divided among every man, woman, and child in the U.S. In 1972, it was \$900. An additional \$80 billion existed in 1973 in the form of private social welfare spending. In the January, 1974, issue of the Social Security Bulletin, Alfred M. Skolnik and Sophie R. Dales of the Office of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration, note in their article on "Social Welfare Expenditures, 1972-73," that "the amounts spent for social welfare purposes in 1973 equaled 17.6 percent of the Nation's output of goods and services." Half of the Federal budget now goes to social welfare payments.

A relatively small proportion of the above is in the form of "public assistance support" or what is usually referred to as "welfare." Some 15 million persons receive public assistance during the month. This includes old age assistance, aid to the blind, the disabled, and poor families with dependent children. The amount of assistance involves some \$1 billion monthly. In addition, over \$800 million are expended monthly on medical assistance payments. (See Public Assistance Statistics—November, 1973, National Center of Social Statistics, March 27, 1974).

Although considerable controversy continues to surround both public assistance and medical assistance programs, particularly with regard to the minority issue, there is no doubt that all involved in the debate over welfare reform, health insurance, negative income tax, and social security benefits, lack useful and accurate data in many areas. This is no less the case with regard to Hispanic Americans who with an estimated 10 to 15 million population can but have a massive impact on the nation's social security and welfare system.

It is ironic that in the major battles surrounding welfare and health care reforms, little if any thought has been given to the actual status of this nation's second largest racial minority group. Policies have evolved which are based on an assumption that all who need help are being helped. However, if one were to press the Social Security Administration (SSA)-or the Social and Rehabilitation Service (SRS) to provide proof for such an assumption, it could not do so at this time.

There is a relatively simple cause for this void in the public "dialogue" over policies on welfare, for the social assistance agencies responsible for providing accurate information and data in their areas of authority, have failed to do so. There is virtually no public welfare data on the Hispanic population in the United States. Consequently, any policies geared to "helping all the people" are in fact based on opinions and prejudgments with respect to the Hispanic Americans which can be neither disproved nor verified through the available welfare data information of SRS and SSA.

There is no way of measuring what these agencies are doing to, or for, Hispanic American groups, nor how these agencies are dealing with their needs. There is no way of measuring the impact of welfare policies on Hispanic Americans. Indeed, that ethnic population has no way of making a case for or against any welfare policies past, present or future. It is quite possible that welfare policies, as currently defined, provide no solutions to this dilemma, and that these current policies are wholly destructive in terms of the family structure of Hispanic Americans.

The information gap is not an impossible barrier to the formulation of several welfare policies, but it is doubtful that such policies will be considered based on a limited statistical sample, or on interpretive studies and research undertaken by social scientists. Differential beneficiary data, encompassing the various Hispanic American subgroups in the Social Security Administration's data system, as well as DHEW's social data systems would go a long way toward providing the public with a better understanding of the real needs of this country.

Technically, this task is a feasible one, as revealed by various studies undertaken by the National Center for Social Statistics. The Findings of the 1971 AFDC Study (1971), Findings of the 1970 APTD Study (1972), Findings of the 1970 OAA Study (1972), and Findings of the 1970 AB/Study (1972), contain data on the Hispanic subgroups. Unfortunately, data utilization does not go beyond recipient data by Hispanic "birth or ancestry."

Other factors such as the detailed general demographic characteristics—e.g. age, sex, marital status, residence, education completed, occupation, etc.—have not been broken down. The same exists with regard to program information, health and mobility status, services provided, assistance status, living arrangements, household, and dependents.

While considerable data is accessible or already available on Black and White Americans, such is not the case with the Hispanic American. Whether the latter is included in the Black or White statistical category is not clear. Although due note is made of the fact that seven percent of the AF'D recipients are known to be of Hispanic American birth or ancestry. However, many states have a higher percentage of Hispanic recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled than the U.S. average for Hispanic Americans (20.1 in Colorado; 17.5 in Texas; 13.9 in New Mexico; 10.1 in Wyoming; 8.6 in Utah; and 8.4 in California). These statistics would be more meaningful if the appropriate supplementary data was available, and would allow for a re-evaluation of policy and administrative effectiveness of federal, state and local public agencies.

For Hispanics, it is doubtful that improvements in unemployment data and the census will be able to sufficiently incorporate the vital social statistics that have an immediate bearing on public assistance policy and employment needs. BIS and Census data will be meaningful only when there is other social data allowing for comparative analysis of needs and the correlation of such data and information.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS

Although a few improvements have been made over the past years on information systems within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare bearing on manpower and education, the gap is still enormous. On the whole, agencies in the Office of Education continue to develop and evaluate policies based on "black-white" social identifier criteria.

Additionally, the failures of our public and private schools to advance accurate information about our school systems delivery of services compound the ability to adequately develop factual policies which take into account the role of Hispanic Americans in our society.

The above-mentioned condition is readily evidenced by the lack of attention given to the research and studies of Dr. George D. Mayeske, et. al., of the U.S. Office of Education in *A Study of the Achievement of our Nation's Students* (1973); *A Study of Our Nation's Schools* (1972); and *A Study of the Attitude Towards Life of Our Nation's Students* (1973). These intramural studies, published by the Office of Education as follow-up reports on the Coleman Report, are among the very few in-depth studies containing information on the Spanish speaking and and on Chicanos and Puerto Ricans specifically. There is no indication that government has used these reports in a positive fashion.

The National Council of La Raza, had the opportunity to both monitor and work with the Office of Education's National Advisory Committee on the Education of Bilingual Children. The total lack of accessibility to pertinent statistical information was of real concern to this Committee, which was mandated by law to advise the Commissioner of Education on policies towards children of limited English-speaking ability.

In its First Annual Report of March 25, 1974, the Advisory Committee noted that it is "an almost impossible task to advise on education policy at this time" because it lacked "pertinent detailed information."

Among the vital statistics the Advisory Committee did not have available was an estimate of the number of children with bilingual needs, and the number of such children at school district levels. It was for that reason that the Committee suggested extensive coordination of research and planning efforts of Federal education agencies, including the active involvement of the National Center for Educational Statistics and Division of Civil Rights. It specifically recommended the "design of a research instrument by the Bureau of Census to identify all school district areas with concentrations of limited and non-English speaking ethnic national origin groups in need of Bilingual Education."

A similar problem was faced by the Federal Interagency Committee on Education. Its April 1973 Task Force Report on Higher Education and the Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and American Indians "found education statistics for these groups to be sparse." It also noted that "formal evaluations of many existing programs are lacking, and it is difficult to judge the overall impact of these government efforts." Of its six recommendations, one deals with "Data Needs." It called on the Office of Management and Budget to "include in its Annual Special Analysis, a separate analysis of the impact of all Federal educational programs on disadvantaged minorities." In order to accomplish this task adequately it further

recommended that the Office of Management and Budget: "(1) coordinate development of common definitions for racial and ethnic groups; (2) instruct the Federal agencies to collect racial and ethnic enrollment and other educational data on a compatible and non-duplicative basis."

The Interagency Committee cited that "more accurate and uniformly reported data are needed to aid Federal agencies in programs with Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians; efforts to date have been handicapped by the lack of specific information with common categories and definitions to assist federal agencies to better identify the needs of these groups. It would seem more important to have a firm basis for spending federal moneys for these programs."

There is good reason to be concerned. Responsible elements of society want to know how and if Office of Education funds are making a positive contribution to quality education and to determine if State and local policies are doing the same. The very limited data on Hispanic Americans makes the development and assessment of education policies "guess work," speculation, or worse.

In view of the increased research activity by the National Center for Education Statistics and the apparent higher role assigned to the Center in the Office of Education Fiscal Year 1975 budget, it is clear that the Center can assume an increased information gathering role, systematically encompassing differential data on the various racial-ethnic groups. Until this takes place, the reliability of many if not most of the products of the Office of Education in general, and the National Center for Educational Statistics in particular, will be suspect on scientific grounds. An example of this is the 1972 edition of *Projections of Educational Statistics to 1971-82*, by Kenneth A. Simon, Chief of the References, Estimates and Projections Branch, and Martin M. Frankel of the Division of Statistical Information and Studies, published by the Center during 1973, which contains no racial-ethnic breakdown and no projections on Hispanic Americans.

There is no indication that the ten-year Higher Education Projection stakes account of differential projections relative to minorities. Yet, the Center's report notes that "experience indicates that the final grand enrollment figure for 1972 will be within 2 percent of these preliminary figures." One could surmise that those projections recognize or accept the fact that OE policies will not dramatically improve minority groups' access to educational opportunities, for no change beyond a 2-percent fluctuation is anticipated.

The report provides for no racial-ethnic data on enrollment of high school and higher education graduates and earned degrees; teachers; expenditures by educational institutions; or student charges at institutions of education. Such information would make it possible to estimate with greater accuracy the kind of needs to be met on all levels of government and the private sector.

A simple analysis of the age factor of Chicanos and Puerto Ricans which is fully 10 years below the national median age, according to Census data, would reveal the desirability of differential projections. The growth trend projections for that population sector are fundamentally different from those of the general population, including whites and blacks. Utilization of the undifferentiated statistics as a basis for education and fiscal policy-formulation by the Office of Education would lead to grossly inadequate responses to the pressures facing our Nation's school systems, and more particularly to Hispanic minority constituency needs.

Changing the information systems of the Office of Education does not appear to be a difficult task, as indicated, by the Center's 1973 reports on *Statistics of Non-public Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1970-71*, by Diane B. Gertler and Linda A. Barker; and *Adult Basic Education Program Statistics: 1970-71*, by Nicholas A. Osso. All three reports contain data collected on minority group enrollments. Although data on Hispanic Americans is available, minimal utilization for report and study purposes is indicative of low agency priority given to assessing needs of the Hispanic American population. As is the case with the *Projections of Educational Statistics* report, the accessible differential data on the various minorities is not made use of in policy-related statistical information, e.g., pupil costs and expenditures, health services provided, food services, average daily membership in classes, attendance, age levels breakdown by grades 1 through 12, and the like.

The Office of Education, and the National Center for Educational Statistics having the capability and professional talent to undertake significant research and data gathering activities pertaining to the various Hispanic American groups. The publication by William Dorfman, *Projects, Products and Services of the National Center for Educational Statistics 1973* shows that the Center undertakes

large numbers of surveys and other data gathering projects. Yet, its past record does not reveal one simple study devoted to assessing the state of the art vis-a-vis Hispanic American minorities. Thus, some of its most "innovative" projects, including the National Assessment of Educational Progress; Longitudinal Study of Educational Effects; Educational Indicators that Measure Social and Program Progress; and School Staffing Patterns, will not systematically incorporate the concerns of these minorities. This condition is quite serious in view of the Center's self-acknowledged importance in policy-formulation, including: "longitudinal analysis of trends in program expenditures and participation," "evaluation of the targeting of program funds," "recommendations on reallocation of funds for new program activities," "develop and review the Office of Education's budget requests and to support the budget requests before Congress," and other functions.

Indeed, the technological capabilities of OE in general, and NCES in particular, go far beyond the mere systematic inclusion principle for Hispanic Americans. The Center is already developing a "conversion system for defining school districts in terms of Census Bureau geographical areas," extracting socio-economic data from Census summary tapes. The School Resources and Community Characteristics Project apparently will include the obtaining of data on Hispanic American subgroups. Whether this data will be used in *all* other appropriate research areas, such as the Projections report, for example, is not clear at this time. Nor is it clear whether, or to what extent, that data will be readily accessible.

The National Center for Educational Statistics plays a vital role in determining the future growth policies within the education complex, an information and planning role which in terms of immediacy, has probably a greater quantitative impact on Hispanic Americans (50 percent of the latter population, or more than 5 million children and youths), than the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Agriculture, or the Census Bureau.

Thus, improved NCES data can provide for the development of solutions to problems revealed in BLS unemployment data. BLS data shows, in part, the effects of inadequate education policies, rather than the causes. As with other federal agencies, the issue of systematic inclusion of Hispanic Americans in the Office of Education's information systems is not a lack of technological capability, but the absence of a policy to make systematic use of that capability.

CONCLUSION

This report has largely steered away from the growing debate surrounding the census, labor statistics and agricultural data as it regards the Hispanic American. Rather its thrust has been on the root problems relating to Federal information policy which reflects all of these debates. The NCLR report, *Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans*, is intended to aid in defining the problem of informations systems as they pertain to Hispanic Americans. Its goals throughout have been: To bring about an increased awareness on the extent of the problem; and to provide a better understanding of its implications on the future economic, social and cultural development of Hispanic Americans.

There is great value in going beyond the confines of the undercount debate which pervades the current labor, census and farm household data. For such a debate fundamentally is one which deals with the technicalities of the Hispanic American dilemma rather than the policies behind them.

The policies behind the technicalities are of enormous import to minorities. Among the invidious outcomes of existing national policies is that they are structuring systems into essentially biracial schemas in which Hispanic Americans become systematically precluded or excluded from the benefits derived from such structured systems.

Although officially and statistically included within the population defined as white, the guarantees for a systematic access to the same opportunities provided for the members of that population classification are not provided for the Hispanic American within that same classification framework. Officially and statistically, Hispanics exist in one classification. Yet, officially, they also are identified with another classification—a minority. Within this latter classification, they do not exist statistically. Concurrently, within the white classification, they are not identified. In either instance is there an identification of needs and interests based on a statistical framework. In both cases, the Hispanic Americans are placed in a competitive situation without that kind of leverage which exists for the predominant white and black sectors! The system is artificially structured against equality

in competition. The issue of equal opportunities becomes, in effect, a competition of human need vs. human need, rather than an issue of equal rights for all minorities.

The problem is systematically defined as one of unequal competition in which Hispanic Americans do not have the built-in advantages of blacks and whites.

The problem facing minorities should not be a matter of competition for equality among minorities; rather, at the minimum, it should be systematically structured toward an equality in competition with the economically and socially advantaged sectors of society. In the terms of laws and rights, however, the issue should not at all be structured on a basis of competition among ethnic and racial groups. Policies should be based on human needs and rights of *all* people and their communities.

Sound management breaks down within the above context. Policies formulated within a system of management that do not identify major interests based on sound information are preferential policies for the included groups whose interests are defined. By definition, Hispanic Americans tend to be least represented among those interests included in the information systems used for policy formulation. An analysis of social indicators, management performance systems, and productivity measurements concepts reveals fundamental flaws in rational public policy making.

These flaws place upon the Hispanic Americans the burden of asserting their rights, interests and needs solely within the pale of pressure politics and political favoritism. Such assertion runs headlong into conflict with management, the other interest groups that are identified within the information systems, the strategies and already established priorities.

The reason for the prevalent non-priority assigned by management and policy makers to the Hispanic American in domestic policies is itself the logical consequence of the low-quality information systems of our government. The current strategic exclusion of the Hispanic American from domestic policies inherently becomes a consequence of value judgments by managers and policy makers, rather than a consequence of management judgment.

Far from eliminating management problems, the present policy structures are geared to create problems as a result of the lack of identification of interests based on sound statistical information, as well as prevent solutions to basic social and economic needs of millions of people who happen to be Hispanic Americans, and of thousands of barrios and Hispanic American neighborhoods throughout the nation. The prevention of such solutions negatively affects the well-being of non-Hispanics in these areas, as well as the community-at-large.

Throughout this report the desirability and value of an explicitly enunciated national policy for high quality management and high quality management information systems has been suggested. Such a policy is in the interest of all minority groups, and especially, of the disproportionate number of poor and lower income sectors of this nation's communities.

The basis of the critique of federal management information systems is that the latter are not high quality, and, that the lack of quality is a reflection of current national policies' inadequacies. Although there may be various causes of these inadequacies, a major contributing factor is the inefficiency of racial/ethnic data policies of the Federal government. The major illustration of this inefficiency is found in the data information policies of agencies in relation to the Hispanic Americans.

An analysis of those policies reveals that a management information systems (MIS) approach by the Federal government toward the Hispanic American does not exist. From this, it follows that Federal policies toward the Hispanic American are based on considerations other than rational decision-making. The only alternative to rational decision-making is decision-making based on feelings and attitudes, value judgments and the like. The logical product is inefficiency and ineffectiveness in management.

A pragmatic response to this condition entails the systematic improvement in racial/ethnic data. This requires a policy for systematic improvement of racial/ethnic data gathering and dissemination.

Three key questions have been raised concerning the existing policies of the nation's information systems:

(1) Can the social and economic interests of Hispanic Americans be incorporated in the National Interest as defined by fundamental rights and laws relating to racial/ethnic groups?

(2) Can the social and economic interests of Hispanic Americans be defined in a forthright and responsible manner in accord with the democratic *processes* of this nation?

(3) Can the dominant force in social and economic policymaking be based on sound information on Hispanic American groups which appropriately identifies needs and interests for the managers and planners of this nation?

The critique basically revolves around these three questions which essentially deal with the question of constitutional rights, reliance on the democratic process and insistence on sound management. The picture that evolves out of an assessment of current policies is one in which all three questions are answered negatively within the public sector. That picture would lead one to believe that "equal protection under law" does not apply to Hispanic Americans in the technologically advanced society. The position of the National Council of La Raza is that equality is both a possibility and a necessity—from the technical and practical perspective, as well as the legal perspective.

Management of a healthy democratic society is based on a dialogue of give and take, based on sound and extensive information about all the participants in the dialogue. While not geared to perfection, such a democracy and its managers do not create policies which insure that no dialogue can take place. They do not create policies which result in placing minorities at a disadvantage in helping to advance themselves, their interests, and their participation in the processes of a more efficiently managed society.

In a technologically advanced society, many of the dialogues take place within the "management information system," or as a result of the hard data acquired through such a system, rather than in a public forum. The absence of the Hispanic American from that type of systems dialogue can and does place unnecessary disadvantages on Hispanic Americans in this nation's public affairs. The disadvantages resulting from the information systems policies, patterns and practices cannot be construed as being in the national interest or in keeping with constitutional rights, the democratic processes and sound management, which are the goals and guidelines of those interest groups who are part of the American tradition.



