

MID-DECADE CENSUS

4 - JUN - 6
Copy . . . 1973

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS,

OF THE

U. S. Congress, House

COMMITTEE ON

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

PROPOSALS FOR A MID-DECADE CENSUS OF POPULATION
AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

APRIL 9, 1973

Serial No. 93-4

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



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1973

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York, *Chairman*
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina, *Vice Chairman*

MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona	H. R. GROSS, Iowa
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey	EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania	ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Pennsylvania
JAMES M. HANLEY, New York	LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Maryland
CHARLES H. WILSON, California	JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California
JEROME R. WALDIE, California	ELWOOD HILLIS, Indiana
RICHARD C. WHITE, Texas	WALTER E. POWELL, Ohio
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	WILLIAM O. MILLS, Maryland
FRANK J. BRASCO, New York	RICHARD W. MALLARY, Vermont
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri	ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado	L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS, Florida
JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY, Massachusetts	
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida	

JOHN H. MARTINY, *Chief Counsel*
VICTOR C. SMIROLODO, *Staff Director and Counsel*
WILLIAM A. IRVINE, *Assistant Staff Director*
THEODORE J. KAZY, *Senior Staff Assistant*
ROBERT E. LOCKHART, *Assistant Counsel*
ROY C. MESKEE, *Staff Assistant*
FRANCIS C. FORTUNE, *Coordinator*
RALPH J. DEVLIN, *Staff Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS

RICHARD C. WHITE, Texas, *Chairman*

JAMES M. HANLEY, New York	JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona	ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida	L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS, Florida
CHARLES H. WILSON, California	

(Room B-345(b), Rayburn Building—Ext. 56741)

KF27
 P634
 1973a
 copy 2

CONTENTS

Statement by—	Page
Aiken, John H., executive director of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference.....	30
Bogue, Prof. Allan G., chairman, department of history, University of Wisconsin, accompanied by Dr. Paul Ward, secretary for American History Association.....	17
Daniels, Thomas E., administrative assistant, the genealogical society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.....	23
Hagan, Robert L., Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census, accompanied by Alfred Meisner, Assistant General Counsel, Department of Commerce.....	1
Harlan, Louis R., representing the Organization of American Historians.....	72
Statements submitted by—	
Albert, Hon. Carl, Speaker of the House of Representatives.....	82
Bensko, Robert R., assistant city manager, city of Hallandale, Fla.....	86
Broomfield, Hon. William S., Member of Congress from the State of Michigan.....	79
Brotzman, Donald G., Member of Congress from the State of Colorado.....	80
Colket, Meredith B., Jr., director, the Western Reserve Historical Society.....	85
Day, Miss Nancy H., private citizen.....	89
Erlenborn, Hon. John N., Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.....	78
Ferebee, S. Scott, Jr., FAIA, president, the American Institute of Architects.....	85
Fuqua, Hon. Don, Member of Congress from the State of Florida.....	81
Griffiths, William S., city manager, city of Opa-Locka, Fla.....	86
Haden, Ms. Eunice B., national chairman, Lineage Research Committee, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution....	82
McGann, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard A., private citizens.....	99
MacDougall, Hon. William R., executive director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	93
Madden, Dr. Carl H., chief economist, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.....	91
Marden, Robert H., president, Council of State Planning Agencies....	83
Martin, George C., president, National Association of Home Builders..	95
Perry, Mrs. Joyce C., secretary, Prince Georges County Genealogical Society.....	95
Pollard, Ms. Sharon M., historian and professional genealogist.....	90
Rarick, Hon. John R., Member of Congress from the State of Louisiana.....	78
Rhoads, Hon. James B., Archivist of the United States.....	99
Stryker-Rodda, Kenn, president, National Genealogical Society.....	84
Vanik, Hon. Charles A., Member of Congress from the State of Ohio.....	97
Wildman, J. Ross, Investments, Oklahoma City.....	96
Wildman, Mrs. Marguerite Rieks, past president, Oklahoma Society, Colonial Dames XVII Century.....	96
Zuccotti, John E., chairman, city planning commission, city of New York.....	96
Material submitted—	
Report on Federal Statistics Users' Conference survey regarding proposals for a mid-decade census of population and housing.....	36

MID-DECADE CENSUS

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1973

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

The committee met at 9:30 a.m., in room 321, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Richard C. White (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. WHITE. The Census and Statistics Subcommittee will come to order. This committee is convened for the purpose of hearing testimony regarding proposed bills that have been introduced on the mid-decade census and we have a number of witnesses who are present as well as other persons who are observing.

Last year this committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Wilson, did pass out a mid-decade census bill which went to the full committee and was reported to the floor, but due to the logjam at the latter part of the session, it was unable to report from the House. So therefore, we have a history of information and testimony on this particular bill, and it is our pleasure that you have come today to enlighten new members and add to the record so that we can take action on these bills. Some of these bills do contain matters which, I don't believe, were addressed in the other bills, such as a confidentiality question.

At this time I would like to call the first witness. I believe it is Mr. Robert Hagan. Counsel, is that the first witness?

Mr. BRAY (staff assistant). Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hagan? If you have any other persons you would like to have come up with you, just pull up a chair. It will be all right.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. HAGAN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, ACCOMPANIED BY ALFRED MEISNER, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. HAGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am glad to be here this morning. I am Robert L. Hagan, Acting Director of the Bureau of the Census. In response to the chairman's invitation, I will present the Department of Commerce position on five bills to amend certain sections of title 13, United States Code.

Mr. Alfred Meisner, Assistant General Counsel with the Department of Commerce, is here with me this morning. I prepared a statement that with your permission I shall read for the record.

Mr. WHITE. Fine.

Mr. HAGAN. I will outline our position on the more important aspects of the five bills, these bills are H.R. 546, H.R. 592, H.R. 1386, H.R. 1629, and H.R. 4426, which provide for a mid-decade census or

sample survey of population; limit the categories of questions for which reporting is mandatory in a mid-decade census or survey and in the decennial census; and to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, and for other purposes.

The Department of Commerce recommends that none of the proposed legislation be enacted as presently stated, although some provisions of H.R. 4426 are desirable. The Department's position is based on the following points: H.R. 546, 592, and 1386 all provide for a mid-decade census. The term census usually implies a complete enumeration of the population, even though some of the information may be collected on a sample basis. If this is what is intended by the legislation, then we think the cost—\$200 to \$300 million, depending on the scope of the census—is greater than can be justified by the needs for the data. We are therefore opposed to these bills.

The Department favors the provision of H.R. 4426 directing the Bureau of the Census to conduct a sample survey in 1975, and every 10 years thereafter. The Bureau already has authority to conduct such surveys, but we agree that legislation requiring such surveys to be conducted would be desirable.

The President has included in his fiscal year 1974 budget a request for preparatory funds for a 1975 sample survey of the social and economic characteristics of the population. The proposed size of the 1975 survey sample is approximately 1 million households and its total cost would be about \$45 million.

A sample survey of this size does not require as much lead time as a full census. Consequently, if Congress approves the request for funds and the moneys are made available at the beginning of the fiscal year, the Bureau can still conduct the sample survey in 1975. However, if there is any delay in funding, 1976 is the earliest the survey could be done. In your March 29 letter to me, you indicated that a motion will be made to amend H.R. 4426 to change the date of mid-decade activities from 1975 to 1976. We therefore would suggest that the possible amendment to H.R. 4426 give the Secretary discretion to conduct the survey in either 1975 or 1976. In future decades, we favor requiring the survey to be done in years ending with five.

I would like to emphasize several points from our presentation on confidentiality. H.R. 4426 has several other provisions we favor. The amendments proposed by section 4 of H.R. 4426 to section 8 of title 13 eliminate obsolete references to Governors and courts of record and establishing how and to whom an authenticated copy of a census record may be furnished are considered desirable.

The authority to make special statistical compilations and surveys for departments, agencies, and establishments of the Federal Government, in addition to the present authorization to perform these functions for State or local agencies and private persons and agencies, would eliminate a present ambiguity in what authority the Bureau should cite in performing such services for Federal agencies.

Section 5 of H.R. 4426 would amend section 9 of title 13 by making more specific the confidentiality provisions for data collected by the Bureau. The amendment would apparently eliminate a controversy over the availability of past decennial records and establish the limited uses of census reports. We generally favor this amendment.

We would suggest two additional sections to the amendment of section 9 title 13 to clarify issues that may be variously interpreted. Part (b) of this amendment describes quite explicitly the restraints on the uses of the data that apply to other Government agencies. Similar restraints on the Department of Commerce are implied but not as clearly stated. We would favor using similar language for the Department of Commerce. The second section relates to difficulties that may occur in attempting to prosecute for refusal to answer questions or willfully providing false answers. A strict interpretation of the proposed legislation would prohibit the Bureau of the Census from providing a court with the information required to prosecute such cases. An additional section permitting disclosure in such circumstances is necessary.

This discussion of the confidentiality provisions of H.R. 4426 sets forth our views on this subject from our standpoint as the agency carrying out the census laws. We recognize, however, that others, including Federal agencies, have different interests in the wealth of data stored in our files. Census files are probably the best single source of historical and genealogical data. The General Services Administration in its exercises of Archives functions believes that information furnished by individuals in the taking of population censuses should be made publicly available after a period of years for proper historical and genealogical purposes. In fact GSA feels the Archives law (44 U.S.C. 2104) now provides for such release. H.R. 4426 would amend section 9 of title 13 by adding a subsection 9(c) to make the Archives law subject to the census law permitting no such release of information from the census records, forever, unless the respondent or his descendant.

We share the view that it would be desirable for census information to become available for legitimate purposes *if its release will not constitute an invasion of privacy or serve to destroy public faith that under the confidentiality provision of the census law answers cannot be used to the detriment of the respondent*. If this faith is lessened, the accuracy of the census will also be lessened. If it is determined that a permanent ban on release, as proposed in H.R. 4426, is excessive, we must be careful that any less stringent approach does not involve legal problems in view of the commitments made at the time these censuses were taken. Some 7 million people living in 1970 were covered in the census of 1900. We must be careful not to breach the trust which secured response to that census. We are willing to work with General Services Administration and the Office of Management and Budget and other agencies to try to resolve this complex issue.

Section 10 of H.R. 4426 would extend the penalties of section 214 of title 13 to any Federal employee who, because of his employment has access to census data and discloses such data. Such employees would be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. The section also increases the present \$1,000 fine and 2 year imprisonment penalties to sworn Census Bureau employees. By extending this penalty to any Federal employee who has access to census data because of his employment, an expanded assurance of confidentiality of census data is established. It is assumed the amendment would apply to census records which are transported by, or placed in storage by another Federal agency. The amendment is favored.

PRISON TERMS FOR REFUSAL TO REPORT

We do not agree with the elimination of imprisonment features of sections 221, 224, and 225 of title 13 as called for in sections 11-13 of H.R. 4426. The fines now authorized are relatively small and would not, by themselves, induce unwilling persons or business firms to cooperate with the census effort. It is believed that the imprisonment penalties serve to deter willful or flagrant refusal to participate in a census. Courts are under no obligation to enforce imprisonment penalties, but removal of such an authority could cause serious problems in completing a full and accurate census.

SPECIAL CENSUSES

Section 9 of H.R. 4426 would add a new section 197 to title 13 and provide authority to conduct special censuses for States, counties, cities and other political subdivisions. The Bureau has been performing these functions under section 8 of title 13 which authorizes surveys for State or local officials. The proposed section 197 is, therefore, considered unnecessary.

VOLUNTARY REPORTING

H.R. 1386 and 1629 are objectionable in their provisions to limit to seven categories the number of questions a respondent must answer in population and housing censuses without penalty. As we see it, enactment of the proposed legislation would require two censuses—one on the mandatory basis covering the seven categories, the other on a voluntary basis covering a sample of the population. The Bureau of the Census conducts both voluntary and mandatory survey operations and is familiar with both. To attempt to conduct a census, a part of which is on a mandatory basis and another part on a voluntary basis, would lead to so many problems of incomplete returns, respondent and interviewer confusion, and problems of followup, that the cost of the census would be greatly increased, the quality suffer and the resultant stretchout in the completion of the field work would delay important tabulations.

This proposal has been made several times before, and representatives of the Bureau have always expressed their concern about being able to conduct a census under such conditions. We know of no country in the world that conducts censuses with voluntary provisions. We have noted in the record of the subcommittee's visit to a group of foreign countries last year, that the issue of voluntary reporting in censuses was raised with a number of Government statisticians, with the unanimous reaction that they did not think they could conduct voluntary censuses.

RECOUNTS

Finally, H.R. 1386 is objectionable in its provision for a new section 196 to provide for recounts of population of a State, county, city or other unit of government, if the unit of government believes that reasonable grounds exist for a belief that the count is incomplete. The proposed section 196 does not set standards or state what facts

and figures or other information would be furnished in support of a recount request. No alternative is given; if a unit of Government requests a recount because it has some facts and figures that form a belief its population count was inaccurate, a recount must be made. No time limit is specified as to how long after a census is reported that a request may be made. As a matter of policy, we always check information supplied by units of Government concerned about our counts and did so literally hundreds of instances following the 1970 census but we do not consider recounts an acceptable device for obtaining accurate census totals. We consider recounts unfeasible because of the impossibility of reconstructing at a much later date the population as it existed on April 1.

I should like to bring to the committee's attention one additional item that relates to the issue of confidentiality. A pervasive flaw in the Federal statistical information system is the lack of comparability among economic statistics series because of differences in lists of firms used by the various agencies. These include differences in industry classification, in degrees of completeness of the lists, in updating of the lists with regard to companies and establishments going out of business, mergers, new incorporations, etc., and other inconsistencies.

Over the past 3 to 4 decades there have been several commissions appointed by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Commerce and others whose studies have contained the recommendation that a complete list of business establishments in the United States be compiled and regularly updated for common use in the Federal statistical information system.

Beginning with fiscal year 1972, appropriations have been made by the Congress for the Census Bureau to develop and maintain such a list. Planning and developmental work began that year and are continuing with the goal of having an automated list system operative in calendar 1975. It is expected that upon its institution, the Office of Management and Budget will require that other Federal statistical agencies use the list in lieu of the continued maintenance of separate agency lists.

To effectively operate this statistical establishment list, legislation will be needed which will enable the consolidation by the Bureau of the Census of Federal administrative record data and possibly other agency source data, and permit statistical access to the file by Federal agencies for a very limited number of items of information such as firm name, location, industry classification, employer identification number, and size classification. The legislation will not only specify the limitation of items but the precise confidentiality requirements.

The Department's written comments do not contain any reference to this because we are not yet ready with any proposed legislation and consequently it did not seem appropriate to discuss it. However, I do not want to alert the committee to the fact that it is likely we will propose such legislation in the near future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Hagan. At this time I will call on Mr. Hinshaw. Before I do so, insofar as this committee belongs to the people and insofar as so many people do come here who are familiar with the field, we are going to give the opportunity for those

present to submit one question on a piece of paper and pass it to counsel, and if we have time for those questions to be asked of Mr. Hagan, we will. If you want to try to do that, we will be happy to entertain your questions, providing they are pertinent and will be instructive and helpful to this committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hagan, to what extent have you explored the feasibility of doing not only a mid-decade census but of a complete census supplemented in part by administrative records of other units of State, city, county government?

Mr. HAGAN. We have underway a research effort using administrative records presently available from a number of sources. We have also undertaken cooperative projects with State agencies to develop population estimates. This effort is limited at the present time to developing State and county population estimates. We consider this research to have been quite productive up to this point. In fact, we are optimistic about being able to improve and extend our techniques. There is a substantial administrative record activity included in our proposed 1975 sample survey which would permit us to develop reliable population estimates for larger size places.

Mr. HINSHAW. When do you expect the feasibility study to be complete?

Mr. HAGAN. Results will be available next year after we complete the first cycle. This information will be provided to the Office of Revenue Sharing for their consideration for use in computation of amounts to be paid under the Revenue Sharing Act.

Mr. HINSHAW. Are the population estimates generally extrapolated from other types of physical characteristics?

Mr. HAGAN. Primarily birth records, death records, and migration information, which is probably the most difficult element to obtain on a reliable basis. Other types of information that the States may have, of course, are considered, and used where the validity of the data is substantiated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, is it not an appropriate method of estimating population to go to housing data, numbers of single family houses, number of housing units in apartments, number of utility connections?

Mr. HAGAN. That is a possible element, although you have to be careful with that approach if used to the exclusion of other information. For example, the number of—

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not suggesting that we do it to the exclusion of other information, but isn't it an appropriate ingredient?

Mr. HAGAN. Yes, it is an appropriate ingredient. The point I wanted to make is that the number of occupants per housing unit does change and it is dangerous to estimate the population totals from information of that type without obtaining some other information regarding the trend in the number of occupants.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do you have information on the 20 States as to how they estimate population? What ingredients?

Mr. HAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HINSHAW. Could you provide to the committee some of this information? We will be in a better position to evaluate the bills that are now before us or those that might be put before us; also as to what the ingredients are of your feasibility study.

Mr. HAGAN. Yes, sir; we will be happy to provide that information. [The following tabulation was furnished:]

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
AVAILABILITY OF STATISTICS FROM ALTERNATIVES TO A MID-DECADE CENSUS

April 5, 1973

Type of statistical program	Size of population group for which counts can be estimated	Size of population group for which characteristics can be published.	Estimated cost (over 5-year period) ¹	
			Limited set of questions	Full set of questions
1. Intensive use of administrative data plus 1½ percent sample survey (uniform sampling rate throughout the United States).	All States, and cities, and counties with over 250,000 population. The new sources of data plus the 1½-percent sample will provide usable data down to areas of 50,000 persons (although not with quite the same reliability as the other proposals). It is unlikely that we can go below 50,000 unless the use of administrative records turns out to be exceptionally successful. Also, it is unlikely that data can be produced for subareas of cities, such as neighborhoods.	Quite detailed statistics for States and very large SMSA's, limited detail for areas over 250,000 persons, and simple totals and distributions (without cross-classifications) in areas from 50,000 to 250,000. Exploration would be made of the possibility of greater use of administrative records in such fields as income, employment, earnings, and school enrollment.	\$35,000,000	\$45,000,000
2. 25-percent sample (uniform sampling rate) ²	All States, and cities, and counties with 25,000 persons or more. This would include groups of small contiguous counties, or neighboring cities. It would also include subareas containing 25,000 or more persons.	Characteristics would be available for all areas for which such data are published for the 1970 census, i.e., down to the tract level, although for places under 25,000 the data might be shown as percentage distributions rather than absolutes.	115,000,000	200,000,000
3. Minimum census (questions limited to age, sex, marital status, race, national origin, home ownership, and a few additional items).	All areas of the U.S. for which 1970 Census data were tabulated.	Only the limited set of items are available—but for all areas for which these items were tabulated in 1970.	200,000,000	-----
4. Complete census (repet of detail in 1970).	Same as in 1970.	Same as in 1970.	-----	300,000,000
5. Census-sample with 25,000 cutoff (Census for cities and counties under 25,000, varying sampling rate for larger areas, with minimum sampling rate of 5 percent; where census is used, detailed characteristics will be obtained for only a 20-percent sample).	All States, places, and counties in the United States; subareas within cities would range from the tract level for places under 75,000 up to subareas of 200,000 in cities of 1,000,000 or more.	Characteristics would be available for all areas for which data are published in 1970, except for tracts. Tract-type data could be provided for subareas within cities ranging from 4,000 in small cities to 200,000 cities of 1,000,000 and more.	145,000,000	170,000,000

¹ The cost estimates shown here (a) take into account expected population and housing unit work-loads as of April 1975, and (b) are based on January 1973 wage and price levels.

² Including cost of administrative records.

³ This proposal uses a 1-percent coefficient of variation as the standard of accuracy required for the publication of estimates of the total population of an area. For characteristics of the population, the minimum tabulation area would have the same reliability as tract data in 1970. Although the Bureau of the Census recommends these standards, they are obviously a matter of judgement, and

others may feel the standards are too high or low. Tables 1 and 2 that are attached show what the population cutoff would be if other standards are used. These tables also show the population cutoffs that would result if other sample sizes are used. (It should be noted that the 1-percent coefficient of variation does not reflect problems of undercoverage in addition to sampling errors. The Bureau of the Census' experience is that population estimates from sample surveys are usually 1- to 3-percent lower than complete census data. See the Mar. 22, 1972, letter from Dr. Brown to Congressman Wilson for details.)

Mr. WHITE. At this time, I will turn to Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In my district we have several cities with populations from 5,000 to 35,000 or 40,000. These cities such as Opa Locka have increased 35 to 40 percent and even doubled in population since the 1970 census. And I am concerned whether the mid-decade census would accurately reflect the changes in these cities. One city is Hallandale where one housing project will increase its population 39 percent. And this is low-cost housing, which actually stimulates the need for revenue sharing, which is based on census figures. Another example includes areas where the population has more than doubled since the 1970 census with condominium high rises. They have the problems of density and environmental problems that are also going to require some relief on the basis of, once again, census information. And I wonder whether the mid-decade census which you propose is going to offer the kind of informational relief—I guess you would call it that—that would enable these cities to cope with the problems that they are facing at that time.

Mr. HAGAN. I am afraid it wouldn't, Congressman, under the program that we are proposing. The sample of course is approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ percent, and the population size areas for which we could determine or prepare reliable estimates is limited to population groupings of 50,000 or more; so the size places you are talking about would not be that large.

Mr. LEHMAN. In order to properly do that, what would it take? I guess it would just take more money and more equipment to get the kinds of information retrieval just on information which would not delay increased funds for these cities for 10 years at a time. Even in education we are facing certain problems with our title I programs due to census data. And in an area like south Florida, changes occur so fast that data can't keep up with them. So I guess only if you had enough money, you could do what you wanted to?

Mr. HAGAN. It would take a virtually full census to accomplish that objective for the smaller size cities. However, if an entire county elected to have us do a special census, those figures would be used by the Office of Revenue Sharing, but at the present time that is the only option that these smaller places have. If the growth is by annexation, then we do provide an adjusted population total based on the 1970 census.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am just trying to find out what I can do, what effort I can make for these two areas, and another which is going to grow from 5,000 to 15,000 in the next couple of years. And these are the kinds of cities that are hurting the worst for the kind of services that are based on census data. And I think that this is the kind of situation that I have got to address myself to as a member of this committee, in order to help the people that I represent. So I am going to struggle for the kind of legislation that will enable the census people to furnish this kind of information. These are the kinds of situations that are very vital to the health and welfare and actually the orderly growth of these areas. If you didn't have the data to deal with them you couldn't—the mayor of one of these particular cities was up here to meet with myself and the two senators from Florida, and he needs ongoing data to properly plan the city, and

if he isn't able to get it until 1980, you are going to have another disorderly jumble of municipal growth.

Mr. HAGAN. I understand.

Mr. LEHMAN. This is a tough problem.

Mr. HAGAN. I am sorry the answer I have to give you, of course, is that the 1975 survey is not large enough. In fact, a 25-percent sample would not be adequate for places of the 10,000 to 15,000 population level, either. According to our statistical—

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why couldn't you, Mr. Hagan, conduct not only a survey in the sample size and in the format of the sample that you are proposing, but to also conduct, at the same time, a parallel pilot study in the same area, trying to ascertain the same information from other types of sources?

Mr. HAGAN. Are you speaking of this on a limited number of areas, or nationwide?

Mr. HINSHAW. Obviously, a limited number.

I don't want to get off on another tangent here. Why couldn't you, in Mr. Lehman's and in other selected areas, conduct a survey in the normal fashion during a mid-decade census, and in these particular pilot areas from administrative records make an effort to ascertain the same type of information and see to what degree of reliability you might obtain about these items from other sources.

Mr. HAGAN. Well, we are presently doing that, as a matter of fact, as part of the administrative record research, Congressman. We are taking special censuses in a limited number of areas and comparing the information provided from the administrative record research program with the results of a special census, which is similar to what you suggest.

Mr. HINSHAW. In these special areas are you collecting all the types of data you would normally collect, or limited types?

Mr. HAGAN. Limited.

Mr. HINSHAW. Going back to Mr. Lehman's problem, which is a major problem all over the country, why couldn't you pick up data in certain spot areas from administrative records, and then if the reliability of that approach proves out, then implement the same procedure for revenue sharing purposes only, on a nationwide basis so as to see whether you couldn't, from administrative records update the information every year.

Mr. HAGAN. What you suggest is possible and feasible.

Mr. HINSHAW. Have you given it any thought before?

Mr. HAGAN. We have given it thought. An initial step we have taken is to compare administrative record data with a special census. What you suggest is an extension of that, which we could consider doing. It is an interesting suggestion. The use of that data though, I must point out, in revenue sharing is not something that the Bureau of the Census would be able to decide.

Mr. HINSHAW. I recognize that.

Mr. HAGAN. The Office of Revenue Sharing would either accept or reject the use of such information.

Mr. HINSHAW. How many statisticians do you have in the Census Department?

Mr. HAGAN. We have a large number—in excess of 200.

Mr. HINSHAW. So I would take it that you could develop a reasonably good statistical sample with all the proper coefficients, and other type of statistical checks built into it and thereby be able to convince the Bureau people that this idea has merit as an approach?

Mr. HAGAN. We have the technical capability, no doubt about it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you. I just visualize the areas where rapid changes are taking place. One census every 10 years applies to the whole country, and yet the little town that I grew up in really hasn't changed very much in 40 or 50 years. You could use the 1940 census figures for that. And yet in the area I am living in now, you can't even use the 1970 census figures. They wouldn't have any validity. This is so important to my area, to do the kind of planning and these municipalities lean on census figures for their planning, for their programing, for their very existence and they are not getting the information retrieval that they need day to day; not only for government grants, and things like that, but for a day to day management of their own government. So I think that the only kind of mid-decade census that you can support would be one that would properly serve the kind of areas that we have all over this country. We have such a great velocity of population change in certain areas of the country, that people just don't have the same neighbors every day. So it is a tough job and I think we have got a tough problem but if we are going to have a meaningful census we are going to have to really dedicate ourselves to doing the job in a way that would serve the people that you are trying to help.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hagan, in line with Mr. Lehman's questions, I understood you to say at one point that 1½-percent or 1-percent survey and another time 25 percent survey. Maybe I misunderstood. What would be the size of survey you contemplate under this bill if it passed as formed?

Mr. HAGAN. I think I should clarify that, because I did mention both, and I will repeat for the record the information that I provided. The survey we propose in 1975 is a 1½-percent sample survey of approximately a million households.

Mr. WHITE. \$45 million worth?

Mr. HAGAN. That is right: a nationwide sample which would provide detailed cross tabulations for population groupings of 250,000 or more. We would provide essentially the same type of cross tabulations of characteristics of the population that were provided in the 1970 census for much smaller areas. We would also provide summary statistics for population groupings of 50,000 or more.

Mr. WHITE. You say you would have other information for smaller areas?

Mr. HAGAN. Below the 50,000 population level the only information we would provide would be county totals, which we determine largely by use of the administrative record information in measuring migration. For smaller cities, below 50,000, there would not be any information.

Mr. WHITE. Now what percentage would be required in order to

get a pretty good overview of the entire country that you could project and even smaller communities and what would it cost?

Mr. HAGAN. There are limitations in any sample, even at the 25-percent rate. And that was the other reference I made.

Mr. WHITE. Twenty-five percent would be a total?

Mr. HAGAN. A 25-percent sample is the largest sample that has been considered. Let me read our statement of reliability for a 25-percent sample. I think it is necessary to do at this point.

A 25 percent sample of a uniform sampling rate across the country would provide estimated counts (remember this is a sample, therefore the figures that are obtained are estimates rather than an actual count) for all states, cities and counties with 25,000 persons or more.

This would include groups of smaller contiguous counties or neighboring cities.

The full range of characteristics would be available for all areas for which such data are published in the 1970 census down to the tract level, which is roughly 4,000 to 5,000. For places under 25,000 because of the reliability of this sample data, the data might be shown as percentage distributions rather than absolute numbers.

Mr. WHITE. How much would that cost, the 25 percent?

Mr. HAGAN. We have updated our estimates from what has previously been furnished by other witnesses in previous years. For a full set of questions, a 25-percent sample would cost approximately \$200 million.

Mr. WHITE. When you say a full set of questions, tell me please, what you cover generally by subject matter in the 1 percent as compared to the 25 percent or any range in between.

Mr. HAGAN. The type of data that we would cover, or the type of inquiry we would make of the public would be——

Mr. WHITE. For the 1 percent?

Mr. HAGAN. One and a half, or 25 percent in this instance would be identical. We would be asking virtually the same questions that we asked in 1970. Income, education, housing, work experience, employment status, and so forth.

Mr. WHITE. What percentage do you think you would have to take a survey by sampling in order to be of any value to the revenue sharing program?

Mr. HAGAN. At the present point in time, with the policy rules under which the revenue sharing office is operating, I believe that the only thing they would accept would be the equivalent of a full census of the area. This however wouldn't imply the full range of information that I have been discussing here.

Mr. WHITE. Well, actually the bill would give you authority for a sample survey and as to particulars, as to the percentage, that would be determined in the discretion of the executive department, so that could be worked out along with whatever you could get from the Appropriations Committees too, but this will be of interest to the Members on the floor and to the committee when it sits as a full committee.

Mr. HAGAN. I would like to add something for the record. There is one point that might need clarification.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAGAN. We have never considered a sample size larger than 25 percent, because the increased costs of a larger sample approach the cost of a total census.

Mr. WHITE. You are speaking of mail sample?

Mr. HAGAN. Either mail or personal contact.

Mr. WHITE. When you spoke of \$200 million figure, were you speaking of mail sample?

Mr. HAGAN. A combination of mail and personal interviews. We would use the mail technique insofar as it is feasible.

Mr. WHITE. Would it be practical in the instance Mr. Hinshaw and Mr. Lehman spoke of, when you have growth areas—massive growth areas—to increase a percentage for that particular area, while keeping or maintaining a static figure for those areas that have not experienced any growth?

Mr. HAGAN. Variable sampling for selected areas? Obviously anything like that is possible, but we have not considered that as a serious proposal at this point.

Mr. WHITE. Surely there aren't that many growth areas in the country, that it would escalate your cost that much, would it, sir?

Mr. HAGAN. I disagree. I think it would cause a very sizable addition to the operation of a census. Of course, there are definitional problems as to what growth means; what percentage would be used and other such problems. I see some problems in this, although it is possible.

Mr. WHITE. Would it be worth considering by your agency?

Mr. HAGAN. Worth considering as another option; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Let's see, one point on one of the bills, H.R. 4429. This bill makes an absolute confidentiality of census information. This is in contradiction to the mode of operation of the National Archives, which has by agreement and under the auspices of the National Records Act allowed a disclosure of census information in 50 years. Not census, but other information, and there is agreement for 72 years for census information. This has been held in abeyance until some legislation would clarify it. Now you stated that you see some value in some disclosure of information. Did I read your testimony correctly there?

Mr. HAGAN. I think maybe you understood it differently than I intended. If you refer to page 3, item 4, you will find a basic statement of the Bureau's position. As far as we are concerned at the present time, we generally favor this amendment. We do recognize, however, that there are some very valid arguments proposed for some change in the Bureau position.

Mr. WHITE. You believe they should be maintained as confidential?

Mr. HAGAN. Until some satisfactory compromise could be worked out with certainly a lot more input than—

Mr. WHITE. Let's talk about that compromise now, because I think this may be the role of Congress. There have been several proposals in terms of years, and in terms of absolute—in other words, one idea would be to have no disclosure. Another would be for 72 years. After the 72 years allow disclosure on a limited basis for genealogical and historical purposes. Another has been to allow within a span of 72 years or 100 years absolute disclosure to the general public. I'm not sure about England, I know they have 100 years. I don't

know whether it is total public use or limited in scope. But what would you think of 100 years to allow the disclosure for any purpose of census records to the general public?

Mr. HAGAN. All I can say at this point is that a few centenarians would obviously be alive at the 100-year period. That may appear to minimize the problem. However, I think the principal issue is still valid, that there are some people alive whose record would be released. I think the important thing here is to decide that if this is to be the policy and if it is to be a matter of legislation, that it should be done in such a way so that the people who furnish the formation are aware of the fact at the time the information is given that it would be released at some fixed point in time. The information is already in the Archives or in our possession, was collected under a different understanding, and confidentiality was promised. We consider the matter of really keeping faith with the respondents as being very important.

Mr. WHITE. Would you name a period of time that you think would be proper for limited use?

Mr. HAGAN. I would rather not name a period of time, because I do not think I am knowledgeable enough to suggest one.

Mr. WHITE. What limited use would you condone for any particular span of time, with the judgment of Congress?

Mr. HAGAN. I really can't say at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Would you say genealogical purposes would be valid from a number of points of view?

Mr. HAGAN. Yes; that purpose is valid from a number of points of view; however, the question is whether these needs are strong enough to motivate Congress to decide differently.

Mr. WHITE. What about historical use?

Mr. HAGAN. Historical use, of course. A number of university research departments and the like have indicated that there is a lot of value that they could gain from historical review of census records, and I don't think we can deny this. The fact that the information, for instance, prior to 1890 has been made available for historical and genealogical purposes probably serves to further the thrust of that argument. Availability ceases with the 1900 census at the present time.

Mr. WHITE. What do you think about the use of any of these records for establishing heirships in court, for legal purposes? Would you think this would be a proper use of these records?

Mr. HAGAN. That seems to be a legal matter and I would like for Mr. Meisner to comment on that.

Mr. MEISNER. I do. However, under the proposed legislation, H.R. 4426, only the person who is the respondent, or his heir, or an authorized agent of the respondent, can obtain census information or authorize its release for use in court. If it were a contested heirship, between two or more people in the same family, there will be adverse interests. What is to the detriment of one will be to the advantage of the other. You are going to have a problem under this bill, as to whether you can disclose the pertinent census information, since section 8(c) states that no such information may be used to the detriment of any respondent or other party covered by the information. There is present in the law as it exists now, the authority to turn over for proper purposes census information to a court of record. This discretion is now vested in the Director of the Census, or the Secretary

of Commerce, if you want to start at that statutory level. This discretion, however, is being taken away under H.R. 4426, leaving only the discretion, as indicated, of the respondent or whoever his representative may be or his heir. This may create problems since with the passage of time in many instances, as you can visualize, the respondent dies and may not have a discoverable heir, then the census information is locked up forever. You have to take these projections into mind in examining this particular bill, since its present language in this regard may be too restrictive and thereby negate possibly desirable results.

Mr. WHITE. If I may leap over your official role for a second, and probe into your mind, how do you think the law should be in this area?

Mr. MEISNER. Well, I certainly as an attorney and officer of the court am interested in getting facts before a court where they are relevant and necessary to a determination in such a particular case. I am therefore interested in disclosure as such. But you would have to have somebody able to exercise discretion to release the needed census information. In this particular situation, where we are dealing with information collected in the population censuses, Congress has, I believe, since the beginning of this century, provided that no information should be given out which is to the detriment of the individual to whom the information relates. This is in section 8(c) of title 13. That is a difficult concept to determine, i.e., detriment. And who is to determine detriment? The Director of the Bureau of the Census? A judge? Whom? It has been left under the present law, for many years, to the Secretary of Commerce and his delegates.

Mr. WHITE. You are suggesting then that it be open to both sides in the area of judicial determination?

Mr. MEISNER. I am merely saying I can visualize a number of instances where it is desirable in litigation, from a private individual standpoint, that census information be made known to others besides the person who may have furnished it. But then there is the public interest. Who is to determine the public interest in a lawsuit, which may be between private parties or a suit in which the government may be a party? This disclosure in litigation I think, as Dr. Hagen has said, has to be balanced against the desirability of obtaining an accurate census from people who would have to be told, "Your information is going to be kept confidential by the government, except in such and such situations or for such and such periods of time." The Congress has to determine the period of time and the exceptions. Will those factors hurt the accuracy of the census gathering? Will the people who are concerned be loathe to cooperate and furnish information in a census or survey under these conditions?

Mr. WHITE. You think that if people knew that their census information was to be disclosed, say in 100 years, they would be less likely to answer, or what do you think about it?

Mr. MEISNER. I don't know. I leave it up to the people who have been in the field. I personally would not think so.

Mr. HAGAN. I believe there would be some impact but it is difficult to determine how much. I think it is possible with some of the types of information that we collect and we are quite successful in collecting statistical information, but on both mandatory and voluntary surveys

much of it is given with the understanding that it is going to be kept confidential and would not be given out.

Mr. WHITE. You are indicating that you don't think these records should be open to the public totally after a period of years, but on a very selected basis?

Mr. HAGAN. That would be my position.

Mr. WHITE. Who do you think would be the proper party to determine who should see the records?

Mr. HAGAN. I think the conditions could be set forth in legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Not by regulation, in other words?

Mr. HAGAN. I think it would be better if it were a matter of specific reference from legislation as to what purposes. Of course there is always the matter of administering laws of this type.

Mr. MEISNER. Discretion could be given to the administrations of the law under the legislation, to establish by rule making the types of releasable information, after notice, holding hearings, and so forth, and have the people come in and testify. I would want to add one point on confidentiality. A substantial amount of concern has been generated with respect to the opening and closing of census records. This concern has essentially involved the population census records, the personal or private information furnished by people. However, the Census laws cover not only that information, but also information furnished in economic censuses and surveys by corporations and other business organizations. The question of course, then comes up whether that business confidential information should be distinguished from the confidential information furnished by individuals in population censuses and similar surveys. This bill makes no such distinction. Should the information furnished by business organizations be treated the same way as the personal information? Should it have confidentiality for the same number of years? Presently, if it becomes subject to Archives control, business information is releasable after 50 years. The 72 years agreement that Census has with Archives applies only to information obtained in the censuses of population. So that there are a number of refinements to bear in mind in considering changes in the confidentiality provisions of the census laws.

Mr. WHITE. I am inviting the Census Bureau to submit to us any amendments to existing bills we have. We would be delighted to entertain them; at the time we mark up, we would certainly consider them and I think it would be constructive.

Do any members have further questions?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, a couple more. You are suggesting Mr. Hagan, that the review of the Census data on a selective basis should be spelled out specifically. Would you provide to the committee a list of the type of thing which you think would be desirable as examples?

Mr. HAGAN. We could provide some examples, I am sure.

[The following information was furnished:]

One example would be legislation applicable to future censuses that a respondent be informed that his data will be available for historic research after a period of 100 years, or some other fixed period.

Another example would be to permit historians to have access to present confidential records after identifying details had been deleted and under controlled conditions.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would you make it a fairly comprehensive list, so we would not have to think of better examples? Because you would be in a better position to know what type of requests you have had.

Mr. HAGAN. For the record, the representations that have been made directly to the Bureau of the Census have been largely for genealogical purposes, people interested in that type of research, tracing family ancestry, and so forth. I think GSA or the Archives could probably submit a greater range of the types of requests that they have received as well. Ours have largely been requests from single individuals.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will yield, I think he has in mind your ideas from whatever source that you feel we should include; if you feel that it should be legislated by description in the bill, we would be pleased to consider it at that time.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have one further question. Going back to the heirships, it might be a disturbing feature in the bill if there were two members of a family, each having different views and sought to use census data to prove the validity or nonvalidity of a claim. However, I agree that there should be as much disclosure as possible, commensurate with the element principle of confidentiality built into the bill. Why wouldn't an amendment to the present bill be appropriate that would say that when there is a civil case involving two members of a family, or a member of a family that might want to disclose the data of heirship, that the census records be provided to the court in closed session to determine the validity or nonvalidity of having those data exposed in open civil trial?

Mr. MEISNER. That is one of the traditional ways of making confidential information available to the Judge. It is a rare situation, I gather that we are talking about, but it does come up.

Mr. HINSHAW. You brought it up, so I didn't know it was rare.

Mr. MEISNER. It has arisen, and I think there should be some way of opening those records for necessary court determinations.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that perhaps you could ask the staff to explore an amendment along that line and we would be pleased also, I am not an attorney—

Mr. WHITE. Counsel has been taking notes and he will certainly comply with your desire.

Mr. Lehman, anything further?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I guess I am more interested in the information we can get tomorrow than 100 years from now.

Mr. WHITE. If you have any questions, Counsel, or if there have been questions not covered by testimony—

Mr. BRAY. I believe both of these questions we have from the audience have been covered by Mr. Hagan.

Mr. WHITE. Do you have any questions yourself?

Mr. BRAY. Not at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much for coming today. We may be calling on you in the future as we consider this bill and any inserts for the record you can provide for use in the future.

Mr. HAGAN. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. The next witness is Prof. Allan G. Bogue, chairman, Department of History, University of Wisconsin and chairman, American Historical Association's Committee on Quantitative Data.

Professor Bogue, you may introduce your associate and proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF PROF. ALLAN G. BOGUE, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. PAUL WARD, SECRETARY FOR AMERICAN HISTORY ASSOCIATION

Mr. BOGUE. This is Dr. Paul Ward, secretary of the American Historical Association, and we are most grateful for the opportunity to appear before you this morning on behalf of the American Historical Association.

We are opposed to H.R. 4426 in its present form because it proposes to close Federal census data to a large community of qualified scholars forever. We are opposed to the confidentiality clause that appears therein. Historians do not wish to invade the privacy of the individual American, but we do believe that the individual's privacy would be adequately protected by closing any given Federal census for an extended period of time—72 years appears to be more than adequate—after which time the rolls would be opened to qualified historians under appropriate and effective supervisory arrangement.

We think it is important for us to understand the way in which the country has developed. If we, as a nation, do not know where we have been, we are going to have considerable trouble in deciding where we ought to go. History is not just the story of Presidents, Governors, kings, popes and other leaders. It is also the record of ordinary citizens and the societies of which they are a part. The original census rolls are a most important source of information about the representative Americans of times past.

In using the census, historians are not interested in focusing on individuals for the sake of sensation or ridicule. Their findings indeed are usually presented in general or quantitative terms, without mentioning names. If specific individuals are ever mentioned, it is because they illustrate the behavior of considerable numbers of other peoples who underwent similar experiences or made similar decisions, and if necessary this mention could be eliminated.

For many years historians have made heavy use of 19th-century Federal censuses down to 1880, as well as various State censuses extending into the 20th century, without harm to individuals. Today we know many important things about the American past as a result of this research that we could not have known if such censuses had been closed to researchers.

The idea that the analysts of the Bureau of the Census and their advisers can know and decide for all time what the important questions are that should be asked about the population of the United States in a particular year strikes us as naive and even a bit arrogant. Our experiences with the earlier censuses show that later generations develop important questions that are answerable from the censuses, which never occurred to the people planning the censuses originally. Closing the censuses forever completely forecloses this kind of possibility.

Let me touch briefly on some of the kinds of uses that researchers put this information to. Historical research based upon census data in some quantity dates back to the 1930's when James Malin, of the University of Kansas, used census data to study the effect that diminishing amounts of rainfall had had upon the turnover of successive farmers in the various rainfall belts of Kansas. His findings

were so significant to an understanding of agriculture in the Dust Bowl, that the U.S. Department of Agriculture sent out one of its economists to do another study to see if he was right.

About the same time, Frank Owsley and other historians at Vanderbilt University started to rework the manuscript censuses of 1850 and 1860, to give us a better idea of what Southern society was like prior to the Civil War, and in the process considerably changed our understanding of why the War Between the States occurred.

During the last 15 years, there has been a great upsurge in the use of the old census data by historians exploring the way in which Americans have moved from place to place to exploit the opportunities available in America, and the way in which the immigrants have worked their way into responsible positions in the labor force.

Using census data, political historians have found that in the United States the ethnic composition of townships and precincts are often strongly associated with party choice in voting preference, and by using 19th-century census data to document such relationships they have produced a better political history than we have ever had before. In this one kind of research individual names are of no concern to the researchers; they are interested rather in the occupations that ethnic groups represented in simple subdivisions.

These are important problems that historians are studying. In this mobile society of ours, people are going to continue to move around and reestablish themselves in an effort to exploit opportunities. And if the people in the country lose their interest in and their understanding of our political system, we are going to be in a bad way. The more we know about how these processes worked in our past history, the better we can understand them in the present. We have just come through an era of public recrimination and dismal prognoses about the Nation's viability.

Intensive research of the sort being done in census materials gives to this historian at least the message that we are not in decline, that we have made progress and that more can be expected. Historical perspective should be encouraged, not restricted as H.R. 4426 would do.

There are dozens and dozens of historians who have used or are using Federal and State census records. Since the States have abandoned their census activity, it is all the more important that the Federal Government should not deny this resource to historians also.

To sum up, in recent years there have been two particular questions concerning census policy that have been of great interest to historians. First, when are we to be allowed to use the 1900 census bearing in mind that that of 1880 has long been opened for research and that of 1890 was destroyed? And second, can a long-term policy on censuses be developed that will be in the best interests of all groups concerned? As to the first, we initially were told that the 1900 census would be opened after 50 years—then it became 72 years, and that period too has now gone by. It was explained that a confidentiality pledge barred us from that material. I find no specific reference to such a pledge in the statute establishing the census of 1900, although it is possible that by means of interpretation this has been read into it. On the face of it, the 1899 act doesn't seem to show such a pledge.

As to a long-range policy, we have in H.R. 4426 a suggested policy that makes the historian, alone of the social scientists, a pariah. It

will close the door forever on aspects of the past that the citizens of this country will need to know about. We hope that the Congress will agree that since this country does indeed need its past, census data should be open to qualified historians under appropriate supervision at the expiration of a period of 70 to 75 years. There are some middle-ground positions between complete closure and our suggestion, but none of them can be taken without doing a direct disservice to many historians and an indirect disservice to the country.

Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Professor Bogue. At this time I call Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was kind of interesting to look at this fact that you say the census of 1850 and 1860 can give a better understanding of why the War Between the States occurred. I wonder if the census of 1950 and 1960 can give us any indication of why the Vietnam war occurred?

Mr. BOGUE. We would like to find out some 70 years from now.

Mr. LEHMAN. I would like to find out quicker than that. I am using that as a basis for how fast the world is changing. Now there have been more changes in the last 20 years than there has been in the last 50 or 100 years before that. So you know, maybe it is good for knowledge of the 1960's.

Mr. BOGUE. I agree.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have got to react a lot quicker than we used to have to react. That is all.

Mr. WHITE. Under the present law couldn't historians connected with the Census Bureau go into these particular records to form conclusions without naming names?

Mr. BOGUE. Currently?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOGUE. Could he?

Mr. WHITE. Couldn't a Department of the Census historian, in making surveys and utilization or interpretation of census information go into historical questions and of course, you would be spoon fed the information.

Mr. BOGUE. He could find out a number of interesting things and we asked on occasion to be allowed to use the 1900 census rolls with the names covered and that was refused, also.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, excuse me?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. This is important. If this is a valid premise, if you could 120 years later find out why we got in the Civil War, what are some of the causes, on the same token, why couldn't current census data be used to form national policy to keep us from getting into unfortunate national situations. It is information that lends itself to all kinds of national interests.

Mr. BOGUE. It does.

Dr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, may I add a couple of remarks? The historical profession has expanded enormously in the last generation as part of these great changes going on. Over half of the principle historians have completed their training since 1960. That is due to the GI bill, and all of the other changes that have come along. These represent a much broader sampling of the population with more concerns for ethnic groups with levels of mobility, and for example, the

gentleman historians of the past tended to have other interests. My association has 17,000 members and it is very conscious of these new historians who are asking the new questions. It is delighted that Professor Bogue was willing to come in from Wisconsin to represent the interests of our committee on quantitative data, which is concerned with getting at precisely this kind of question. These younger men are quite excited about precisely these questions you are talking about and any sharp closing of the door to them is going to be of serious consequences to the development of the questioning spirit about the background for our involvement in this foreign policy, the way we have, and the sort of support that has been mustered for these situations.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hinshaw?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. I want to state first of all that we are aware of the idea that historians are reputable and are nice as a group to have around. We are currently dealing with another group interest in the Congress, the newsmen's shield. Among the news media, there is a great deal of differentiation as to how you define the term "newsperson." Now we can translate that problem over to ask how you define the scholar or historian?

Why can't I set myself up and claim to be a historian and request this information for an entirely different motive than a reputable academic historian might have, and then come back and somehow or another cause a problem to innocent persons. Professor Bogue, how do you overcome that problem?

Mr. BOGUE. I think there are various answers here. In the first place, the person who is going to misuse the data for the purpose of personal harassment is not going to be prevented from doing this whether or not we open censuses because he can use municipal data—birth certificates, marriage certificates and so on—material which is available and open.

Quite aside from that, there are various ways of going at this. The National Archives, perhaps, who I assume would continue to be custodian of such data, could set certain standards for use comparable to what the Library of Congress, for instance, set up in relation to certain manuscript data in their possession and which is open for use but which they do not have title to, and therefore it can be looked at, but it cannot be quoted directly, and so on.

So I think regulations could be worked up by the National Archives that would protect here.

Mr. HINSHAW. If that is possible then you really shouldn't have any concern about the confidential portion of the statute.

Mr. BOGUE. Oh, no; the confidential portion of the statute proposes to close it, to give no options, no system at all for use of these data, sir.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, I believe you are right, but I don't think you are really being responsive. How do you define historian or scholar versus someone who might be a legitimate author but also like the fellow who wrote the book on Howard Hughes, you know.

Mr. BOGUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that is the big problem. If it were just historians working for—

Mr. BOGUE. I was giving you alternatives. The National Archives set of requirements for us would be one of them. A clause in the law putting some sort of penalty in the law for misuse of these records.

Mr. HINSHAW. All right.

Mr. BOGUE. Perhaps certification by the American Historical Association or by certified graduate schools, or both, or all of these things are options.

Mr. WHITE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Dr. Ward was going to say something else.

Dr. WARD. Speaking for the American Historical Association, we believe that the supervision and selectivity exercised by the Department of Defense in allowing qualified historians access to scientific material has been working satisfactorily over a number of years. We would rather that we ourselves did not set ourselves up as able to say who is a true historian or not. We believe that Archives can easily exercise the same kind of discretion and control that the Department of Defense has been doing so successfully.

Mr. WHITE. Well, let me ask these questions then if you are through, Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. HINSHAW. OK.

Mr. WHITE. In following the line of questioning of Mr. Hinshaw on this particular bill or bills, whichever one you designate to be the vehicle, suppose we provided that no information, as gathered from such information—provided it is remained open to genealogists and historians—could be utilized to specify individuals.

In other words, you cannot say, "This individual did such and such," or, "He said this about himself," he would use it merely in toto as general information and not as specific information about a person, would this be objectionable to the historian?

Mr. BOGUE. The historian could work with this.

Mr. WHITE. Going further, you heard the testimony of the Deputy Director of the Census who stated, in essence, that the American public has a contract for confidentiality for past census forms that they filled. You alluded to this somewhat. But would you address yourself again to that?

A person who answers a form expects it to be confidential. This has been his understanding.

The law, for a number of years, has said this information shall be confidential, and, in essence, that becomes a part of the contract in that the law says it will be confidential.

Would we be breaking faith with the American public for the past censuses we have taken if we open those records to the general public or opened it for specific purposes?

Mr. BOGUE. Well, it is unclear in my mind, sir, as to exactly where and when the specific pledge entered. I do not find it in 1900. I do not believe it is in 1910. But I believe that something of this sort does enter in.

It is a question of how long one is interested in maintaining this, I suppose. I cannot imagine that, after 70 or 80 years, it really matters to anyone, or that the people who were involved if the matter had been put in those terms to them, would have been concerned at that time.

Mr. WHITE. Well, you are indicating, to a degree, that it should matter to the person only as long as he lives, really.

Mr. BOGUE. Yes, I suppose that I am.

Mr. WHITE. So what year would you really fix? What span of years would you fix that would cover that person and probably his offspring?

Mr. BOGUE. Sir, I am really indicating, I suppose, that to me, it would only matter to the individual as long as there were materials relative to his adult life.

I cannot imagine that it matters much to an individual if he is talking about a census report at the age of 1 or 11 or 15 or something like that. So I would return to the fact that I think 70 to 80 years is quite reasonable.

Mr. WHITE. Would you find historians could live with 100 years? In other words, that is in terms of years that are used in some other countries.

Mr. BOGUE. Yes. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And I was just wondering what your understanding of their utility of this would be.

Mr. BOGUE. Well, there is a great deal of interesting research and a lot of interesting questions which historians want put to 1900 and 1910 and 1920, and I know that some of the people who want to put those questions are not going to be around if you extend the 100-year rule back to cover those particular censuses.

Obviously, if, in your wisdom, you settle on a 100-year rule, then we are going to have to live with that rule.

Mr. WHITE. Well, really, what you are saying, though, is that virtually any term of years is not going to really solve the historical needs. There is an area in my mind on which we could compromise this; for instance, just off the top of my head, allow some media by which historians could refer a specific question to the Census Bureau for 1 or 10 years ago, even the last 2 years.

Mr. BOGUE. As you know, we do have a clause in the current census law, section 8, and it has not worked very well.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I know. But it would be a census official who would find this information for you within that shorter span of time?

Mr. BOGUE. Yes. But, often, we need to work with large groups of people, all the residents of a township or precinct or of a county.

To give you one illustration of what might happen, a doctoral candidate had in mind doing a study of a population on agricultural change and population changes in the Nebraska plains country from the 1890's through to the 1960's and thought of taking advantage of section 8 and having the Census Bureau retabulate the age structure of certain counties or townships in central Nebraska, the particular counties he was interested in. So he asked the Census Bureau if he could do this.

Initially, the response was favorable. They quoted a figure of some several hundred dollars. Most graduate students are poverty stricken but he thought he could raise that amount.

Then they advised him they raised their estimate to between \$5,000 and \$10,000. It was absolutely impossible for him to pay that amount of money. The historian, unlike some other sciences, has no easy avenue to the National Science Foundation.

Mr. WHITE. But it is available now.

Mr. BOGUE. You could get retabulations of certain types.

Mr. WHITE. But you cannot get interpretation within the Census Bureau?

Mr. BOGUE. No.

Mr. WHITE. Would you hope, in the periods of time as provided in any particular bill we may report, that the information would be open to the general public, or just to genealogists and historians, or just to historians?

Mr. BOGUE. Well, I am representing the historians this morning, and I have not addressed myself to those questions.

Mr. WHITE. Well, in fairness, as an American citizen, what would you say?

Mr. BOGUE. Well, I would say this: that I do not believe there have been any harmful results as a result of the opening of the Federal census down to 1880 or the State census, in the case of Kansas, down to 1930 or 1935.

Mr. WHITE. Were those open to the general public?

Mr. BOGUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much. Any other questions from members of the committee?

Counsel, do you have a question?

Mr. BRAY. No, sir.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, is there such a possibility of two-tiered questions where certain questions have no point in being confidential and other questions, I can see, very well may be confidential? Certain questions would be restricted and others could be available.

Mr. BOGUE. I think that is a useful concept.

Mr. LEHMAN. So the census could be constructed on the basis of restricted and nonrestricted material, and the person answering questions could respond in that manner.

The second thing is—perhaps this is academic—in a certain climate in this country under a national emergency, you are going to have census data that could very well be opened under executive directive.

I do not know what happened back in 1940, 1941, and 1942 when the Japanese, for instance, were imprisoned for, say, national security reasons. I do not know where they got the information on who was Japanese. But I could well imagine something like that happening and using census data when something like that could come up.

Mr. WHITE. If there are no further questions, thank you both, gentlemen, for appearing.

The next witness will be Mr. Thomas E. Daniels, Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Please come forward.

**STATEMENT OF THOMAS E. DANIELS, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT,
THE GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH**

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you. We are grateful for this opportunity to present our position. I do, indeed, represent the Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and perhaps other genealogical interests; the patrons of our genealogical library, its branches, and the general membership of the church.

We speak against sections 4 and 5 of the House bill 4426 for reasons which will follow.

Now, statements concerning those whom we represent: The general church membership representing about 3¼ million people at the present time; our main genealogical library, which is the largest in the world, in Salt Lake City serving on the average of 1,500 patrons per day; in addition to that, the branch libraries located throughout the United States, 126 of these at the present time which serve a total of approximately 43,875 persons yearly.

Now, 25 percent of these patrons are not members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, indicating that a great number of nonmember people are interested in genealogy, in fact, far more than those who are members of the church that I represent.

Additionally, the members of the LDS Church consider the pursuit of genealogical research as a basic and divinely invoked responsibility which goes far beyond the general interest in genealogy of people who are not members of this church.

There is a great interest in genealogy throughout the United States and, indeed, throughout the world as evidenced by many State and local genealogical societies and associations which may have been organized in recent years, some of which are indicated on the written material.

Now, a statement of our proposal regarding the release of information contained in the Federal census.

We propose that the censuses of the United States be released for general public search after 72 years—consistent with the code as it now exists—after 72 years have passed from the date of the enumeration. And the reasons are based on the following:

We find that there is no more confidential information contained in the 1900 and later censuses than is contained in the 1880 census. In 1900, the following items of information, not included in the 1880 census, were added to the census forms. For instance. Month and year of birth, the number of years married, mother of how many children, the number of these children living, year of immigration to the United States, number of years in the United States, naturalization, and can speak English.

And then four questions concerning ownership of home.

Deleted from the 1900 schedule, but included in the 1880 census, were the following items.

Is the person sick or temporarily disabled so as to be unable to attend to ordinary business or duties? If so, what is the sickness or disability?

Is the individual blind, deaf and dumb, idiotic, insane, maimed, crippled, bedridden, or otherwise disabled?

Now, it would seem to us that some of these items deleted from the 1900 schedule would be much more sensitive than those that were added.

Several of the States of the United States, as we mentioned here this morning, authorized State censuses in the years 1905, 1915 and 1925. At least Kansas and New York do not consider these confidential. They have been made public.

It seems inconsistent that the Federal returns would be detrimental to an individual and the State returns would not. We can find no evidence that the 1900 census carried a promise of confidentiality.

The Federal censuses are considered indispensable to genealogists. There is just no alternative to this information. The following factors, we would point out, enhance the value of these records. These are very important to us.

The late beginning and incomplete recording of statewide registration of vital statistics in many States increases greatly the need for access to the census records.

The arrangement by the Soundex system of families recorded in the 1900 census makes it especially valuable as a "finding tool" to help locate places of residence of families.

The destruction of the 1890 Federal census further increases the value of the 1900 census.

In summary, we would agree with the resolution adopted by the Council of the Society of American Archivists on April 15, 1971, as follows:

Whereas, the Society of American Archivists (a professional association of about 1,200 archivists, manuscript curators, librarians, and records managers and about 400 institutional members—chiefly public and private archives and manuscript repositories) desires to grant maximum access to documents, subject to necessary limitations to protect privacy and the national security;

Whereas, census population schedules provide unique and significant social indicators, such as family size, occupation, education, and place of birth, useful in studying the characteristics and mobility of the American people;

Whereas, the Archivist of the United States and the Director of the Bureau of the Census agreed in 1952 that population schedules be opened to general research after 72 years; and

Whereas, granting access under that agreement to earlier population schedules, which contain far more detailed data than the 1900 schedules, has apparently not been detrimental to any person; be it

Resolved, That the Society petitions the General Services Administration and its National Archives and Records Service and the Department of Commerce and its Bureau of the Census to grant researchers access to the 1900 population schedules on June 1, 1972, 72 years after the Census Day for the decennial of 1900, in accordance with the agreement of 1952.

THEODORE M. BURTON,
President.

THOMAS E. DANIELS,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am kind of curious because my sister-in-law belongs not only to the church, but she tried to trace our records back.

When I say that, I recognize, also that in my former job, I used to have literally hundreds of requests for access to data about property. I recognize that back in 1880, 1890, 1900, there was less concern about keeping track of information, as opposed to what there has been from, say, 1930 on. There are a great deal in numbers of sources of information.

Why do we perpetuate the idea that the Federal census is the only place that we can get data about names of individuals and their ancestry?

Mr. DANIELS. I could respond by saying that the census records are not the primary means of information. But they become one of the very vital means when other records are not available, such as I mentioned in the material; such things as vital statistics and church records.

Census records help genealogists to trace migration, help genealogists to help find many missing people that other records do not contain.

Mr. HINSHAW. Isn't it possible that some persons that were "lost" are lost because they choose to be lost and they do not want anyone tracing them down? And isn't it a fact, also, that many of the so-called skip tracers use your records?

Mr. DANIELS. Skip tracers?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. Persons who are running down persons for bad credit risks or persons who have skipped because of some legal obligation they want to avoid.

Mr. DANIELS. I am not aware of any who are. However, our libraries are open to the public.

As I pointed out, people who have any interest in the records are permitted access to them. We are planning a patron identification system to give us closer control of those who use the records.

As I said, we have the largest genealogical library anywhere, housing approximately 750,000 hundred-foot roles of microfilm, in addition, about 125,000 printed volumes of family genealogies.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me put this forth. I have no objection, as a matter of personal feeling, to releasing data, where you cannot identify the individual, for use by historians, for governmental agencies, for private businesses, so long as you do not identify the individual.

But the moment you identify the individual—even when you may have a good reason such as your—then that information becomes available to anyone else that wants to use it for any purpose whatsoever. Therein, maybe you compromise what the individual wanted to do; and that is, to remain anonymous for whatever reason.

How do you overcome that?

Mr. DANIELS. We would support the bill to be submitted, introduced to the House by Representative Gunn McKay of Utah, which is similar in most respects to House bill 4426, except for one section—subsection F of section 9—which deals with the material on the table here, those who would have access to the census information after the expiration of the 72 years, which is our recommendation.

Mr. McKay's bill would call for 77 years. We could live with that.

But he is proposing that a group of individuals who are registered with the Secretary of Commerce represent a legitimate organization and would be given access to these records and would have the privilege of copying them.

This would prevent individuals from having direct access to the records.

Mr. HINSHAW. But then let me explore that.

What difference does it make whether the person has direct access to the records, or whether he gets the same data out of your library?

Mr. DANIELS. I do not know what provision might be available to keep confidential, or whether this would be necessary.

If anyone has access to the records, I would presume that, for legitimate purposes, all people could have access. This, I suppose, would fall under the law.

At the present time, I do not know of any provision in our organization that would limit anybody from having access to the records.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Daniels, the thing that I am vitally concerned about is simply because of the geometrically increasing use of com-

puters and the manipulation of data back and forth between States, local governments, the Federal Government, and private business, all manipulating data, that the more data that the Federal Government, as well as the State governments, require the individual to provide, that we may very well be approaching the time of big brotherhood.

Everything we know about an individual can be made available to everyone else at some point in time. And it just seems to me that we have to stop that someplace.

Now, when you identify the individual, that is one thing.

When you provide information about aggregate groups of individuals, that is an entirely different aspect, it seems to me.

Mr. DANIELS. We believe that over the period described in our proposal, the sensitivity of this information would be greatly diminished.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would it be entirely diminished?

Mr. DANIELS. That is difficult to say. That would be an individual judgment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, I will just ask one more question.

Could you foresee any possible instance where data that you might collect that might even be 100 years old might be put into your library that could then come about to the detriment of another individual?

Mr. DANIELS. The only thing we are interested in, Mr. Hinshaw, out of the census records, are the items, some of which we have alluded to, such as the names, dates, places and relationships of individuals.

We do not care about their financial status. We do not care about any of these other personal things.

We are interested in family relationships and groupings only. These are the only kinds of things that we would have available in our records.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that the only thing you would take off of the records?

Mr. DANIELS. This, I would not have the responsibility for, directly. But I see no reason why the other information would be of any value. It is my understanding that the demographic data is confined to a single page in the census. That is all we need.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, speaking as a committee member alone, if I knew what type of data you would be interested in and perhaps limiting yourself to collecting, then perhaps I might not be so concerned about having data exposed that would come to the detriment of the individual.

But to give you carte blanche to go into the records, even though you might have it now, is something that I probably would not be in favor of.

Mr. DANIELS. Well, once again, those items as listed on page two, some of which we are keenly interested in, names, dates, places of birth, places of marriage, places of death, dates—

Mr. HINSHAW. Mother of how many children.

Mr. DANIELS. I beg your pardon?

Mr. HINSHAW. The mother of how many children.

Mr. DANIELS. Yes. This is a valuable tool because we sometimes find the situation where we do not know whether we have all the children identified in the family. And if that information were avail-

able, this would—with other information—provide more definite data that would be needed by anyone searching that particular line.

Mr. HINSHAW. And how would that help, just tracing the genealogy?

Mr. DANIELS. How would that help genealogy?

Mr. HINSHAW. All of these things, how would they help tracing the genealogy?

Mr. DANIELS. Well, the interest of the genealogist is to indicate on a pedigree chart their direct ancestral line.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, what difference does it make for the month and year of birth in tracing genealogy?

Mr. DANIELS. Well, you have the identification—the month, year and place of birth to make sure that that individual is the individual that you are concerned with.

Mr. HINSHAW. All right. I can accept that. How about number of years married? How is that going to help trace genealogy?

Mr. DANIELS. The number of years married would be of collateral interest.

Mr. HINSHAW. But not of vital interest?

Mr. DANIELS. Not of vital interest, necessarily.

Mr. HINSHAW. How about the number of these children living? Is that vital?

Mr. DANIELS. It would be, as well as the previous question, in order to help establish a fact that may be partially known.

For instance, the number of years married would indicate, from the time of the census back, it would indicate when that person was married, establishing a marriage date, which might not be available, otherwise.

The number of children living at that time would also help to verify any other information that may be known about those children.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, I just comment then, it would just seem to me that what you are really saying is that you want everything you can get, not only those things that are extremely vital in tracing genealogy. And I could see very easily that a person, from your records, could perhaps ascertain that the parents of children were not married, and, thereby, at some later point in time, throw a cloud, not only on the ownership of property but on the future heirship of properties.

Mr. DANIELS. As I pointed out in Mr. McKay's bill, which we would feel comfortable with it would make unavailable to any court of law any information from any census. It will not be admissible as evidence in any court of law.

Mr. HINSHAW. Which bill is that?

Mr. DANIELS. The bill to be introduced by Representative McKay.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has it been introduced yet?

Mr. DANIELS. No. It is supposed to be introduced today.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have no further questions.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Hinshaw.

Several quick questions to you, Mr. Daniels.

Do you, or your society, publish the data that you obtained in your genealogical research census records in the past, do you publish them for the general public by naming individuals?

Mr. DANIELS. No, we do not publish anything in the society.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, you have them merely kept in your records then?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Do you make duplicates of those records?

Mr. DANIELS. We make duplicate films for our branch libraries where there are no restrictions.

Mr. WHITE. What do you mean by "no restrictions"?

Mr. DANIELS. Well, many times, records are received by the society, microfilmed by the society, and there are restrictions placed on those records by the holder or the archivist.

Mr. WHITE. What do you do, publish those duplicates? Do you send them to any other source or keep them within church records?

Mr. DANIELS. The only sources we would send them to would be our branch genealogical libraries. All this does is provide the same facilities to the people throughout the country.

Mr. WHITE. Are you indicating by your testimony that you feel that there was no law for confidentiality in 1900?

Mr. DANIELS. We are not aware of any.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. McKay's proposed bill, I believe, would limit the availability of census information to genealogists and historians, if I am not mistaken. Is that correct?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes. This is my understanding.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel that this might be too restrictive if you are going to open records at all? Why would you not open records at all?

Why would you not open them to the economists, sociologists, and any others?

Mr. DANIELS. I cannot speak for Mr. McKay, and I do not know whether he would entertain that broad a concept or not.

But I personally would see no reason for preventing a legitimate interest or organization to have access to these records by virtue of certain individuals appointed to examine them and make copies.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Daniels.

Counsel, do you have any questions?

Mr. BRAY. I would like to ask why you refer to genealogy as a divinely invoked responsibility, or why your organization considers it such.

Mr. DANIELS. That is a very interesting question. I would be very happy to answer it, if the chairman approves.

Mr. WHITE. Well, I think, if I am not mistaken, that is a part of the basic religion of the Mormons, is it not?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes, it is. I might point out just briefly, in answer to that question, that those who are not members of The Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, but who still have great interest in genealogy, their interest generally terminates with the entry of those names on a pedigree chart. They identify their people, and that is it.

Our interest goes much deeper than that. We take the names from pedigree charts after they have been identified, and the names then are submitted for clearance for ordinance work in the temples of the Church.

And these ordinances are performed in the temples under the authority of the priesthood, by proxy, for the dead as well as for the living. Those who choose to go through the temples for these ordinances on their own behalf way do so.

The concept, as revealed, is that these ordinances are basic and necessary for eternal life in a family relationship with God. And so

this is why I mentioned that this is a divinely invoked responsibility and why it goes far beyond the normal interest in genealogy.

Mr. WHITE. Does that answer Counsel's question?

Mr. BRAY. Thank you.

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

At this time, we call on John H. Aiken, Executive Director of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference.

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. AIKEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL STATISTICS USERS' CONFERENCE

Mr. AIKEN. As the Executive Director of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference, my appearance here today is to present the views of the Conference on proposals for mid-decade census legislation.

FSCU is an association comprising 189 organizations generally classified as business firms, labor unions, nonprofit research groups (including professional associations), State and local governments and trade associations. Members of these groups have a common interest in obtaining adequate, timely and reliable information from Federal statistical programs. Almost every segment of the economy that uses Federal statistics is represented in the Conference.

I wish to make it clear that the collection of more statistics, per se, is not an objective of our organization. One of our primary functions, as spelled out in our by-laws is "to coordinate efforts of Federal statistics users in developing Federal statistical programs of optimum usefulness at minimum expense."

The Federal Statistics Users' Conference has repeatedly endorsed a mid-decade census, and has so testified at previous hearings before this subcommittee, as well as before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I would particularly refer you to our last detailed statement, presented on May 18, 1971, before this subcommittee. That statement appears in the printed record of the hearings.

However, at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference, held in November, 1972, the following resolution was approved at the membership business meeting:

Whereas, the Two-Hundredth Anniversary of the founding of the Republic will be celebrated in 1976, and

Whereas, anniversaries are a time for considering the past, the present and the future, as well as a time for commemoration, and

Whereas, no better milestone can be posted to mark the progress of this great Nation than a census of population of the United States of America, taken at this pivotal point in the Nation's history, and

Whereas, the Federal Statistics Users' Conference has repeatedly endorsed a Mid-Decade Census, and

Whereas, it is now known that a Mid-Decade Census in 1975 is not feasible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Statistics Users' Conference supports a Bicentennial count of Population and Housing to be taken in 1976, so that we may have a more current picture of the distribution and characteristics of the population of our nation, and be it further

Resolved, That a scaled-down version of the Decennial census, rather than a full replication, should be taken early in the year 1976 so that the results of this modified census may be published during the Bicentennial Year.

Now, that was approved on November 21, 1972, last year, and I think it is clear the general feeling was that if we do not have the lead time necessary for 1975, certainly we ought to consider 1976.

But I would particularly like to call your attention to a report on FSUC Survey regarding proposals for a Mid-Decade Census of Population and Housing. That report was issued in October, 1971, and is included as a part of the hearings held by this subcommittee on May 18, June 2, and 10, 1971.

Now, there seems to be a discrepancy there, but the hearings record was held open for later submission of material and we were fortunate that our report was included. And, if it is agreeable, I would appreciate it if a copy of that report could again be included in the record of these hearings.

Mr. WHITE. Without objection, so ordered, and it will be placed in the record at the end of your testimony.

Mr. AIKEN. Now, the FSUC's survey was conducted at the request of Congressman Charles H. Wilson, then chairman of the House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics. FSUC members were asked for their views on the scope of a mid-decade census, on the level of detail they believe is essential, and on the penalty provisions of the law. A total of 156 responses were received from 123 firms or organizations, representing an overall response rate of 59.1 percent.

The report contains 21 pages of detailed tables. The responses were tabulated for all respondents, and then further tabulated by classification of respondents; that is, business firms, State and local governments, universities, nonprofit research organizations, trade associations and labor unions. As the report indicates, there are distinct variations in the responses as between the various classifications of respondents.

The principal results of the survey showed the following: 95.4 percent favor a mid-decade census to be taken in 1975; 92.8 percent favor a census in the middle of every succeeding decade; 90.7 percent favor the mandatory requirement for response; 67.9 percent believe the provisions of the law for compulsory response in the censuses should be amended to remove the jail penalty; 56.8 percent believe that the level of fine should not be increased.

I want to mention some of the items of major interest. Of the 32 population items included in the 1970 census, 16 of these were rated of high priority in a mid-decade census by 50 percent or more of the total respondents.

From the standpoint of priorities, it is obvious that age, sex, and color or race would rank high in the population category.

Other high priority items include: employment, income, occupation, marital status, education, place of work, means of transportation to work, relationship to head of household, place of residence 5 years ago, and year moved into this house.

Of the 33 housing items included in the 1970 census, 11 of these were rated of high priority in a mid-decade census by 50 percent or more of the total respondents.

In this category, the following items had the highest priority ratings: number of units and whether a trailer, value, contract rent, year structure built, vacancy status, rooms and tenure.

Following in importance is information on: automobiles, flush toilet, bathrooms, complete kitchen facilities, months vacant, farm residence and water supply.

I think one of the things that the results of this survey show is that if you are going to have a scaled-down version, this is at least a documented indication of priority items from the standpoint of users and I hope it will be useful.

Mr. WHITE. That is very valuable. We appreciate you giving it to us.

Mr. AIKEN. Now, the main thing is the need for small area data. The survey provides overwhelming evidence of the great need for small area data by all classes of users.

For every single population and housing item, more than 50 percent of the respondents indicated a need for data at the county, urban place or census tract level.

For block data provided from the 100 percent items for both population and housing, an average of approximately 27 percent of user respondents indicated a need for this level of data.

Now, for these two small area geographic levels—census tracts and blocks—the range of need is from 68 percent to 86 percent.

It is not in my statement, but I would say that the lowest level for which our members need data is at the county level. Their minimum requirement is that they obtain data at the county level in any survey that might be conducted.

Mr. WHITE. What size of population are you suggesting?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that varies. I would have to look up the figures on what is the smallest county. Of course, you may eliminate some. But from what I heard about the proposed surveys, they are going to give data only for some large counties. I think that a lot of counties will be missed that are of great importance. This is why our members feel that we must get down to the county level in these surveys.

It is this overwhelming need for small area data that prompts the conference to support legislation for a mid-decade census of population and housing.

As I have mentioned, our position has been made clear in previous testimony. A review of the history of this issue over the past decade—as compiled in terms of congressional hearings, writings in journals and newspapers, and public statements by Governors, mayors and other local government officials—indicates that there is overwhelming evidence of the utility and value of a mid-decade census. There is little more that can be said now that has not been said before.

We consider legislation for a mid-decade census one of the most important issues today relating to our statistical system. We commend the subcommittee for recognizing this fact and for placing it first on the agenda of business. We earnestly urge the subcommittee to report favorably on a mid-decade census.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference on this important issue.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Aiken. And your former testimony, of course, is available to the committee, and it has been most helpful.

At this time, I am going to recognize Mr. Hinshaw for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Aiken, first of all, I find the report of the survey very helpful, from a quick scan that I gave it.

I am going to give a little background information myself, and then I am going to ask a direct question.

I used to be the assessor in Orange County, Calif., and assessors' offices, generally speaking, do not have computerized records. In 1965 we started collecting all of the property information, of both businesses and residential property, and putting information on file in our computer. I suppose, we led the entire Nation in that regard.

After the 1970 census was published, we checked the data that we had in our file with the data that was listed by census tract and the correlation was extremely good.

I am not prepared to say whose data was better, but I will guess you can think whose was better.

Were you in the room when I was asking Mr. Hagan some questions?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HINSHAW. It would seem to me—and I am asking for your reaction to this supposition on my part—that if the Federal Government, through whatever fashion they chose, were to encourage States and local governments to collect all the type of data which States and local governments are supposed to collect, according to the now existing laws, and compile that data in such a fashion that computer tapes would be presented to the Census Bureau for reformat into whatever fashion it chose, that the huge cost of a mid-decade census, and the huge cost of a full decade census could be reduced in terms of number; but, more importantly, perhaps the data could be then available not every 5 or 10 years but would be available every few months or every year. I would like to get your reaction to that suggestion.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, I am not a user, but a representative of users. But I will say this: We have encouraged and supported better coordination between the Federal Government and State governments than between State governments. From what I have learned, there are many different data systems.

They have different definitions, different classifications, and they are not consistent in their methods of collection and some medium needs to be established where States can get together—and we have encouraged it, as a matter of fact—to identify their priorities for data, to describe how they are collecting data, to determine the differences, and find a means for improving the system so that the data can be meshed and coordinated.

I think you have touched on a very important problem. Some States say, "Well, we don't have the resources, either in money or staff."

Some are doing a pretty good job and our organization would encourage greater coordination and lend support to any efforts that could be made along that line.

Now the question of revenue sharing came up this morning by Mr. Hagan. We consider this a most important area. As a matter of fact, I now have under consideration a 2-day conference in June on data sources and needs for revenue sharing and formula grants.

I am holding a meeting next week of about 20 key people from government and private industry who are working on this to see if we can structure a logical, informative program about what kinds of information we are going to need to establish eligibility—where does it exist, how do they use it. But I think you have touched on a very good point.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you. We have one more point; it seems to me that the great objections of the States and local governments to the reliability of the Census Bureau figures of the 1970 census has been such that the Census Bureau data collection method has been largely discredited.

My own feeling is that data, however collected, has to be considered as primarily usable for business because our whole economy, and therefore government, depends upon accurate, timely data for the use of business.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, there are, of course, many different types of users who use the data for the same purposes. But I agree that the business users are vitally important.

The list you refer to includes only five people from each membership group. I think our State and local government group has about 13 or 14 members. I would like to have a meeting of our State members to consider the very suggestion that you made.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will see if I cannot help foster that with you.

Mr. AIKEN. Thank you. We will be happy to have your support.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Aiken, even Mr. Hagan, in testifying, indicated that he felt that a 25-percent central survey, which is about the amount that appears to be required to reach down into the county level that you are speaking of, would cost something in the neighborhood of \$200 million, if I recall his testimony.

Mr. AIKEN. Two years ago, it was \$170 million.

Mr. WHITE. Well, just assuming that those figures are reasonably accurate.

Mr. AIKEN. We have to go on that assumption because I have no way to verify them.

Mr. WHITE. Do you feel this would be an economical venture that will pay off, or do you feel that this would not be a justified expenditure?

Mr. AIKEN. The question has come up many times, and the Office of Management and Budget says \$200 million is just too much to spend. They say: Where are you going to get the money? Can you give it to us?

We support economy in government, but this proposal is a single isolated type of a program. We have the census, the 10-year census. That need has been established.

Our attitude is that an expenditure in statistics is a good investment. It does pay off.

Now, I know the President's Commission examined the question and said, "Well, we need a good cost-benefit analysis." But it is tough to do it.

I have not seen a good cost-benefit analysis regarding statistical programs. What I really think is needed is some measure of the value of decisions or the kinds of decisions that are made based on statistical data.

We have often been asked, what kinds of decisions are made based on certain kinds of statistical data. Well, you cannot say.

The chairman of a corporation may call his economist and say, "I need data on this." Well, the economist provides a combination of data. The man that provides the data just does not realize how much impact that data has on decisionmaking.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Aiken, if we give you the opportunity, would your organization like to furnish for the record some study that would indicate the economic feasibility of expenditures of sums upward of \$200 million?

We would be delighted to receive this so that we could have this completed in the record.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure I understood you.

Mr. WHITE. In other words, your justification for the expenditure, can you show in the various modes how this would be economical to the country? How it would, in fact, be a savings to the country, rather than a needless expenditure.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure that we are equipped to do it. We are a small organization, a three-person staff with a small budget.

I would like to suggest that to the board of trustees, but as I say, we have a \$60,000-a-year budget with a 3-person staff. I would like to see that type of thing done.

Mr. WHITE. That is all right. I thought you had the facilities.

At this time, Mr. Rousselot, do you have any questions of this witness, or do you wish to wait until the next witness?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will wait until the next witness.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Aiken.

[The attachments to Mr. Aiken's statement follow:]

REPORT ON FSUC SURVEY REGARDING PROPOSALS FOR
A MID-DECADE CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

On May 18, 1971, the Executive Director of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference appeared before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to present the views of FSUC in support of proposals for a mid-decade census. In the course of the hearing, the Executive Director offered to survey FSUC members in order to obtain an additional expression of their views on the scope of a mid-decade census, the level of detail they believe is essential, and on the penalty provisions of the law. Congressman Charles H. Wilson, Chairman of the Subcommittee, responded to Mr. Aiken's offer and requested that the FSUC membership be surveyed.

Accordingly, on June 30, 1971, an in-depth questionnaire was sent to the Official Representative of the 188 member organizations. A follow-up questionnaire was sent to non-respondents on July 21, 1971.

Prior to the initial distribution of the questionnaire, a Special Newsletter on the mid-decade census issue was sent to all FSUC members. In addition, this Special Newsletter was sent as a matter of interest to various non-member users, as well as to each subscriber to the FSUC Newsletter. All recipients of the Special Newsletter were informed that the initial mailing of the questionnaire would be to Official Representatives of member firms, but that anyone wishing to respond was cordially invited to do so.

Twenty non-member firms or organizations participated in the survey. Non-member respondents included one business firm, eight universities and eleven local governments. Most of the non-member respondents are affiliated with trade and professional association members of FSUC, that is, through their membership on government statistics committees of such organizations. Others participated at their own request.

Some of those participating in the survey duplicated the questionnaire for distribution to persons who might have differing uses and points of view. This effort resulted in 33 additional responses from eleven organizations. On the other hand, some members indicated that the questionnaire form had been circulated to others in the organization and that the single questionnaire response represented the consolidated views of several individuals.

RESPONSE RATES AND TYPES OF USERS

A total of 156 responses were received from 123 firms or organizations, representing an over-all response rate of 59.1 percent. One response was in the form of a letter with the remaining 155 in the form of questionnaires from which the results have been tabulated. [Three additional questionnaires were received after the closing date of the survey.]

A good cross-section of users was covered in the survey, as will be seen in the following tabulation which classifies respondents by types of firms or organizations.

Classification of Respondents to FSUC Mid-decade Census Questionnaire

	<u>Firms or Organizations Surveyed</u>	<u>No. of Respondents</u>	<u>Percent</u>
BUSINESS FIRMS	118	58	49.2
Advertising and Business Services	(18)	(7)	(38.9)
Banking-Finance-Insurance	(35)	(18)	(51.4)
Communications-Transportation	(4)	(2)	(50.0)
Printing and Publishing	(7)	(1)	(14.3)
Trade	(5)	(2)	(40.0)
Manufacturing	(49)	(28)	(57.1)
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ^{1/}	27	25	92.6
UNIVERSITIES	15	14	93.3
NONPROFIT RESEARCH (Including Professional Associations)	18	13	72.2
TRADE ASSOCIATIONS	20	10	50.0
LABOR UNIONS	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>30.0</u>
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	208	123	59.1
Additional Responses	<u>11</u>	<u>33</u>	
TOTAL RESPONSES		156	

^{1/} Includes 8 state governments and 16 local governments.

The preceding table listed number of respondents by class. The following tabulation lists the number of responses by class:

	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Business firms.....	65	41.7
State and local governments.....	41	26.3
Universities.....	24	15.4
Nonprofit research.....	13	8.3
Trade associations.....	10	6.4
Labor unions.....	<u>3</u>	<u>1.9</u>
Total.....	156	100.0

The first three groups account for 83.4 percent of the total responses.

With regard to labor unions, it should be pointed out that although the ten members constitute a small proportion of the total members of FSUC, in terms of the total universe of union membership, they account for 97 percent of that total. The three labor union members of FSUC that responded to the questionnaire account for 89 percent of the total U.S. union membership.

VIEWS ON MID-DECADE CENSUS AND MANDATORY RESPONSE

In tabulating the results it was evident that there were some variations in the responses as between the various classifications of respondents. Hence, the responses in this section and the following section on Penalty Provisions have been classified according to the preceding tabulations.

On the question of whether or not respondents favor a mid-decade census to be taken in 1975, 98.7 percent answered the question. Responses were as follows:

	No. of Answers	Percent	
		Yes	No
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	153	95.4	4.6
Business firms.....	62	93.5	6.5
State and local governments.....	41	100.0	-0-
Universities.....	24	87.5	12.5
Nonprofit research.....	13	100.0	-0-
Trade associations.....	10	100.0	-0-
Labor unions.....	3	100.0	-0-

FSUC member views on a mid-decade census have been obtained through the use of surveys conducted in 1962, 1965, 1966 and 1971. These surveys are indicative that an increasing number of our members favor a mid-decade census. The percentage of respondents favoring a mid-decade census in these years is as follows: 33 percent in 1962; 40 percent in 1965; 85 percent in 1966; and 95 percent in 1971.

On the question of whether or not respondents favor a census in the middle of every succeeding decade, 98.1 percent answered the question. Responses were as follows:

	No. of Answers	Percent	
		Yes	No
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	152	92.8	7.2
Business firms.....	63	92.1	7.9
State and local governments.....	40	100.0	-0-
Universities.....	24	75.0	25.0
Nonprofit research.....	13	100.0	-0-
Trade associations.....	9	100.0	-0-
Labor unions.....	3	100.0	-0-

On the question of whether or not respondents favor the mandatory requirement for response to a mid-decade census, 96.8 percent answered the question. Responses were as follows:

	No. of Answers	Percent	
		Yes	No
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	150	90.7	9.3
Business firms.....	61	91.8	8.2
State and local governments.....	40	100.0	-0-
Universities.....	23	69.6	30.4
Nonprofit research.....	13	92.3	7.7
Trade associations.....	10	90.0	10.0
Labor unions.....	3	100.0	-0-

VIEWS ON PENALTY PROVISIONS OF CENSUS LAW

On the question of whether or not respondents believe provisions of the law for compulsory response in the censuses should be amended to remove the jail penalty, 84.5 percent answered the question. Responses were as follows:

	No. of Answers	Percent	
		Yes	No
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	131	67.9	32.1
Business firms.....	52	73.1	26.9
State and local governments.....	34	50.0	50.0
Universities.....	23	73.9	26.1
Nonprofit research.....	10	70.0	30.0
Trade associations.....	9	77.8	22.2
Labor unions.....	3	100.0	-0-

Respondents were also asked if they believe that the level of fine should be increased; 61.5 percent answered the question. Responses were as follows:

	No. of Answers	Percent	
		Yes	No
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	95	43.2	56.8
Business firms.....	39	41.0	59.0
State and local governments.....	19	36.8	63.2
Universities.....	18	44.4	55.6
Nonprofit research.....	8	62.5	37.5
Trade associations.....	8	50.0	50.0
Labor unions.....	3	33.3	66.7

Respondents were asked for their views as to whether or not the jail sentence provision of the law should be made less than 60 days, or whether they thought it should be made more than 60 days. Response rates to both of these questions were extremely low:

On the question of reducing the jail sentence, there were 40 responses, and 72.5 percent of these favored a reduction.

On the question of increasing the jail sentence, there were only 26 responses, and only 30.8 percent of the respondents favored an increase.

Individual Comments Regarding the Penalty Provisions -- A number of respondents expressed individual comments regarding the penalty provisions. These comments are quoted in Appendix A attached to this Report.

ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION OR OMISSION
IN A MID-DECADE CENSUS

Section II of the FSUC questionnaire listed all of the subject items included in the 1970 Census of Population and Housing and respondents were asked to indicate which items they would recommend for inclusion or omission in a mid-decade census.

Respondents were also asked to indicate how they would rank the items recommended for inclusion in terms of priority, viz, high, medium or low.

These results are tabulated in Tables A and B, attached. Each group of items -- 100 percent, and the 20 percent, 15 percent and 5 percent samples -- are listed according to how the respondents rank them in terms of high, medium or low priority. Table A covers population items and Table B covers housing items.

It is obvious that all respondents did not answer this part of the questionnaire. However, the range of response for population items was from 36 percent to 93 percent and for housing items the range was from 86 percent to 90 percent.

In addition, respondents were asked to indicate what subject items, not reported in the 1970 census, they believe should be included in a mid-decade census in 1975. Part II of Tables A and B lists the recommended additional items according to classification of users.

ITEMS OF MAJOR INTEREST:

Population Items -- Of the 32 population items included in the 1970 census, 16 of these were rated of high priority in a mid-decade census by 50 percent or more of the total respondents. Table C, attached, lists these 16 items ranked according to the combined percentage of those rating them of high and medium priority. In other words, by combining these two priority ratings we find that the total degree of primary interest ranges from 80 percent to 97 percent. The table also shows the degree to which respondents require the information on a small area basis, viz, at the county, urban place, census tract level or at the minor civil division (township) or city block level.

In the case of the university group, 21 population items were rated of high priority by 50 percent or more of the respondents. For the nonprofit research group, the number of items with this rating was 18.

Housing Items -- Of the 33 housing items included in the 1970 census, 11 of these were rated of high priority in a mid-decade census by 50 percent or more of the total respondents. Table D, attached, lists 14 housing items ranked according to the combined percentage of those rating them of high and medium priority, showing the total degree of primary interest. Three additional items are included in this tabulation because the combined percentage of those rating them of high and medium priority equalled 80 percent or more. The table also shows the degree to which respondents require the information on a small area basis.

As one would expect, the state and local government group indicated the highest degree of interest in housing items. For this group, 17 housing items were rated of high priority by 50 percent or more of the respondents.

For both population and housing items, it is to be noted that some of the less than 100 percent sample items were of greater interest and rated a higher priority than some of the complete count (100 percent) items. Likewise, some of the 15 percent sample items were of greater interest and rated a higher priority than some of the 20 percent items. This was also the case as between some 5 percent and 15 percent items.

QUESTIONS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT, OCCUPATION, ETC.:

Of the 32 population items, ten relate to employment, occupation, place of work, etc. For convenience, these items have been tabulated separately in Table E, attached. The table shows both priority rating and geographic level desired.

ITEMS OF LOWEST PRIORITY:

Population Items -- The following eight population items were rated of lowest priority by those recommending their inclusion. A relatively high percentage of respondents also recommended their omission.

	Percent	
	Low Priority	Recommend Omission
Year of immigration.....	54.9	40.1
Mother tongue.....	54.0	37.0
Country of birth.....	51.2	40.7
When married.....	48.3	36.5
Period and duration of disability.....	46.9	29.9
Veteran status.....	45.9	37.0
Mexican or spanish origin.....	45.9	27.9
Citizenship.....	43.6	31.9

Housing Items -- The following eight housing items were rated of lowest priority by those recommending their inclusion. A relatively high percentage of respondents also recommended their omission.

	Percent	
	Low Priority	Recommend Omission
Dishwasher.....	38.5	33.6
Television.....	38.2	34.6
Radio.....	37.9	36.5
Home food freezer.....	35.9	35.0
Storeroom, elevator in structure.....	35.9	34.6
Basement.....	35.6	35.1
Clothes dryer.....	35.6	34.3
Clothes washing machine.....	35.2	33.6

ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR OMISSION:

Tables A and B show the percentage of respondents that recommended omission of each item from a mid-decade census. For convenience, the following summary indicates for the complete count and sample groups the highest and lowest percentage of respondents recommending omission:

Population:	Percent
(5) 100% Items: Age.....	0.0
Sex.....	0.0
Relationship to head of household.....	7.1
(12) 20% Items: Income last year-wage and salary income.....	2.1
State or country of birth.....	25.7

<u>Population:</u>		<u>Percent</u>
(8)	15% Items: Place of residence five years ago..... Country of birth of parents.....	10.2 40.6
(7)	5% Items: Vocational training completed..... Occupation or industry, 5 years ago..... Year of immigration.....	24.6 24.6 40.1
 <u>Housing:</u>		
(13)	100% Items: Value..... Access to unit.....	8.7 30.1
(5)	20% Items: Number of units in structure and whether a trailer..... Heating equipment.....	13.1 28.7
(5)	15% Items: Automobiles..... Bathrooms.....	17.5 29.2
(10)	5% Items: Second home..... Home food freezer.....	17.5 35.0

GEOGRAPHIC LEVEL FOR WHICH DATA WOULD BE DESIRED
IN A MID-DECADE CENSUS

Section II of the FSUC questionnaire asked respondents to indicate the geographic detail for which they would require data in a mid-decade census, based on the following levels:

- 1 State
- 2 SMSA, large city
- 3 County, urban place, census tract
- 4 Minor civil division (township), city block

Tables A and B, attached, indicate the percentage of respondents who would require mid-decade information by geographical levels, according to the breakdown shown above, for each of the population and housing items included in the 1970 census.

Need for Small Area Data -- Levels 3 and 4 represent the need for data on a small area basis. The following summarizes the averages of respondents requiring data at these levels for the complete count and sample items in the population and housing censuses:

		<u>Percent</u>		
		<u>Level</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Totals</u>
		3	4	3 & 4
<u>Population:</u>	(5) 100 percent items.....	59.1	26.7	85.8
	(12) 20 percent items.....	68.8	10.5	79.3
	(8) 15 percent items.....	66.3	10.8	77.1
	(7) 5 percent items.....	54.9	8.6	63.5

		Percent			
		Level	Level	Totals	
		3	4	3 & 4	
<u>Housing:</u>	(13)	100 percent items.....	57.2	26.5	83.7
	(5)	20 percent items.....	68.9	13.0	81.9
	(5)	15 percent items.....	64.0	11.4	75.4
	(10)	5 percent items.....	58.3	9.5	67.8

It is obvious from the above that there is an extremely high degree of interest and definite need for data at the small area level in a mid-decade census. *More than 50 percent of the respondents indicated a need for data at the county, urban place, or census tract level, for every single population and housing item.*

Although it is recognized that block data can be provided only from information collected in the 100 percent items in the census, the survey shows that there are some respondents who desire block data for each of the subject items included in the 20, 15 and 5 percent samples. In fact, it is important to note that two respondents felt that all population and housing information items were vitally needed at the 5-digit zip code level, for the five-year census.

As would be expected, state and local governments indicated the highest degree of need for data at the block level. To illustrate, on the subject of color or race, 31 percent of all respondents desire such data at the block level, whereas 48.6 percent of state and local government respondents indicated such a need. The next highest degree of need for block data was by nonprofit research organizations and universities. And, as also would be expected, trade associations and labor unions indicated little or no interest in block data.

RESPONSES BY CLASS OF USER:

Because of the variations in responses between classes of users, special tabulations have been made of the responses for both population and housing items by the six major classes of users covered in the survey. These responses are shown for each of the 32 population items and 33 housing items in Tables F and G, attached.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This survey of user views on a mid-decade census is the most definitive survey ever conducted by the Federal Statistics Users' Conference, not only because of the large number of subject items covered, but for the first time it accurately pinpoints how users rate statistical subject areas in terms of priority and the geographic level desired.

The 59 percent rate of response was the highest of any FSUC survey. The returns indicate that respondents gave considerable time and thought to answering the six-page questionnaire.

Although the survey was designed primarily to determine user views regarding a mid-decade census, it is obvious that the results will also be beneficial in defining user interests and needs in relation to current statistical series or special sample surveys.

With regard to criteria for evaluating statistical programs, FSUC's Long Range Program for Improvement in Federal Statistics states: "Statistical programs which serve multiple and widely felt needs should have priority over those which serve limited purposes...As a corollary to this criterion, every statistical program, existing or proposed, should be considered in terms of possible uses to which the information can be put and should be designed to provide optimum usefulness for these different purposes." In other words, programs should provide the greatest good for the greatest number. On the other hand, this FSUC survey indicates that, in some cases, there are considerable variations in the interests and needs as between groups of users. For example, one group may have little interest or need for a specific type of statistical data, whereas another group will consider the information highly essential for their purposes. The survey shows that there are often considerable variations in needs (and obviously uses) as between state and local governments and university users.

By the same token, consideration should be given to the differences in needs of non-Federal government users and the Federal government. To illustrate, information on "basements" was given a comparatively low rating by respondents to FSUC's survey. This item, first collected in 1960, is considered of great importance to the Federal government for civil-defense purposes. The question on number of children ever born has been collected in most censuses since 1890. In the FSUC survey, 15.7 percent of the respondents recommended its omission, 28.3 considered it of low priority, while 39.8 percent rated it of high priority. Statistics on children ever born are unique in providing significant information on the current and future trends of population growth through births and how the composition of the population is changing through differences in fertility of various population groups. Such data are used for projecting the age of the future population. In turn, these projections are needed by Federal, State and local governments and private industry for the planning of various short- and long-range projects. So far as FSUC respondents are concerned, what this may mean is that a relatively small number are individually concerned with making population projections; while the remainder may have a high interest, but rely on projections made by others, especially those of the Federal government.

With regard to a mid-decade census, the survey conclusively shows an extremely high percentage of respondents favoring both a mid-decade census and mandatory response. On the subject of penalties, the conclusion is that severe penalties are not required.

From the standpoint of priorities, it is obvious that age, sex and color or race would rank high in the population category. Other high priority items include: employment, income, occupation, marital status, education, place of work, means of transportation to work, relationship to head of household, place of residence 5 years ago, and year moved into this house.

In the housing category, the following items had the highest ratings: number of units and whether a trailer, value, contract rent, year structure built, vacancy status, rooms and tenure. Following in importance is information on: automobiles, flush toilet, bathrooms, complete kitchen facilities, months vacant, farm residence and water supply.

The survey results support the statement made by the Executive Director of FSUC in testimony on proposals for a mid-decade census before the Subcommittee on

Census and Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee that a full replication of the decennial census is not necessary or desired. The PSUC survey results should provide some guidance in the planning of a scaled-down census, if and when legislation for a mid-decade census is passed.

The survey also provides overwhelming evidence of the great need for small area data by all classes of users. For every single population and housing item, more than 50 percent of the respondents indicated a need for data at the county, urban place, or census tract level. For block data provided from the 100 percent items for both population and housing, an average of approximately 27 percent of user respondents indicated a need for this level of data. For these two small area geographic levels, the range of need is from 64 percent to 86 percent.

JOHN H. AIKEN
Executive Director

October, 1971

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS REGARDING PENALTY PROVISIONSBUSINESS FIRMS:

"Jail is no solution to our problem of obtaining valid and current statistical information concerning our citizens. Even an increased fine probably won't aid much. The answer must lie in the area of greater public awareness both of the confidentiality with which this data must be treated and the value of the aggregated information to the economic and social well being of the country."

"Penalty is a fool idea. Should be reserved for real crimes and not take up time of law enforcement agencies with unimportant matters. They can't handle what we now have."

"I would keep the jail penalty unless the fine was substantially increased perhaps by saying 'up to \$10,000' thus allowing the courts to deal harshly with deliberate violators whose actions endanger the integrity of the Census and moderately with people who failed to do their duty through ignorance or bad advice or who are poor, etc."

"The jail penalty does not bother me, particularly, inasmuch, as it is seldom used, but the maximum fine should be much higher."

"Objective is to obtain valid data. Do not know what value of penalty is in achieving this objective. Ideally should be able to do without penalty."

"A jail sentence would make it more democratic in that it would not matter whether you were rich or poor."

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

"I have no strong feelings on the jail sentence, but if the retention of the jail sentence will be a stumbling block to passage of the legislation, I would be willing to have this provision removed." (State)

"The 100 percent questions should be required of everyone--with a substantial penalty for refusal (NOT JAIL). The sample questions should bear little or no penalty for refusal as they lead themselves to adjustment through analytic techniques." (State)

"Make the fine, if possible, proportional to income--but as guideline suggested to the courts." (State)

"The penalty should be increased for wrongful disclosure by a Census Bureau employee--a step which would reinforce the Bureau's claim that the data is held in confidence. A \$100 fine for non-response is too low to discourage casual challengers. A heavy fine and jail sentence should be imposed on individuals or leaders of organizations that encourage others publicly (in print or otherwise) not to respond or to alter, falsify or in any other way invalidate their response." (Local)

"Fines could be established on a sliding scale according to a percentage of income or ability to pay." (Local)

UNIVERSITIES:

"Maintain penalties for wilfully giving false answers."

"While a 10 year census is desirable, I am opposed to the mandatory answers to questions other than those relating to the number of people in a given household. If people wish to answer such questions, well and good, but they should not be required to do so. However, if they choose to answer such questions, then and only then should penalties be assessed for wilfully giving false or misleading answers. Such penalties should be rather harsh."

"The imperfections of the census have been known to users for a long time and they owe more to the imperfect and often malintegrated structure of our society than to the motivating force of threat of fines and jail sentences. Making these threats more pre-eminent would only lessen the cohesion of society further and make it even more difficult for the census to reflect the reality."

"Our feeling is that more emphasis should be placed upon selection of pertinent questions, the answers to which are needed by the most units in government, education, research, etc., rather than upon determining what penalties should be applied for refusal to answer. When a minimum set of questions (selected to yield maximum genuinely needed information) is chosen, efforts could then be directed toward educating the population as to the benefits to them, the respondents, when decision-making units have proper information."

"Since I am only guessing that the threat of fine alone would be sufficient to guarantee that most people would respond, I think that this question should be researched to see if the threat of jail penalty is necessary in order to get a high response rate. If it is, I would support continuation of both the present fine and jail penalties."

NONPROFIT RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS:
(Including Professional Associations)

"I am unable to state our opinion on jail vs. a fine without further reflection. It's true that a small fine (e.g., \$100) is a penalty only to the poor, and that is absurd. I therefore would lean toward imprisonment as a penalty. But if this infuriates Congressmen and the issue is a quinquennial census with no prison penalty, or no quinquennial census, then I'd favor the dropping of imprisonment and substitution of a fine."

"We have recommended that the level of fine be established to be equivalent to the cost of obtaining the information by other means. We have suggested that standards for determination of this cost may be developed from information available to the Federal government regarding the cost of background investigations for National security clearance or from the cost of the Federal Civil Service Commission incorporated as a function of their personnel recruitment practices."

TRADE ASSOCIATIONS:

"Since the jail sentence is rarely imposed, it should be eliminated. Fines should be used as needed to require responses on the major items or question categories."

TABLE A

PSOC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	Recommend Omission #	No. of Answers	Recommend Inclusion			No. of Answers	Geographic Level				
			Priority	Rating			Percent	1	2	3	4
				High	Medium						
100% Items:											
Age (month and year of birth).....	0	0-0	144	85.4	11.1	3.5	2.3	10.6	59.1	28.0	
Sex.....	0	0-0	142	80.7	12.7	5.6	3.1	10.7	60.3	25.9	
Color or race.....	1	0-7	140	80.7	12.1	7.1	129	2.3	10.1	56.6	
Marital status.....	7	5-0	133	69.2	23.3	7.5	123	3.2	13.0	60.2	
Relationship to head of household.....	10	7-1	130	62.3	20.0	17.7	119	2.5	13.4	59.7	
20% Items:											
Income last year: Wage and salary income.....	3	2-1	139	84.9	10.8	4.3	128	3.1	12.5	71.9	
Income last year: Self-employment income.....	4	2-8	138	81.1	13.8	5.1	126	3.2	13.5	70.6	
Employment status.....	4	2-8	138	79.0	15.2	5.8	126	3.2	15.1	69.0	
Occupation, industry, and class of worker.....	7	5-0	137	80.0	16.1	2.9	125	2.4	12.0	71.2	
Years of school completed.....	7	4-9	135	86.6	14.9	4.5	123	4.1	12.2	70.7	
Weeks worked last year.....	29	21-3	107	63.0	27.4	9.6	122	4.1	14.8	72.1	
Last year in which worked.....	29	21-5	106	43.0	35.5	21.5	95	6.3	17.9	68.4	
Number of children ever born.....	21	15-7	113	41.5	29.2	29.2	95	6.3	15.8	70.5	
Activity 5 years ago.....	32	23-9	102	39.8	31.9	28.3	103	9.7	16.5	61.2	
Hours worked last week.....	30	22-1	106	39.2	31.4	29.4	91	7.7	19.8	65.9	
State or country of birth.....	35	25-7	101	36.8	25.5	37.7	94	5.3	19.1	68.1	
				31.7	29.7	38.6	90	8.9	22.2	62.2	
15% Items:											
Place of work.....	16	11-5	123	69.1	18.7	12.2	111	2.7	14.4	73.0	
Means of transportation to work.....	18	12-9	121	59.5	25.6	14.9	109	1.8	15.6	69.7	
Place of residence 5 years ago.....	14	10-2	123	52.0	29.3	18.7	113	5.3	14.2	67.2	
Year moved into this house.....	24	17-5	114	51.7	28.1	20.2	103	4.8	12.6	68.0	
School or college enrollment.....	24	17-5	113	51.3	31.0	17.7	103	3.9	18.4	68.0	
Country of birth of parents.....	56	40-6	82	19.3	29.3	51.2	74	8.1	23.0	62.2	
Mother tongue.....	51	37-0	87	18.4	27.6	56.0	77	14.3	19.5	55.8	
Veteran status.....	50	37-0	85	16.5	37.6	45.9	76	11.8	21.1	60.5	
5% Items:											
Vocational training completed.....	34	24-6	104	42.3	27.9	29.8	92	8.7	25.0	59.8	
Occupation-industry 5 years ago.....	38	24-6	104	36.5	26.9	36.5	91	12.1	19.8	57.1	
Mexican or Spanish origin or descent.....	41	29-9	98	34.7	19.4	45.9	86	13.9	23.3	52.3	
Presence and duration of disability.....	44	31-9	94	28.1	25.0	46.9	84	10.7	26.2	53.6	
Citizenship.....	55	40-1	82	25.5	30.9	43.6	81	14.8	23.5	54.3	
Year of immigration.....	55	40-1	82	21.9	23.2	54.9	69	15.9	23.2	52.2	
When married.....	50	36-5	87	19.5	32.2	48.3	76	15.8	23.7	53.9	

Geographic Level: 1-State; 2-SMSA, large city; 3-County, urban place, census tract; 4-Minor civil division, city block.

TABLE A
PART II

FSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS
NEW ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION

TABLE A
PART II

Respondents were asked if there are any subject items, not included in the 1970 census, that they believe should be included in a mid-decade census in 1975. Recommended items, by classification of user, were as follows:

POPULATION ITEMS:

Business Firms:

More information on working wives, as separate from working women.
Age and income correlations within the population and if possible on a regional level.
Income five years ago.
Place of residence one year ago.
Data by zip code (5-digit).
Means of trash disposal.
Miles from work.
Time required to get to work.
Contact with crime and justice system; as victim, type of crime, subsequent apprehension of criminal, availability of compensation for loss; number of arrests, convictions, etc.

State and Local Government Group:

Income five years ago (to determine upward mobility).
More detail on migration.
Chronic afflictions.
* Religious preferences.
* Other income - detailed.
Last employment promotion.
Distance between work and home.
Number of children living with parents.
Distance to school attended by children; means of transportation.
Whether school is public or private.
Personal taxes by level of government.
For employment status, suggest they add "retired."
Breakdown of means of transportation to work to reflect multi-modal possibility.

Universities:

Newspaper, magazine reading.
Radio-TV, listening-watching habits.
Amount of annual travel.
Costs for education per family member.
Marriage and the family.
A good ethnic origin question similar to the kind asked by the Canadian Census and recently used by the U.S. Census in its monthly sample.

Nonprofit Research Group:

Trade Association Group:

Labor Group:

(No recommended items)

* indicates two identical recommendations.

TABLE B

FSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS

TABLE B

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

	Omission		Recommend Inclusion				Geographic Level				
	#	%	No. of Answers	Priority	Rating	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3	4
100% Items:											
Value.....	12	8.7	126	74.6	20.6	4.8	115	1.7	9.6	58.3	30.4
Vacancy status.....	21	15.3	116	74.1	16.4	9.5	104	2.9	9.6	59.6	27.9
Contract rent.....	19	13.9	118	72.0	21.2	6.8	107	3.7	7.5	58.9	29.9
Rooms.....	18	13.1	119	67.2	21.8	10.9	108	1.9	14.8	56.5	26.9
Tenure.....	18	13.1	119	60.5	26.1	13.4	108	4.6	11.1	55.6	28.7
Months vacant.....	31	23.0	104	55.8	26.0	18.2	92	4.4	15.2	54.3	26.1
Water supply.....	32	23.4	105	50.5	30.5	19.0	95	3.2	14.7	58.9	23.2
Plush toilet.....	37	26.8	101	47.5	35.6	16.8	91	3.3	13.2	58.2	25.3
Bathub or shower.....	35	25.5	102	45.1	33.3	21.6	92	3.3	15.2	56.5	25.0
Commercial establishment on property.....	36	27.1	97	42.3	33.0	24.7	86	4.4	12.2	57.0	25.6
Complete kitchen facilities.....	36	26.3	101	41.6	40.6	17.8	90	4.4	12.2	56.7	26.7
Access to unit.....	40	30.1	93	38.7	33.3	28.0	80	6.2	13.8	57.5	22.5
Resement.....	47	35.1	87	23.3	39.1	35.6	76	3.9	17.1	55.3	23.7
20% Items:											
# of units in structure & whether a trailer.....	18	13.1	119	70.6	26.0	3.4	107	1.9	14.0	65.4	18.7
Year structure built.....	19	13.7	120	60.8	30.8	8.3	107	2.8	13.1	69.2	14.9
Farm residence.....	31	23.0	104	51.0	30.8	18.2	91	2.2	14.3	74.7	8.8
Components of gross rent.....	37	27.6	97	40.2	37.1	22.7	83	4.8	19.3	66.3	9.6
Heating equipment.....	39	28.7	97	38.1	41.2	20.6	82	2.4	17.1	69.5	11.0
15% Items:											
Automobiles.....	24	17.5	113	51.3	33.6	15.0	97	5.2	19.6	63.9	11.3
Sewage disposal.....	38	27.7	99	43.4	31.3	25.3	84	3.6	19.0	65.5	11.9
Source of water.....	39	28.5	98	41.8	31.6	26.5	82	4.9	18.3	65.8	11.0
Bathrooms.....	40	29.2	97	39.2	43.3	17.5	84	4.8	16.7	67.9	10.7
Air conditioning.....	39	28.7	97	31.9	42.3	23.8	84	7.1	23.8	57.1	11.9
5% Items:											
Bedrooms.....	34	25.2	101	44.5	32.7	22.8	89	4.5	21.3	61.8	12.4
Second home.....	24	17.5	113	44.2	35.4	20.4	100	5.0	20.0	59.0	12.0
Fuel -- heating, cooking, water heating.....	45	33.1	91	36.3	40.6	23.1	77	5.2	26.8	64.9	9.1
Storied, elevator in structure.....	47	34.6	89	31.5	32.6	33.9	76	9.2	25.0	56.6	9.2
Radio.....	50	36.5	87	25.3	36.8	37.9	76	10.5	23.7	57.9	7.8
Television.....	47	34.6	89	24.7	37.1	38.2	77	10.4	24.7	57.1	7.8
Clothes dryer.....	47	34.3	90	23.3	41.1	35.6	79	10.1	25.3	55.7	8.9
Clothes washing machine.....	46	33.6	91	23.1	41.7	35.2	79	10.1	25.3	55.7	8.9
Dishwasher.....	46	33.6	91	23.0	38.5	38.5	79	10.1	24.0	57.0	8.9
Home food freezer.....	48	35.0	89	22.5	41.6	35.9	78	10.3	24.3	56.4	9.0

Geographic Level: 1--State; 2--SMSA, large city; 3--County, urban place, census tract; 4--Minor civil division, city block.

TABLE B
PART IIFSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUSTABLE B
PART IINEW ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION

Respondents were asked if there are any subject items, not included in the 1970 census, that they believe should be included in a mid-decade census in 1975. Recommended items, by classification of user, were as follows:

HOUSING ITEMS:Business Firms:

Growth potential regionally.
Persons per household by type of unit.
Number of full and partial bathrooms.
Data by zip code (5-digit).
Should be a breakdown of color TV vs. B/W.
Paving of street; transit within 1/4 mile; frequency of garbage collection;
"adequacy" of heat and of hot water in respondent's opinion.

State and Local Government Group:

More detail on disappearance of housing.
More detail on number of units to structure.
* Assessed value.
Property taxes - detailed.
Millage of real estate tax.
Air conditioner - room vs. central.
Some qualification of second home to indicate where it is in relation to first home - or how far away; possibly its value or other characteristics.
Garbage grinder.

Universities:

Number of residents, per room, in home.
Percent of value spent on repair/remodel of owned home.
Percent of real estate tax increase (year, 5 years).
Value gone up/down?

Nonprofit Research Group:

The situation with respect to CT of model homes should be reviewed.
The process for determination of the number of units per structure should be clarified.

Trade Association Group:

Number of structures 3 [geographic level desired].

Labor Group:

(No recommended items)

* indicates two identical recommendations.

TABLE C

FSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS

TABLE C

POPULATION CENSUS ITEMS OF MAJOR INTEREST

Population Item:	% 1970 Census Sample	No. of Answers	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level			
			High	Medium	High & Medium	Percent	3	4	3 & 4
Employment status.....	20	137	81.0	16.1	97.1	71.2	14.4	85.6	
Age (month and year of birth).....	100	144	85.4	11.1	96.5	59.1	28.0	87.1	
Income last year: Wage and salary income.....	20	139	84.9	10.8	95.7	71.9	12.5	84.4	
Occupation, industry, and class of worker.....	20	134	80.6	14.9	95.5	70.7	13.0	83.7	
Income last year: Self-employment income.....	20	138	81.1	13.8	94.9	70.6	12.7	83.3	
Sex.....	100	142	81.7	12.7	94.4	69.0	25.9	86.2	
Income last year: Other income.....	20	138	79.0	15.2	94.2	60.3	12.7	81.7	
Color or race.....	100	140	80.7	12.1	92.8	56.6	31.0	87.6	
Marital status.....	100	133	69.2	23.3	92.5	60.2	23.6	83.8	
Years of school completed.....	20	135	63.0	27.4	90.4	72.1	9.0	81.1	
Place of work.....	15	123	69.1	18.7	87.8	73.0	9.9	82.9	
Means of transportation to work.....	15	121	59.5	25.6	85.1	69.7	12.8	82.5	
Relationship to head of household.....	100	130	62.3	20.0	82.3	59.7	24.4	84.1	
School or college enrollment.....	15	113	51.3	31.0	82.3	68.0	9.7	77.7	
Place of residence 5 years ago.....	15	123	52.0	29.3	81.3	67.2	13.3	80.5	
Year moved into this house.....	15	114	51.7	28.1	79.8	68.0	14.6	82.6	

Geographic Level: 3 --- County, urban place, census tract

4 --- Minor civil division (township), city block

TABLE D

FSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS

TABLE D

HOUSING CENSUS ITEMS OF MAJOR INTEREST

Housing Item:	% 1970 Census Sample	No. of Answers	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level			
			Priority Rating -- %	High	Medium	Percent	Total	3	4
# of units in structure & whether a trailer.....	20	119	70.6	26.0	96.6	65.4	18.7	84.1	
Value.....	100	126	74.6	20.6	95.2	58.3	30.4	88.7	
Contract rent.....	100	118	72.0	21.2	93.2	58.9	29.9	88.8	
Year structure built.....	20	120	60.8	30.8	91.6	69.2	14.9	84.1	
Vacancy status.....	100	116	74.1	16.4	90.5	59.6	27.9	87.5	
Rooms.....	100	119	67.2	21.8	89.0	56.5	26.9	83.4	
Tenure.....	100	119	60.5	26.1	86.6	55.6	28.7	84.3	
Automobiles.....	15	113	51.3	33.6	84.9	63.9	11.3	75.2	
Flush toilet.....	100	101	47.5	35.6	83.1	58.2	25.3	83.5	
Bathrooms.....	15	97	39.2	43.3	82.5	67.9	10.7	78.6	
Complete kitchen facilities.....	100	101	41.6	40.6	82.2	56.7	26.7	83.4	
Months vacant.....	100	104	55.8	26.0	81.8	54.3	26.1	80.4	
Farm residence.....	20	104	51.0	30.8	81.8	74.7	8.8	83.5	
Water supply.....	100	105	50.5	30.5	81.0	58.9	23.2	82.1	

Geographic Level: 3 -- County, urban place, census tract
4 -- Minor civil division (township), city block

TABLE E FSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RELATING TO QUESTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT, OCCUPATION, ETC.

	No. of Answers	Recommend Inclusion				Priority Rating -- Percent		Recommend Omission		No Answer Number
		High	Medium	Low	High & Medium		Number	Percent		
					High	Low				
Employment status.....	137	81.0	16.1	97.1	2.9	4	2.8	14		
Occupation, industry, and class of worker.....	134	80.6	14.9	95.5	4.5	7	5.0	14		
Place of work.....	123	69.1	18.7	87.8	12.2	16	11.5	16		
Means of transportation to work.....	121	59.5	25.6	85.1	14.9	18	12.9	16		
Weeks worked last year.....	107	43.0	35.5	78.5	21.5	29	21.3	19		
Last year in which worked.....	106	41.5	29.2	70.7	29.2	29	21.5	20		
Activity five years ago.....	102	39.2	31.4	70.6	29.4	32	23.9	21		
Vocational training completed.....	104	42.3	27.9	70.2	29.8	34	24.6	17		
Occupation-industry 5 years ago.....	104	36.5	26.9	63.4	36.5	34	24.6	17		
Hours worked last week.....	106	36.8	25.5	62.3	37.7	30	22.1	19		

	No. of Answers	Geographic Level Desired				
		Percent				
		1	2	3	4	3 & 4*
Employment status.....	125	2.4	12.0	71.2	14.4	85.6
Occupation, industry, and class of worker.....	123	4.1	12.2	70.7	13.0	83.7
Place of work.....	111	2.7	14.4	73.0	9.9	82.9
Means of transportation to work.....	109	1.8	15.6	69.7	12.8	82.5
Weeks worked last year.....	95	6.3	17.9	68.4	7.4	75.8
Last year in which worked.....	95	6.3	15.8	70.5	7.4	77.9
Activity five years ago.....	91	7.7	19.8	65.9	6.6	72.5
Vocational training completed.....	92	8.7	25.0	59.8	6.5	66.3
Occupation-industry 5 years ago.....	91	12.1	19.8	57.1	11.0	68.1
Hours worked last week.....	94	5.3	19.1	68.1	7.5	75.6

Geographic Level: 1 State
2 SMSA, large city
3 County, urban place, census tract
4 Minor civil division (township), city block

* Indicates desire for small area data

TABLE F

PSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	100%	No Ans.	Recommend Omission #	%	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level					
					No. of Answers			No. of Answers					
					High	Medium	Low	1	2	3	4		
Age (month and year of birth)													
ALL RESPONDENTS.....													
Business firms.....		11	0	0.0	144	85.4	11.1	3.5	132	2.3	10.6	59.1	28.0
State and local governments.....		4	0	0.0	60	78.3	16.7	5.0	54	3.7	13.0	61.1	22.2
Universities.....		2	0	0.0	39	94.9	5.1	0.0	38	2.6	2.6	52.6	42.1
Nonprofit Research.....		2	0	0.0	22	77.3	13.6	9.1	20	0.0	10.0	65.0	25.0
Trade Associations.....		2	0	0.0	11	100.0	0.0	0.0	10	0.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
Labor Unions.....		1	0	0.0	9	88.9	11.1	0.0	8	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5
		0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Sex													
ALL RESPONDENTS.....		13	0	0.0	142	81.7	12.7	5.6	131	3.1	10.7	60.3	25.9
Business firms.....		6	0	0.0	58	79.3	17.2	3.5	53	3.8	11.3	64.2	20.7
State and local governments.....		2	0	0.0	39	82.1	10.2	7.7	38	5.3	2.6	53.3	36.9
Universities.....		2	0	0.0	22	77.3	9.1	13.6	20	0.0	15.0	60.0	25.0
Nonprofit Research.....		2	0	0.0	11	100.0	0.0	0.0	10	0.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
Trade Associations.....		1	0	0.0	9	77.8	22.2	0.0	8	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5
Labor Unions.....		0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Color or race													
ALL RESPONDENTS.....		14	1	0.7	140	80.7	12.1	7.1	129	2.3	10.1	56.6	31.0
Business firms.....		6	0	0.0	58	72.4	15.5	12.1	53	3.8	11.3	62.3	22.6
State and local governments.....		3	0	0.0	38	92.1	7.9	0.0	37	2.7	5.4	43.2	48.6
Universities.....		2	0	0.0	22	86.4	4.5	9.1	20	0.0	5.0	60.0	35.0
Nonprofit Research.....		2	1	9.0	10	80.0	20.0	0.0	9	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3
Trade Associations.....		1	0	0.0	9	66.7	22.2	11.1	8	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0
Labor Unions.....		0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Marital status													
ALL RESPONDENTS.....		15	7	5.0	133	69.2	23.3	7.5	123	3.2	13.0	60.2	23.6
Business firms.....		6	2	3.4	56	71.4	21.4	7.1	52	5.8	11.5	61.5	21.2
State and local governments.....		4	5	13.5	32	59.4	31.2	9.4	31	3.2	9.7	51.6	35.5
Universities.....		2	0	0.0	22	63.6	22.7	13.6	20	0.0	15.0	65.0	20.0
Nonprofit Research.....		2	0	0.0	11	81.8	18.2	0.0	10	0.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
Trade Associations.....		1	0	0.0	9	77.8	22.2	0.0	8	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0
Labor Unions.....		0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

TABLE F

-2-

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	No Ans.	Recommoed Omission #	%	Recommoed Inclusion			No. of Answers				Geographic Level		
				High	Medium	Low	1	2	3	4			
<u>Relationship to head of household</u>													
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>													
Business firms.....	15	10	7.1	130	62.3	20.0	17.7	119	2.3	13.4	59.7	24.4	
State and local governments.....	6	6	10.3	52	55.8	23.1	21.1	47	4.3	14.9	61.7	19.1	
Universities.....	4	2	5.4	35	60.0	20.0	20.0	34	2.9	8.8	52.9	35.3	
Nonprofit Research.....	2	1	4.3	21	71.4	9.5	19.1	19	0.0	10.5	63.2	26.3	
Trade Associations.....	2	1	9.1	10	80.0	20.0	0.0	9	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	
Labor Unions.....	1	0	0.0	9	66.7	33.3	0.0	8	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	
	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	
<u>20%</u>													
<u>Income last year: Wage and salary</u>													
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>													
Business firms.....	13	3	2.1	139	84.9	10.8	4.3	128	3.1	12.5	71.9	12.5	
State and local governments.....	5	1	1.7	58	82.8	10.3	6.9	53	3.8	17.0	66.0	13.2	
Universities.....	2	0	0.0	39	84.6	12.8	2.6	37	0.0	5.4	75.7	18.9	
Nonprofit Research.....	2	1	4.5	21	90.5	9.5	0.0	19	5.3	5.3	78.9	10.5	
Trade Associations.....	3	0	0.0	10	90.0	10.0	0.0	9	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0	
Labor Unions.....	1	0	0.0	8	75.0	12.5	12.5	8	12.5	12.5	75.0	0.0	
	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	
<u>Income last year: Self-employment</u>													
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>													
Business firms.....	13	4	2.8	138	81.1	13.8	5.1	126	3.2	13.5	70.6	12.7	
State and local governments.....	5	2	3.4	57	77.2	14.0	8.8	52	3.8	19.2	63.5	13.5	
Universities.....	2	0	0.0	39	84.6	12.8	2.6	37	0.0	5.4	75.7	18.9	
Nonprofit Research.....	3	0	0.0	21	81.0	19.0	0.0	19	5.3	5.3	78.9	10.5	
Trade Associations.....	1	1	11.1	8	75.0	12.5	12.5	8	12.5	12.5	75.0	0.0	
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	
<u>Income last year: Other</u>													
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>													
Business firms.....	13	4	2.8	138	79.0	15.2	5.8	126	3.2	15.1	69.0	12.7	
State and local governments.....	5	2	3.4	57	75.4	14.0	10.5	52	3.8	19.2	63.5	13.5	
Universities.....	2	0	0.0	39	79.5	17.9	2.6	37	0.0	8.1	73.0	18.9	
Nonprofit Research.....	3	0	0.0	21	81.0	19.0	0.0	19	5.3	5.3	78.9	10.5	
Trade Associations.....	1	1	11.1	8	75.0	12.5	12.5	8	12.5	12.5	75.0	0.0	
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	

TABLE F

-3-

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	20%	No Ans.	Recommend Omission		Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level				
			f	%	No. of Answers	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3
<u>Employment status</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	14	4	2.8	81.0	16.1	2.9	125	2.4	12.0	71.2	14.4	
State and local governments.....	6	2	3.4	78.6	16.1	5.3	31	2.0	15.7	64.7	17.6	
Universities.....	3	1	2.6	37	75.7	24.3	0	35	0.0	5.7	74.3	20.0
Nonprofit Research.....	2	0	0.0	22	95.5	4.5	0.0	20	5.0	5.0	80.0	10.0
Trade Associations.....	1	1	11.1	81.8	9.1	9.1	9	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0	
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Occupation, industry, class of worker</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	14	7	5.0	80.6	14.9	4.5	123	4.1	12.2	70.7	13.0	
State and local governments.....	6	3	5.2	81.8	14.6	3.6	50	4.0	14.0	68.0	14.0	
Universities.....	2	1	2.6	38	78.9	15.8	36	0.0	2.8	77.8	19.4	
Nonprofit Research.....	3	1	4.8	20	85.0	15.0	0.0	19	5.3	5.3	78.9	10.5
Trade Associations.....	2	1	9.1	10	80.0	10.0	10.0	8	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	1	11.1	8	62.5	25.0	12.5	8	25.0	12.5	62.5	0.0
<u>Years of school completed</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	13	7	4.9	63.0	27.4	9.6	122	4.1	14.8	72.1	9.0	
State and local governments.....	5	3	5.1	56	58.9	30.4	10.7	50	4.0	20.0	62.0	14.0
Universities.....	3	3	7.9	35	48.6	40.0	11.4	33	0.0	6.1	84.8	9.1
Nonprofit Research.....	2	0	0.0	22	86.4	4.5	9.1	20	5.0	10.0	80.0	5.0
Trade Associations.....	1	1	11.1	11	81.8	9.1	9.1	9	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Weeks worked last year</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	19	29	21.3	107	43.0	35.5	21.5	95	6.3	17.9	68.4	7.4
State and local governments.....	7	11	19.3	46	41.3	34.8	23.9	41	7.3	19.5	63.4	9.8
Universities.....	4	12	32.4	25	28.0	56.0	16.0	23	0.0	4.3	87.0	8.7
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	10.0	18	66.7	22.2	11.1	16	6.2	6.2	81.3	6.2
Trade Associations.....	1	3	33.3	6	16.7	33.3	50.0	6	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

TABLE F

-4-

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	20%	No. Omission #	Recommend %	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level					
				No. of Answers	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3	4
<u>Last year in which worked</u>												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....												
Business firms.....	20	29	21.5	106	41.5	29.2	29.2	95	6.3	15.8	70.5	7.4
State and local governments.....	5	16	27.1	43	44.2	25.6	30.2	38	7.9	15.8	65.8	10.5
Universities.....	4	9	24.3	28	21.4	46.4	32.1	26	0.0	7.7	84.6	7.7
Nonprofit Research.....	4	1	5.0	19	57.9	21.1	21.0	17	5.9	5.9	82.3	5.9
Trade Associations.....	3	2	20.0	8	50.0	0.0	50.0	6	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0
Labor Unions.....	3	1	14.3	6	33.3	50.0	16.7	6	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0
	1	0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Number of children ever born</u>												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....												
Business firms.....	22	21	15.7	113	39.8	31.9	28.3	103	9.7	16.5	61.2	12.6
State and local governments.....	7	12	20.7	46	37.0	30.4	32.6	41	14.6	17.1	53.7	14.6
Universities.....	3	7	20.6	27	40.7	37.0	22.2	27	3.7	11.1	66.7	18.5
Nonprofit Research.....	3	1	4.8	20	35.0	25.0	40.0	17	5.9	5.9	76.4	11.8
Trade Associations.....	3	0	0.0	10	80.0	20.0	0.0	9	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
Labor Unions.....	2	1	12.5	7	14.3	57.1	28.6	7	28.6	28.6	42.8	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Activity 5 years ago</u>												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....												
Business firms.....	21	32	23.9	102	39.2	31.4	29.4	91	7.7	19.8	65.9	6.6
State and local governments.....	8	16	28.6	40	32.5	40.0	27.5	36	11.1	22.2	61.1	5.6
Universities.....	6	9	25.7	26	38.5	26.9	34.6	24	0.0	8.3	79.2	12.5
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	14.3	18	61.1	22.2	16.7	16	6.2	6.2	81.3	6.2
Trade Associations.....	3	2	20.0	8	37.5	25.0	37.5	6	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	2	22.2	7	0.0	42.9	57.1	7	14.3	42.8	42.8	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Hours worked last week</u>												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....												
Business firms.....	19	30	22.1	106	36.8	25.5	37.7	94	5.3	19.1	68.1	7.5
State and local governments.....	9	11	20.0	44	40.9	31.8	27.3	39	5.1	20.5	61.5	12.8
Universities.....	4	11	29.7	26	15.4	26.9	57.7	24	0.0	8.3	87.5	4.2
Nonprofit Research.....	4	2	10.0	18	50.0	27.8	22.2	16	6.2	6.2	81.3	6.2
Trade Associations.....	1	3	25.0	9	44.4	0.0	55.6	7	14.3	42.8	42.8	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	3	33.3	6	16.7	16.7	66.6	6	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

TABLE F

-5-

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	No Ans.	Recommend Omission #	%	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level					
				No. of Answers	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3	4
<u>20%</u>												
<u>State or country of birth</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>												
Business firms.....	19	35	25.7	101	31.7	29.7	38.6	90	8.9	22.2	62.2	6.7
State and local governments.....	7	17	29.8	40	25.0	37.5	37.5	35	11.4	22.9	57.1	8.6
Universities.....	4	10	27.0	27	33.3	25.9	40.7	25	8.0	12.0	72.0	8.0
Nonprofit Research.....	4	3	15.0	17	35.3	17.6	47.1	16	6.2	12.5	75.0	6.2
Trade Associations.....	3	2	20.0	8	62.5	12.5	25.0	6	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	1	11.1	8	12.5	50.0	37.5	8	12.5	50.0	37.5	0.0
	0	2	66.7	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>15%</u>												
<u>Place of work</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>												
Business firms.....	16	16	11.5	123	69.1	18.7	12.2	111	2.7	14.4	73.0	9.9
State and local governments.....	7	7	12.3	50	70.0	18.0	12.0	45	2.2	22.2	64.4	11.1
Universities.....	2	2	5.1	37	81.1	16.2	2.7	35	0.0	2.9	80.0	17.1
Nonprofit Research.....	3	4	19.0	17	53.0	23.5	23.5	15	6.7	13.3	80.0	0.0
Trade Associations.....	3	0	0.0	10	70.0	20.0	10.0	8	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	2	22.2	7	28.6	28.6	42.8	7	14.3	14.3	71.4	0.0
	0	1	33.3	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<u>Means of transportation to work</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>												
Business firms.....	16	18	12.9	121	59.5	25.6	14.9	109	1.8	15.6	69.7	12.8
State and local governments.....	7	7	12.3	50	64.0	20.0	16.0	45	2.2	24.4	60.0	13.3
Universities.....	2	2	5.1	37	67.6	27.0	5.4	35	0.0	2.9	80.0	17.1
Nonprofit Research.....	3	6	28.6	15	46.7	26.7	26.6	13	0.0	15.4	69.2	15.4
Trade Associations.....	3	0	0.0	10	50.0	40.0	10.0	8	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	2	22.2	7	14.3	42.8	42.8	7	14.3	14.3	71.4	0.0
	0	1	33.3	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<u>Place of residence 5 years ago</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS.....</u>												
Business firms.....	18	14	10.2	123	52.0	29.3	18.7	113	5.3	14.2	67.2	13.3
State and local governments.....	8	11	19.6	45	51.1	28.9	20.0	41	7.3	21.9	53.7	17.1
Universities.....	4	0	0.0	37	56.8	27.0	16.2	35	0.0	5.7	74.3	20.0
Nonprofit Research.....	3	1	4.5	20	50.0	30.0	20.0	19	5.3	15.8	73.7	5.3
Trade Associations.....	2	0	0.0	11	45.4	45.4	9.1	9	11.1	22.2	66.7	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	1	11.1	8	50.0	12.5	37.5	8	12.5	0.0	87.5	0.0
	0	1	33.3	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

TABLE P

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

-6-

TABLE P

	15%	No Ans.	Recommend Omission # %	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level					
				No. of Answers	Priority Rating--%	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3
Year moved into this house												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....		17	24 17.4	114	51.7	28.1	20.2	103	4.8	12.6	68.0	14.6
Business firms.....		6	10 17.2	48	50.0	27.1	22.9	44	6.8	22.7	54.5	15.9
State and local governments.....		4	4 10.8	33	48.5	39.4	12.1	31	0.0	0.0	77.4	22.6
Universities.....		4	5 25.0	15	66.7	6.7	26.6	13	0.0	0.0	74.6	7.7
Nonprofit Research.....		2	1 9.1	10	50.0	30.0	20.0	8	12.5	25.0	62.5	0.0
Trade Associations.....		1	3 33.3	6	50.0	16.7	33.3	6	16.7	0.0	83.3	0.0
Labor Unions.....		0	1 33.3	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
School or college enrollment												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....		18	24 17.5	113	51.3	31.0	17.7	103	3.9	18.4	68.0	9.7
Business firms.....		8	12 21.4	44	59.1	22.7	18.2	39	5.1	30.8	51.3	12.8
State and local governments.....		4	5 13.5	32	43.8	40.6	15.6	31	0.0	3.2	87.1	9.7
Universities.....		2	5 23.8	17	58.8	23.5	17.7	16	0.0	18.8	75.0	6.2
Nonprofit Research.....		3	0 0.0	10	50.0	30.0	20.0	8	12.5	25.0	62.5	0.0
Trade Associations.....		1	1 11.1	8	37.5	37.5	25.0	8	12.5	0.0	75.0	12.5
Labor Unions.....		0	1 33.3	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Country of birth of parents												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....		17	56 40.6	82	19.5	29.3	51.2	74	8.1	23.0	62.2	6.7
Business firms.....		7	24 42.1	33	18.2	27.3	54.5	30	13.3	30.0	50.0	6.7
State and local governments.....		4	16 43.2	21	14.3	23.8	61.9	189	0.0	21.1	68.4	10.5
Universities.....		3	8 38.1	13	30.8	30.8	38.4	12	0.0	8.3	83.3	8.3
Nonprofit Research.....		2	2 18.2	9	33.3	44.4	22.2	8	12.5	25.0	62.5	0.0
Trade Associations.....		1	4 44.4	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	5	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....		0	2 66.6	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mother tongue												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....		17	51 37.0	87	18.4	27.6	54.0	77	14.3	19.5	55.8	10.4
Business firms.....		7	20 35.1	37	16.2	27.0	56.8	33	18.2	27.3	39.4	15.1
State and local governments.....		4	16 43.2	21	19.0	19.0	61.9	19	10.5	5.3	78.9	5.3
Universities.....		3	7 33.3	14	28.6	35.7	35.7	13	0.0	15.4	69.2	15.4
Nonprofit Research.....		2	2 18.2	9	22.2	33.3	44.4	7	28.6	28.6	42.8	0.0
Trade Associations.....		1	4 44.4	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	5	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....		0	2 66.6	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE F

-7-

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES --- BY USER CLASSIFICATION --- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	No. of Ans.	15%	Recommend Omission #	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level					
				No. of Answers			No. of Answers		Percent			
				High	Medium	Low	1	2	3	4		
Veteran status												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	20	50	37.0	85	16.5	37.6	45.9	76	11.8	21.2	60.5	6.5
State and local governments.....	7	23	40.4	34	14.7	41.2	44.1	30	13.3	26.7	46.7	13.3
Universities.....	5	15	41.7	21	23.8	33.3	42.9	20	5.0	20.0	70.0	5.0
Nonprofit Research.....	3	6	28.6	15	13.3	40.0	46.7	14	7.1	14.3	78.6	0.0
Trade Associations.....	4	1	11.1	8	25.0	25.0	50.0	6	33.3	16.7	50.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	3	33.3	6	0.0	33.3	66.7	6	16.7	16.7	66.7	0.0
	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5%												
<u>Vocational trainings completed</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	17	34	24.6	104	42.3	27.9	29.8	92	8.7	25.0	59.8	6.5
State and local governments.....	7	17	29.8	40	37.5	30.0	32.5	36	13.9	27.8	44.4	13.9
Universities.....	4	9	24.3	28	39.3	25.0	35.7	25	0.0	20.0	76.0	4.0
Nonprofit Research.....	2	3	16.3	19	63.2	10.5	26.3	17	0.0	23.5	76.5	0.0
Trade Associations.....	3	1	10.0	9	33.3	44.4	22.2	7	28.6	28.6	42.8	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	4	44.4	5	20.0	80.0	0.0	5	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Occupation-industry 5 years ago</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	17	34	24.6	104	36.5	26.9	36.5	91	12.1	19.8	57.1	11.0
State and local governments.....	7	18	31.6	39	20.5	28.2	51.3	34	23.5	23.5	41.2	11.8
Universities.....	4	8	21.6	29	48.3	24.1	27.6	26	0.0	11.5	73.1	15.4
Nonprofit Research.....	2	4	20.0	18	66.7	11.1	22.2	16	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5
Trade Associations.....	3	1	10.0	9	33.3	44.4	22.2	7	28.6	28.6	42.8	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	3	33.3	6	0.0	50.0	50.0	6	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Mexican or Spanish origin or descent</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	19	38	27.9	98	34.7	19.4	45.9	86	13.9	23.3	52.3	10.5
State and local governments.....	5	14	23.7	45	26.7	20.0	53.3	39	17.9	23.1	46.2	12.8
Universities.....	8	12	36.4	21	38.1	14.3	47.6	18	5.6	22.2	61.1	11.1
Nonprofit Research.....	3	5	22.0	17	47.1	17.6	35.3	16	6.2	12.5	68.8	12.5
Trade Associations.....	2	8	62.5	8	62.5	25.0	12.5	7	28.6	28.6	42.8	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	4	44.4	5	0.0	40.0	60.0	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
	0	1	33.3	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE P

-8-

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO POPULATION ITEMS

	5%	No. Ans.	Recommend Omission #	Recommend Inclusion			No. of Answers	Geographic Level				
				z	High	Medium		Low	1	2	3	4
Presence and duration of disability												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	18	41	29.9	96	28.1	25.0	46.9	84	10.7	26.2	53.6	9.5
State and local governments.....	7	21	36.8	36	25.0	25.0	50.0	32	18.8	25.0	43.7	12.5
Universities.....	4	10	27.0	27	18.5	29.6	51.9	24	0.0	25.0	66.7	8.3
Nonprofit Research.....	3	4	19.0	17	41.2	17.6	41.2	15	0.0	20.0	66.7	13.3
Trade Associations.....	3	2	20.0	8	37.5	37.5	25.0	6	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	4	44.4	5	40.0	20.0	40.0	5	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	33.0	0.0	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Citizenship</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	17	44	31.9	94	25.5	30.9	43.6	81	14.8	23.5	54.3	7.4
State and local governments.....	7	17	29.8	40	22.5	30.0	47.5	34	17.6	26.5	47.1	8.8
Universities.....	4	13	35.1	24	16.7	37.5	45.8	21	9.5	14.3	66.7	9.5
Nonprofit Research.....	2	6	27.3	16	37.5	31.2	31.2	15	6.7	20.0	66.7	6.7
Trade Associations.....	3	2	20.0	8	37.5	23.0	37.5	6	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	4	44.4	5	40.0	20.0	40.0	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>Year of immigration</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	18	55	40.1	82	21.9	23.2	54.9	69	15.9	23.2	52.2	8.7
State and local governments.....	7	24	42.1	33	18.2	24.2	57.6	28	21.4	28.6	39.3	10.7
Universities.....	4	16	43.2	21	14.3	19.0	66.7	18	11.1	16.7	61.1	11.1
Nonprofit Research.....	3	8	38.1	13	30.8	30.8	38.4	11	0.0	9.1	81.8	9.1
Trade Associations.....	3	1	10.0	9	44.4	22.2	33.3	7	28.6	28.6	42.8	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	5	55.6	4	25.0	25.0	50.0	4	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0
	0	1	33.3	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
<u>When married</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	18	50	36.5	87	19.5	32.2	48.3	76	15.8	23.7	53.9	6.6
State and local governments.....	7	23	40.4	34	17.6	32.5	58.9	29	24.1	27.6	37.9	10.3
Universities.....	4	15	40.5	22	4.5	50.5	45.5	19	10.5	15.8	68.4	5.3
Nonprofit Research.....	3	6	28.6	15	33.3	20.0	46.7	14	0.0	14.3	78.6	7.1
Trade Associations.....	3	0	0.0	10	40.0	40.0	20.0	9	22.2	22.2	55.6	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	5	55.6	4	0.0	50.0	50.0	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
	0	1	33.3	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE G

FSUC SURVEY ON MID-DECADE CENSUS

TABLE C

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES --- BY USER CLASSIFICATION --- RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

Value	No Ans.	100%	Recommend		Recommend Inclusion				Geographic Level			
			Omission %	z	No. of Answers	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3
Value												
ALL RESPONDENTS												
Business firms	17	12	8.7	126	74.6	20.6	4.8	115	1.7	9.6	58.3	30.4
State and local governments	6	5	8.6	53	71.7	22.6	5.7	49	4.1	12.2	59.2	24.5
Universities	3	2	5.3	36	80.5	16.7	2.8	34	0.0	0.0	58.9	41.2
Nonprofit Reserch.	3	2	9.5	19	73.7	21.0	5.3	17	0.0	5.9	64.7	29.4
Trade Associations	3	1	10.0	9	66.7	33.3	0.0	8	0.0	25.0	23.0	50.0
Labor Unions	2	2	25.0	6	83.3	0.0	16.7	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Vacancy status												
ALL RESPONDENTS												
Business firms	18	21	15.3	116	74.1	16.4	9.5	104	2.9	9.6	59.6	27.9
State and local governments	6	8	13.8	50	70.0	18.0	12.0	46	6.5	13.0	58.7	21.7
Universities	4	5	13.9	32	87.5	12.5	0.0	30	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
Nonprofit Reserch.	3	4	19.0	17	64.7	17.6	17.6	15	0.0	6.7	66.7	26.7
Trade Associations	3	1	10.0	9	66.7	11.1	22.2	7	0.0	28.6	28.6	42.8
Labor Unions	2	3	60.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Contract rent												
ALL RESPONDENTS												
Business firms	18	19	13.9	118	72.0	21.2	6.8	107	3.7	7.5	58.9	29.9
State and local governments	6	9	15.5	49	69.4	18.4	12.2	45	8.9	8.9	60.0	22.2
Universities	3	4	10.5	34	82.4	17.6	0.0	32	0.0	0.0	56.3	43.7
Nonprofit Reserch.	3	2	9.5	19	73.7	15.8	10.5	17	0.0	5.9	64.7	29.4
Trade Associations	4	1	11.1	8	50.0	50.0	0.0	7	0.0	28.6	28.6	42.8
Labor Unions	2	3	60.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Rooms												
ALL RESPONDENTS												
Business firms	18	18	13.1	119	67.2	21.8	10.9	108	1.9	14.8	56.5	26.9
State and local governments	6	7	12.1	51	58.9	27.4	13.7	47	4.2	21.3	51.1	23.4
Universities	4	5	13.5	32	84.4	9.4	6.2	30	0.0	0.0	63.3	36.7
Nonprofit Reserch.	4	3	15.0	17	47.1	35.3	17.6	15	0.0	6.7	73.3	20.0
Trade Associations	2	0	0.0	11	72.7	18.2	9.1	10	0.0	30.0	30.0	40.0
Labor Unions	2	3	60.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

TABLE G

-2-

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

	100% No. of Ans.	Recommend Omission %	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level					
			No. of Answers	Priority Rating--%			Percent				
				High	Medium	Low	1	2	3	4	
Tenure											
ALL RESPONDENTS.....											
Business firms.....	18	13.1	119	60.5	26.1	13.4	108	4.6	11.1	55.6	28.7
State and local governments.....	8	12.5	49	55.1	28.6	16.3	45	8.9	17.8	51.1	22.2
Universities.....	3	13.1	33	69.7	27.3	3.0	31	0.0	0.0	61.3	38.7
Nonprofit Research.....	3	19.0	17	52.9	29.4	17.7	15	0.0	6.7	60.0	33.3
Trade Associations.....	2	9.1	10	60.0	30.0	10.0	9	0.0	22.2	33.3	44.4
Labor Unions.....	0	0.0	3	33.3	0.0	66.7	2	16.7	0.0	83.3	0.0
Months vacant											
ALL RESPONDENTS.....											
Business firms.....	20	23.0	104	55.8	26.0	18.2	92	4.4	15.2	54.3	26.1
State and local governments.....	7	24.6	43	62.8	18.6	18.6	38	10.5	23.7	44.7	21.1
Universities.....	4	18.9	30	56.7	30.0	13.3	28	0.0	3.6	64.3	32.1
Nonprofit Research.....	4	30.0	14	35.7	35.7	28.6	12	0.0	8.3	66.7	25.0
Trade Associations.....	3	10.0	9	55.6	22.2	22.2	8	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Labor Unions.....	2	60.0	5	30.0	20.0	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Meter supply											
ALL RESPONDENTS.....											
Business firms.....	18	23.4	105	50.5	30.5	19.0	95	2.2	14.7	58.9	23.2
State and local governments.....	7	28.1	41	43.9	36.6	19.5	37	8.1	21.6	51.4	18.9
Universities.....	3	15.8	32	68.7	21.9	9.4	30	0.0	3.3	66.7	30.0
Nonprofit Research.....	3	23.8	16	37.5	31.2	31.2	14	0.0	7.1	64.3	28.6
Trade Associations.....	4	11.1	8	50.0	37.5	12.5	7	0.0	28.6	42.8	28.6
Labor Unions.....	1	44.4	5	40.0	40.0	20.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
Flush toilet											
ALL RESPONDENTS.....											
Business firms.....	17	26.8	101	47.5	35.6	16.8	91	3.3	13.2	58.2	25.3
State and local governments.....	7	29.8	40	42.5	37	20.0	36	8.3	22.2	50.0	19.4
Universities.....	3	15.8	32	59.4	34.4	6.2	30	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Nonprofit Research.....	3	28.6	15	33.3	26.7	40.0	13	0.0	7.7	61.5	30.8
Trade Associations.....	3	30.0	7	57.1	42.9	0.0	6	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Labor Unions.....	1	44.4	5	40.0	60.0	0.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....											
	0	33.3	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

TABLE G

-3-

TABLE G

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES --- BY USER CLASSIFICATION --- RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

	100%	No. of Ans.	Recommend Omission #	2	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level				
					No. of Answers	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3
Bathub or shower												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	35	25.5	102	45.1	33.3	21.6	92	3.3	15.2	56.5	25.0
Business firms.....	7	16	28.1	41	43.9	36.6	19.5	37	8.1	21.6	51.4	18.9
State and local governments.....	3	6	15.8	32	50.0	34.4	15.6	30	0.0	3.3	63.3	33.3
Universities.....	3	6	28.6	15	33.3	26.7	40.0	13	0.0	7.7	61.5	30.8
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	30.0	7	57.1	28.6	14.3	6	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Trade Associations.....	2	4	50.0	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Commercial establishment on property												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	22	36	27.1	97	42.3	33.0	24.7	86	4.7	12.8	57.0	25.6
Business firms.....	8	15	26.8	41	41.5	39.0	19.5	36	11.1	19.4	50.0	19.4
State and local governments.....	4	10	27.0	27	44.4	40.7	14.8	25	0.0	0.0	64.0	36.0
Universities.....	4	5	25.0	15	46.7	20.0	33.3	13	0.0	7.7	69.2	23.1
Nonprofit Research.....	4	1	11.1	8	37.5	25.0	37.5	7	0.0	28.6	28.6	42.8
Trade Associations.....	2	4	50.0	4	50.0	0.0	50.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	1	33.3	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Complete kitchen facilities												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	36	26.3	101	41.6	40.6	17.8	90	4.4	12.2	56.7	26.7
Business firms.....	7	16	28.1	41	39.0	41.5	19.5	37	10.8	18.9	51.4	18.9
State and local governments.....	3	7	18.4	31	58.1	35.5	6.4	29	0.0	0.0	62.1	37.9
Universities.....	3	7	33.3	14	28.6	35.7	35.7	12	0.0	8.3	58.3	33.3
Nonprofit Research.....	3	1	10.0	9	33.3	55.6	11.1	7	0.0	28.6	42.8	28.6
Trade Associations.....	2	4	50.0	4	25.0	25.0	50.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	1	33.3	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Access to unit												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	22	40	30.1	93	38.7	33.3	28.0	80	6.2	13.8	57.5	22.5
Business firms.....	7	19	33.3	38	39.5	34.2	26.3	33	12.1	18.2	48.5	21.2
State and local governments.....	5	9	25.0	27	48.1	33.3	18.5	24	4.2	4.2	62.5	29.1
Universities.....	5	6	31.6	13	23.1	23.1	53.8	11	0.0	9.1	72.7	18.2
Nonprofit Research.....	3	1	10.0	9	33.3	44.4	22.2	7	0.0	28.6	42.8	28.6
Trade Associations.....	2	4	50.0	4	50.0	25.0	25.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	1	33.3	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

TABLE G

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

-4-

TABLE G

	100%	No Ans.	Recommend Omission		Recommend Inclusion				Geographic Level			
			#	%	No. of Answers	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3
Basement												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	21	47	35.1	87	25.3	39.1	35.6	76	3.9	17.1	55.3	23.7
State and local governments.....	8	18	32.1	38	26.3	47.4	26.3	34	8.8	20.6	52.9	17.6
Universities.....	4	13	48.1	24	29.2	29.2	41.6	21	0.0	4.8	61.9	33.3
Nonprofit Research.....	4	7	35.0	13	15.4	30.8	53.8	11	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3
Trade Associations.....	3	3	30.0	7	28.6	42.8	28.6	6	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Labor Unions.....	2	4	50.0	4	25.0	50.0	25.0	4	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
	0	2	75.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20%												
<u>Number of units in structure and whether a trailer</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	18	18	13.1	119	70.6	26.0	3.4	107	1.9	14.0	65.4	18.7
State and local governments.....	6	7	12.1	51	72.5	27.5	0.0	46	4.3	19.6	56.5	19.6
Universities.....	4	4	10.8	33	81.8	18.2	0.0	31	0.0	0.0	74.2	25.8
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	14.3	18	55.6	22.2	22.2	16	0.0	12.5	68.8	18.7
Trade Associations.....	3	2	20.0	8	37.5	62.5	0.0	7	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0
Labor Unions.....	2	2	25.0	6	83.3	16.7	0.0	5	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Year structure built</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	16	19	13.7	120	60.8	30.8	8.3	107	2.8	13.1	69.2	14.9
State and local governments.....	6	4	6.9	54	61.1	29.6	9.3	49	6.1	18.4	57.1	18.4
Universities.....	3	8	21.0	30	63.3	30.0	6.7	27	0.0	0.0	81.5	18.5
Nonprofit Research.....	4	4	20.0	16	50.0	43.8	6.2	14	0.0	7.1	78.6	14.3
Trade Associations.....	2	1	9.1	10	60.0	20.0	20.0	9	0.0	33.3	66.6	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	2	22.2	7	85.7	14.3	0.0	6	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	33.3	66.6	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<u>Farm residence</u>												
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>												
Business firms.....	20	31	23.0	104	51.0	30.8	18.2	91	2.2	14.3	74.7	8.8
State and local governments.....	7	12	31.0	45	53.3	37.8	8.9	39	2.6	20.5	64.1	12.8
Universities.....	5	11	20.6	25	64.0	16.0	20.0	23	4.3	0.0	82.6	13.0
Nonprofit Research.....	4	3	15.0	17	47.1	17.6	35.3	15	0.0	6.7	93.3	0.0
Trade Associations.....	3	2	20.0	8	25.0	62.5	12.5	7	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0
Labor Unions.....	1	3	33.3	6	50.0	50.0	0.0	5	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	0	0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

TABLE G

-5-

TABLE C

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

Components of Gross Rent	20%	No. of Ans.	Recommend Omission #	z	Recommend Inclusion			No. of Answers			Geographic Level		
					High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	1	2	3
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	21	37	27.6		97	40.2	37.1	22.7	83	4.8	19.3	66.3	9.6
Business firms.....	7	16	28.1		41	36.6	43.9	19.5	34	11.8	23.5	50.0	14.7
State and local governments.....	3	10	26.3		28	60.7	25.0	14.3	25	0.0	16.0	72.0	12.0
Universities.....	5	7	36.8		12	16.7	41.7	41.7	11	0.0	9.1	90.9	0.0
Nonprofit Research.....	4	1	9.1		8	37.5	37.5	25.0	7	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0
Trade Associations.....	2	3	37.5		5	20.0	60.0	20.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0		3	33.3	0.0	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Heating equipment													
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	19	39	28.7		97	38.1	41.2	20.6	82	2.4	17.1	69.5	11.0
Business firms.....	8	15	26.8		41	36.6	43.9	19.5	34	5.9	26.5	50.0	17.6
State and local governments.....	3	11	28.9		27	48.2	40.7	11.1	24	0.0	4.2	91.7	4.2
Universities.....	4	7	35.0		13	23.1	38.5	38.5	11	0.0	9.1	72.7	18.2
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	20.0		8	37.5	25.0	37.5	7	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0
Trade Associations.....	1	3	33.3		6	33.3	50.0	16.7	5	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	1	33.3		2	50.0	50.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Automobiles													
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	24	17.5		113	51.3	33.6	15.0	97	5.2	19.6	63.9	11.3
Business firms.....	6	5	8.6		53	58.5	30.2	11.3	46	8.7	21.7	58.7	10.9
State and local governments.....	3	9	23.7		29	65.6	31.0	3.4	26	3.8	3.8	73.1	19.2
Universities.....	3	5	23.8		16	25.0	43.8	31.2	13	0.0	15.4	76.9	7.7
Nonprofit Research.....	4	2	22.2		7	42.8	28.6	28.6	6	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Trade Associations.....	2	3	37.5		5	20.0	60.0	20.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0		3	0.0	33.3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Sewage disposal													
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	38	27.7		99	43.4	31.3	25.3	84	3.6	19.0	65.5	11.9
Business firms.....	8	16	28.6		40	42.5	35.0	22.5	34	8.9	23.5	50.0	17.6
State and local governments.....	3	9	23.7		29	62.1	13.8	24.1	26	0.0	15.4	76.9	7.7
Universities.....	3	7	33.3		14	28.6	28.6	42.8	12	0.0	8.3	75.0	16.7
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	20.0		8	25.0	62.5	12.5	6	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
Trade Associations.....	1	3	33.3		6	33.3	66.7	0.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	1	33.3		2	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

-15-

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

Source of water	No. Ans.	Recommend Omission #	%	Recommend Inclusion			No. of Answers				Geographic Level					
				High	Medium	Low	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	39	28.5	98	41.8	31.6	26.5	82	4.9	18.3	65.8	11.0				
Business firms.....	8	16	28.6	40	37.5	32.5	30.0	33	12.1	21.2	51.5	15.2				
State and local governments.....	3	10	26.3	28	66.3	14.3	21.4	25	0.0	16.0	76.0	8.0				
Universities.....	3	7	33.3	14	28.6	35.7	35.7	12	0.0	8.3	75.0	16.7				
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	20.0	8	25.0	62.5	12.5	6	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0				
Trade Associations.....	1	3	33.3	6	33.3	66.7	0.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0				
Labor Unions.....	0	1	33.3	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0				
Bathrooms																
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	40	29.2	97	39.2	43.3	17.5	84	4.8	16.7	67.9	10.7				
Business firms.....	8	18	32.1	38	39.5	44.7	15.8	34	11.8	23.5	50.0	14.7				
State and local governments.....	3	10	26.3	28	46.4	42.9	10.7	25	0.0	4.0	88.0	8.0				
Universities.....	3	7	33.3	14	28.6	21.4	50.0	11	0.0	9.1	81.8	9.1				
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	20.0	8	37.5	62.5	0.0	7	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3				
Trade Associations.....	1	3	33.3	6	33.3	66.7	0.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0				
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0				
Air conditioning																
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	19	39	28.7	97	31.9	42.3	25.8	84	7.1	23.8	57.1	11.9				
Business firms.....	7	13	22.8	44	31.8	45.5	22.7	38	13.1	26.3	47.4	13.2				
State and local governments.....	5	13	14.7	23	39.1	43.5	17.4	20	5.0	10.0	70.0	15.0				
Universities.....	3	8	38.1	13	30.8	23.1	46.1	12	0.0	16.7	75.0	8.3				
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	20.0	8	25.0	50.0	25.0	7	0.0	57.1	28.6	14.3				
Trade Associations.....	1	3	33.3	6	33.3	50.0	16.7	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0				
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0				
Bedrooms																
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	20	34	25.2	101	44.5	32.7	22.8	89	4.5	21.3	61.8	12.4				
Business firms.....	8	13	22.8	43	39.5	34.9	25.6	40	10.0	30.0	45.0	15.0				
State and local governments.....	4	8	21.6	29	55.2	31.0	13.8	26	0.0	11.5	73.1	15.4				
Universities.....	3	8	38.1	13	30.8	23.1	46.1	11	0.0	9.1	81.8	9.1				
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	20.0	8	37.5	50.0	12.5	7	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0				
Trade Associations.....	2	3	37.5	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0				
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0				

TABLE C

-7-

TABLE G

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO HOUSING ITEMS

	5%		No Ans.	Recommend Omission		Recommend Inclusion				Geographic Level				
	#	%		No. of Ans.	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3	4		
Second home														
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	24	17.5	113	44.2	35.4	20.4	100	3.0	26.0	59.0	12.0		
Business firms.....	6	7	12.1	51	58.9	33.3	7.8	47	6.4	23.4	57.4	12.8		
State and local governments.....	4	9	24.3	28	42.9	32.1	25.0	25	0.0	28.0	56.0	16.0		
Universities.....	3	5	23.8	16	31.3	25.0	43.7	13	0.0	15.4	76.9	7.7		
Nonprofit Research.....	3	0	0.0	10	0.0	80.0	20.0	9	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1		
Trade Associations.....	2	3	37.5	5	60.0	20.0	20.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0		
Labor Unions.....	0	0	0.0	3	0.0	33.3	66.7	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0		
Fuel--heating, cooking, water heating														
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	19	45	33.1	91	36.3	40.6	23.1	77	5.2	20.8	64.9	9.1		
Business firms.....	8	15	26.8	41	36.6	43.9	19.5	35	11.4	25.7	54.3	8.6		
State and local governments.....	4	13	35.1	24	45.8	41.7	12.5	21	0.0	9.5	81.0	9.5		
Universities.....	3	9	42.9	12	33.3	25.0	41.7	10	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0		
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	30.0	7	28.6	57.1	14.3	6	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0		
Trade Associations.....	1	3	33.3	6	16.7	33.3	50.0	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0		
Labor Unions.....	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Storied, elevator in structure														
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	19	47	34.6	89	31.5	32.6	35.9	76	9.2	25.0	56.6	9.2		
Business firms.....	7	16	28.1	41	36.6	31.7	31.7	35	17.1	31.4	37.1	14.3		
State and local governments.....	4	14	37.8	23	34.8	34.8	30.4	20	5.0	15.0	75.0	5.0		
Universities.....	3	9	42.9	12	16.7	25.0	58.3	10	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0		
Nonprofit Research.....	3	2	20.0	8	25.0	50.0	25.0	7	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0		
Trade Associations.....	2	4	50.0	4	25.0	25.0	50.0	4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0		
Labor Unions.....	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Radio														
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	50	36.5	87	25.3	36.8	37.9	76	10.5	23.7	57.9	7.9		
Business firms.....	7	12	21.1	45	31.1	42.2	26.7	40	17.5	25.0	47.5	10.0		
State and local governments.....	4	18	48.6	19	21.1	26.3	52.6	16	6.2	18.8	75.0	0.0		
Universities.....	3	10	47.6	11	27.3	18.2	54.5	10	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0		
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	30.0	7	14.3	42.8	42.8	6	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0		
Trade Associations.....	1	5	55.6	4	0.0	75.0	25.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0		
Labor Unions.....	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

TABLE G

-8-

TABLE G

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES -- BY USER CLASSIFICATION -- RELATING TO NOUSING ITEMS

	5%	No. Ans.	Recommend Omission %	Recommend Inclusion			Geographic Level					
				No. of Answers	High	Medium	Low	No. of Answers	1	2	3	4
Television												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	19	47	34.6	89	24.7	37.1	38.2	77	10.4	24.7	57.1	7.8
Business firms.....	7	12	21.1	45	31.1	44.4	24.4	40	17.5	25.0	50.0	7.5
State and local governments.....	5	17	47.2	19	21.1	26.3	52.6	16	6.3	18.7	68.7	6.3
Universities.....	3	9	42.9	12	25.0	16.7	58.3	11	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	30.0	7	14.3	42.8	42.8	6	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Trade Associations.....	1	4	44.4	5	0.0	60.0	40.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clothes dryer												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	47	34.3	90	23.3	41.1	35.6	79	10.1	25.3	55.7	8.9
Business firms.....	7	11	19.3	46	28.3	47.8	23.9	41	17.1	26.8	46.3	9.8
State and local governments.....	4	17	45.9	20	20.0	30.0	50.0	17	5.9	17.6	70.6	5.9
Universities.....	3	9	42.9	12	25.0	16.7	58.3	11	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	30.0	7	14.3	57.1	28.6	6	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Trade Associations.....	1	5	55.6	4	0.0	75.0	25.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clothes washing machine												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	46	33.6	91	23.1	41.7	35.2	79	10.1	25.3	55.7	8.9
Business firms.....	7	11	19.3	46	28.3	47.8	23.9	41	17.1	26.8	46.3	9.8
State and local governments.....	4	17	45.9	20	20.0	35.0	45.0	17	5.9	17.6	70.6	5.9
Universities.....	3	9	42.9	12	25.0	16.7	58.3	11	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	30.0	7	14.3	57.1	28.6	6	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Trade Associations.....	1	4	44.4	5	0.0	60.0	40.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dishwasher												
ALL RESPONDENTS.....	18	46	33.6	91	23.0	38.5	38.5	79	10.1	24.0	57.0	8.9
Business firms.....	7	12	21.1	45	28.9	47.8	24.4	40	17.5	25.0	47.5	10.0
State and local governments.....	4	16	43.2	21	19.0	26.3	57.1	18	5.5	16.7	72.2	5.5
Universities.....	3	9	42.9	12	25.0	16.7	58.3	11	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2
Nonprofit Research.....	3	3	30.0	7	14.3	57.1	28.6	6	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Trade Associations.....	1	4	44.4	5	0.0	60.0	40.0	4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Labor Unions.....	0	2	66.7	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Mr. WHITE. At this time, we call to the stand Mr. Louis R. Harlan.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS R. HARLAN, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS

Mr. HARLAN. I am a professor of history at the University of Maryland and editor of the Booker T. Washington papers. As such, I have spent hundreds of hours in the archives using manuscript census records and microfilm. But I am speaking for the Organization of American Historians, a much larger group, smaller than the American Historical Association since it only includes historians of American history.

Since Mr. Bogue covered so many of the points that I wanted to make, perhaps the simplest thing would be simply to touch some of the points that he did not cover.

Well, it seems to me, and to the Organization of American Historians, that the present divisions in section 5 covering confidentiality are unreasonable in that they, as your own summary of the bill indicates in the notice at the bottom of page 1, would close off to genealogists and also, by implication, to historians, all the censuses prior to 1900 which had been opened for a number of years.

We think that would be not in the interest of historians and, more importantly, not in the interest of the American people insofar as it is their history, not merely the Government's history that is involved.

We, the people, not just just we the historians, have a stake in a more open policy.

At the same time, I want to indicate that I do not oppose confidentiality in the sense of protection of the rights of people to privacy and any reasonable protection. I would support the civil liberties position of the right of privacy, so that I would not argue with Mr. Hinshaw on this point.

In fact, I feel very strongly against the idea of a huge surveillance by the Government of everybody and all that being put into a data bank.

But there is a strong trend in American historical writing and teaching toward writing the history of the American people, rather than merely of the government, of the rich and the famous, the Presidents and so forth.

Now, it seems to me, that if this history is to be written, it has to be written with the kind of data that are in the census and the census is the vest of all the various kinds of nonliterary sources.

I have used the courthouse records. I have used many other kinds of records, and I found the census the most useful in that area to study the anonymous Americans and women and Chicanos, the poor people who do not appear in the manuscript records.

They either did not write manuscripts because they were illiterate or their families could not afford to preserve their personal papers because manuscript preservation is a luxury these people could not afford. So they would be left out of history without such sources as census.

Now, on the basis of my extensive experience in the census records, I have worked on Booker T. Washington, a black man born in 1856. The first time he appears in any public record is in the will of his

master where his name appears. Nowhere else, for the first 16 years of his life, does his name even appear.

So the only way we can study anything about his early life is to study everything around it; that is, to get the agricultural census record of his owner, to get that man's census return and learn about his family, and to use the manufacturing census for that county as showing the tobacco factories around it and the mills, and to learn generally the economic and social life of the area through the census records, the church records in the census of religious bodies, of knowing what denominations people belonged to in the area, so that it is almost like little dots on a grid. We can gradually develop the life that surrounded him and, therefore, understand something of such persons of obscure origin.

This is true of the history of many people. It is not just a matter of getting the statistical evidence either. For example, I have a friend, a young black historian who is working on a history of New Orleans blacks from 1860 to 1890. Now, he uses the manuscript census records, by names of individuals, knowing what their occupations were, where they lived, the geographical structure of the city in relation to blacks. Out of that basic social data then can grow a social history on which he can then add black poets, newspaper editors, and so forth up to the top, the elite blacks.

But the only way to study the ordinary life of the people is through census records backed up by local records. I think that historians would accept the other half of this bill for this mid-decade sample survey of population as, in general, a good thing, without knowing the details about it and without feeling it would help historians particularly.

But it seems to me that what has happened here is that there are two different bills merged into one, I suppose, in the hope of getting the wider constituents was for one being put into another.

But I would say, in the long-run interest of most people, there would be a greater advantage in freedom; that is, the advantages of freedom are greater than the dangers of it.

You always take some risk when you do anything.

But I say that for an open history that is not an official history, not a governmental history, we would be better served by opening the 1900 census, or the 72-year rule.

Now, if you want an answer to the problem of what to do about the people 80 odd years old now, who might be involved, in the first place, they did not make out the census returns. They were made out by the parents.

In the second place, it might be much cheaper and maybe in the interest of gerontology and a study of the aged to have a census of people over 80 that could then be used as a Census Bureau check against the use of the return.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Harlan, would you like to introduce your testimony in full in the record?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes; thank you.

Mr. WHITE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The complete statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LOUIS R. HARLAN

I am a professor of history at the University of Maryland and editor of the *Booker T. Washington Papers*. I am speaking for the Organization of American Historians at the request of its executive secretary. The Organization of American Historians, made up of most of the teachers and writers of American history in the colleges and universities, as well as many secondary teachers, opposes the confidentiality section (pp. 5-7) of House Bill 4426 as such a sweeping and unreasonable provision for confidentiality of census records that it would make it impossible to write some of the most important aspects of our country's history. Our organization would accept any reasonable date for opening census records like the fifty-year rule of the Library of Congress manuscripts division, or sixty or seventy years. But to deny historians the right to examine a census return forever, unless with the "written permission of the respondent or his heir, successor, or authorized agent," is unreasonable. It will not only work a hardship on historians but will deny to the ordinary people their rightful place in our national history. "We, the people," then, not just we the historians urge you not to take this backward step.

There has been for some time a strong trend in American historical writing and teaching toward considering our history to be not just the story of our government and the rich and the famous, but the experience of the American people—the poor and ordinary as well as the rich and famous, the immigrants and ethnic groups, racial minorities, women, in short, the anonymous Americans who never got into our history textbooks before. We are moving toward a more democratic history, and this seems to me altogether a good thing, to consider the totality of our past and not just the elite part of it. But to study the anonymous Americans, we cannot expect to use private papers, because the preservation of records is a luxury the poor cannot afford, even if they are literate enough to create a file of private papers. If we are going to write their history at all, if they are to have a recoverable past, Blacks and Chicanos and Indians have to be studied through the census records, the county courthouses and other public archives, but above all through the manuscript census returns.

Perhaps I can make my point with a reference to my own experience as editor of the *Booker T. Washington Papers*, a fifteen-volume series now into its fourth volume. Luckily, Washington was one of the exceptional Blacks whose papers were preserved, about one million items, an amazingly rich collection that allows us to see behind the veil, to know more about black community life. But in these letters are frequent references to persons, white or black, who are so obscure that my assistant editors and I cannot find any record of them in print, even in the newspapers. So we turn to the manuscript census records of 1870 and 1880. We have spent hours reading the microfilm at the National Archives, and have been able to learn from the census the basic facts about them to illuminate their historical role. The census is the *Who's Who* of the anonymous and ordinary American. I was easily able to find in other places information about the white farmer who owned Booker T. Washington as a slave. But only in the census could I trace the wanderings after freedom of Washington's Aunt Sophia and Cousin Sally. To continue our work of bringing obscure persons into the light of history, however, we need the 1900 census, taken more than seventy years ago. The 1890 census was destroyed, but the 1900 census would open up a whole new body of social data.

I am sure that historians will regard the other half of this bill, for a mid-decade sample survey of population, as a forward step, an aid to demographers and social scientists in studying trends for the future. But we plead with you, while taking this forward step, not to try incongruously to take a backward step of cutting the American people off from an important part of their past.

Mr. WHITE. At this time, I will recognize Mr. Rousselot for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Harlan, I assume, by your testimony, that you do favor some type of mid-decade census. Are you willing to participate in paying for the cost of this?

Mr. HARLAN. I simply indicate that I do not believe historians would regard this as a bad thing. I think most historians would probably consider this a legitimate use of tax money more so than some other programs that they might not like as well.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. A mid-decade census seems to benefit some groups more than others. Would your associates be willing to pay some kind of minimal fees in covering the cost? The cost has been estimated anywhere from \$170 million to \$200 million.

Mr. HARLAN. You mean in income tax?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. No.

Mr. HARLAN. I don't understand. You see, the historians could not be using this material; so, therefore, we would not be involved in paying such a fee, and so I cannot—

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You do not use the material?

Mr. HARLAN. Not for that—that is, we do not consider a census of the next 5 years. I see, in the long run over a period of 40, 40 years later, use of it. I imagine they would probably be under those circumstances, using the decennial census anyhow, since it would be more complete.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So is your answer no or yes?

Mr. HARLAN. Well, it would not be useful to historians.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So your answer—

Mr. HARLAN. For that reason, we would not have any objection if it is useful to demographers, useful to economists and useful to city planners and useful to business concerns, we would not object to that. We consider it a more sophisticated approach to data gathering.

As such, not anything we would object to, but on the other hand, it is not our business.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Well, let us suppose that, in 2 or 3 years from the time the mid-decade census was taken, there was developed a substantial amount of data. Would you, as a group, be willing to help in some way share in the cost?

Mr. HARLAN. Well, the useful way that we citizens, who do not have a direct interest in a program, do this is through the tax laws.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So you are saying increase the taxes to cover the cost?

Mr. HARLAN. Well, I think, of course, that there are other—I mean, other things that could be eliminated and—

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is what everybody says. Everybody that comes to see us says, "My program is very sacred."

Mr. HARLAN. Well, let me put it this way. I would be willing to pay taxes for this; yes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You would?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes. There are a lot of other things I would not like to pay for by tax, but I do pay my taxes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not have any more questions.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Harlan, just from a historian's point of view, 500, 1,000, 2,000 years ago, recordkeeping did not appear to be as easy. There did not seem to be as much interest in it from a long range point of view. So I guess now, historians have a very difficult task going back in tracing events.

Since, certainly, 1900, there seems to be all kinds of publications, I guess basically since the early days of movable type it has been as easier task to trace history. With all of the works that are now put

forth, historical works, volumes of historical novels, fiction, non-fiction, Government records, is the census data really as needed as it might have been, say, for the year 1880?

Mr. HARLAN. You mean is census data for today needed as it would have been for 1880?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. Looking at a hundred years from now, is the need for data from the census files going to be as necessary to the historians' uses as it is now for the year, say, even 1900?

Mr. HARLAN. I would say, given the trend among historians toward broader conceptualization of what history is, and more use of quantitative data in arriving at today's trends, it would continue to be useful.

Furthermore, the censuses of today are so much better than the censuses of 1880; therefore, they are more useful in that sense. That is, the data are more precise. You have no idea, unless you have used those early censuses, just how much errors you have.

In Booker T. Washington's first entry in the 1870 census, that is, of his family, there were about 10 errors. Some blacks were called mulatto and vice versa, some females were called males and all sorts of things like that. In the returns, there were misspellings of family names and just all sorts of errors, whereas now, the returns are much more carefully run.

Mr. HINSHAW. Just take the case of Booker T. Washington. If, all of a sudden, we were to find out there was a Booker T. Washington born in the year 1950 and we wanted to trace the first 22 years of his life, do we really have the problem of tracing what his town would be like?

We have Chambers of Commerce, publications from which we can glean information of what the area was like, and the economic conditions under which that person probably grew up more so than we might have had 70 years ago.

So is it really quite so important, except for the mass of quantitative data?

Mr. HARLAN. I would agree that it is not as conclusively significant for 1950 as it was for 1850; though the data is so much greater that it would be useful for historians to have it.

I think the case of harm being done to anybody by it has not been proven or to any substantial segment, compared with the good and the value derived from it. I am still saying yes, it would be helpful to have it. I say it is not as needed. I agree.

But we are talking as historians, above all, about that 1900 census that was promised to be opened 20 years ago. I think 50 years was too short a time, myself.

I agree that 72 years is much better.

But I say, the census should be made available at some reasonable time, protecting the right of privacy of the individual who made out the return, and 72 years will do that because children did not make out returns. They were made out by heads of families, and that meant adults. Therefore, this is not information given by the person, until they are 20, say.

Mr. HINSHAW. No further questions.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Hinshaw.

One question, Mr. Harlan.

Do you feel that these records should be opened to the general public, whatever span of years this committee should decide on, if any? Or do you think it should be limited to classes of research?

Mr. HARLAN. I have an individual opinion that would probably differ from the association.

Mr. WHITE. What is your opinion?

Mr. HARLAN. My individual opinion is that you cannot distinguish between a historian and a writer. For example, Barbara W. Tuchman, a really brilliant historical writer, is not an academic, does not have a Ph. D., but does not bother with that. Yet, from my point of view, she is a better historian than most.

The same is true of many other people who come out of journalism and into history. Allen Nevins, a distinguished historian, wrote 40 books in his time and was not a Ph. D. He came out of journalism. He came out of a New York paper.

So where do you stop? Where do you set up a line of who is a historian? Shall we have an official list?

Every man is a historian, I say. Somewhere or other, you have to reach the point where you put a minimal amount of trust in the people.

Mr. WHITE. Did you testify earlier on how many years you thought would be a proper span?

Mr. HARLAN. I said 70 would be proper. Now, I could live with a span beyond that. But again, I think that would be reasonable.

Mr. WHITE. What would you say in this bill that this committee should determine? That the 1900 census returns would be open to the general public, but thereafter—subsequent to the 1900—that a span of years would extend to 100 years, in order to catch up with it eventually? Would you have any objection to that?

Mr. HARLAN. One of the problems that you would have is that you would have to go back to 1880 and close it up.

Mr. WHITE. No, no, no. Not go beyond 1900. Catch up with the years so that eventually in the year 2010, that you would begin going to subsequent censuses.

Mr. HARLAN. I would oppose it, going beyond the point. I would not wish to speak for my association on 100 years. It does seem to be a possible basis for compromise, but I would tend to think 72 is reasonable enough and that your proposal goes to, eventually, what I regard as an unreasonable extent; that is, shifting to 100 years.

I still say that is unreasonable, but less unreasonable, certainly, than the provision in the present bill.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Harlan.

Counsel, do you have any questions?

Mr. BRAY. No questions.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much, Mr. Harlan. There are no further witnesses on behalf of or in opposition of the mid-decade census bill.

There was a meeting scheduled tomorrow morning in room No. 219. That has been canceled, and the markup time will be held at a later time.

I am going to hold the record open for a period of 10 days in order to give the others an opportunity to submit written testimony and written statements for the record.

Is there any further business before the committee?

Without any further business, the committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, the hearing was adjourned.]

[The statements and letters which follow were received for inclusion in the hearing record:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN R. RARICK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, I welcome this opportunity to submit this statement in support of my bill H. R. 1629 and similar legislation to "limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes."

This legislation is necessary to protect the American people from further governmental intrusion into their lives. There is nothing more important to the American way of life than the right of privacy. Continued infringement of this right cannot be countenanced inasmuch as it threatens to destroy the very fabric of our society.

I urge the Subcommittee to give favorable consideration to my bill H. R. 1629, or similar legislation which restricts the categories of questions which our people are required to answer under penalty of law during the decennial censuses of population. In closing, I would point out that this legislation in no way limits the type of questions that can be asked; rather, it protects the citizen, much like the 5th Amendment of the Constitution, from being forced to reveal information to the government which he objects to becoming a part of public knowledge.

STATEMENT OF JOHN N. ERLBORN, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman: I would like to register my appreciation to you for holding hearings on several similar bills, including H.R. 6227 which I introduced, to provide for a mid-decade census of population.

A census in mid-decade becomes increasingly attractive as our nation grows beyond the 200 million level, and as the pace of our activity increases.

When we were a new nation and a small one, our only need for a census was that we might have a basis for representation in the House of Representatives. For that purpose, a head count once every ten years was sufficient; and for that purpose, in my opinion, it still is.

Over the decades, however, we have found other uses for the census.

I look upon a mid-decade census as a useful device in anticipating and guiding future urban growth. By making current census figures available twice as often, we could gain a better understanding of population-related programs. Timely census information can help us to direct our efforts toward places where they can do most good and away from the less productive endeavors.

What population-related programs do I have in mind?

The cleaning up of the environment comes to my mind. So does the development of energy; and there are lots of others.

We Americans are a mobile people—more mobile, perhaps, than the nomadic Indians who inhabited this continent before Columbus came. We not only are on the move, but the directions we will go are not always predictable. We also are an expanding society; and census figures which are eight or nine years old oftentimes are not much help in dealing with today's problems.

In my estimation, the needs of the House of Representatives for periodic re-apportionment are adequately met by the censuses we have had every ten years. I doubt that the people were well served by the adjustments made in congressional districts during the 1960's. Hence, I propose that we specifically rule out the use of the mid-decade census for creating new House districts.

The mid-decade census questionnaire ought to be kept brief, but I have written no restriction into my bill. I think that once every ten years is often enough for Congress to get into a debate about such questions as the number of people using each bathroom. I doubt the wisdom, however, of writing these preferences into law.

These are my views. I hope they are helpful to this subcommittee in its deliberations of these bills, and I hope they are persuasive in pointing out the need for a mid-decade census.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Chairman, as the author of H.R. 1386, one of the mid-decade proposals under consideration today, I wish to thank and commend the Subcommittee for convening these necessary and timely hearings. As you know, the institution of a mid-decade census as a means to assure the fair distribution of federal and state funds to local governments has been a matter of concern to me for some time.

The most compelling argument for a five-year census is of course the serious handicap that rapidly-growing communities experience because they are locked into federal grant distribution formulas that are six, seven, eight or nine years old. Thus, they are seriously underpaid at a time when increased population generates severe fiscal pressures upon local officials to maintain basic goods and services.

Since State governments rely on federal census figures to allocate their funds to their local units, these errors are compounded. In effect, this results in a form of double taxation for the people of rapidly-growing communities. They pay a greater share of federal and state taxes and receive a reduced share of the benefits from those taxes.

In a recent year, it was estimated that the federal government allocates ten billion dollars annually to local governments on the basis of census statistics. This was before the passage of the Revenue Sharing Act which uses population as one of three main factors for dividing \$5 billion annually among the States and their cities.

Add to this figure the billions disbursed by the States themselves and it is clear that the census plays a vitally important role in the fiscal life and death struggle that many of our local governments are fighting.

Viewed in this perspective, it is apparent that the estimated \$150 to \$200 million dollar cost of a mid-decade census is well worth it. Furthermore, since the benefits of a five-year census would be spread over five years it would carry an annual price tag of only thirty to forty million dollars.

Consider for instance that the federal government spends in excess of \$2 billion every year on computer rental time. I am suggesting then that we spend 1.5 to 2 percent of that sum so that statistics which are fed into those expensive computers will not be six, seven, eight or nine years out of date. Viewed in this light, it seems clear that opposition to a five-year census on budgetary grounds is a classic example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the administration has requested \$6 million in this year's budget for a mid-decade sample survey of 1.5 percent of the population that will eventually cost \$45 million. A sample survey will not be sufficient to revise the distribution formulas for federal funds, and, therefore, does not compare to the benefits of a complete headcount.

Interestingly enough, one of the most frequently-cited arguments against the creation of a mid-decade census in 1975 is the claim that gearing up for a census requires thirty months of lead time. Since the Census Bureau is already preparing for a survey, it seems that with additional funds and timely approval of a census by Congress that this hurdle can be overcome.

Mr. Chairman, we have only to look to the results of the 1970 census to understand why a more frequent population count is so imperative. Never before in our history has our population been more mobile or migratory.

For example, of the slightly more than eight million people in the State of Michigan who were more than five-years old in 1970 more than three million of them had moved since 1965. A half a million of them had moved from another state or country. Of the remainder, there is no telling for sure how many had switched from one village or township to another.

If this survey were repeated today in Oakland County, Michigan, these percentages would be even greater. In one section of the county I represent communities have grown from eight to forty-four percent in a recent eighteen month period.

These communities and others like them across the country are being handicapped by census statistics that are unrealistic even three years after they were compiled. They will be continually shortchanged unless Congress takes positive action to initiate a mid-decade census.

This is especially true in regard to the amount of money allocated to various local units by revenue sharing. I have asked the Treasury Department how they intend to revise population figures between censuses. While they are exploring various possibilities, it appears that short of a mid-decade census, it will be impossible.

This is hardly surprising since the Director of the Census Bureau, Dr. George H. Brown, stated before this Subcommittee in 1971 that:

"The difficulties of making good estimates for smaller cities or for smaller counties (25,000 or less) are significantly greater. Here the margins of error are so great that neither the Census Bureau, or any other organization has been able to make estimates with the accuracy that is needed for their use for administrative purposes."

If the Census Bureau can not accurately project population growth, how do they expect the local officials in my Congressional District to estimate their future needs? There are only two communities in my Congressional District, Pontiac and Birmingham, that had a 1970 population in excess of 25,000. The census was never intended to be for the benefit of large cities to the detriment of smaller ones. If a ten-year census cannot do the job for all of our cities, then it is about time we had a five-year census.

Before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, I would like to stress two additional aspects of my legislation which to my knowledge are not included in any other legislation now pending before you. I am referring to my proposal to move back the census date two months and to establish an orderly procedure so that towns can, on demand, receive a recount if they feel they have been undercounted.

Many communities in Oakland County, Michigan, learned through hard experience how necessary this provision is for a proper tallying of their size. Some of our cities were assigned as many as three or four population counts before a final figure was assigned to them. Fortunately, some were successful in receiving updated counts which reflected their true growth. Others were not so fortunate. Before they had a chance to appeal for a recount, the Census Bureau had already submitted to Congress the official figures.

My legislation would establish a two-month review period specifically for recounts. If the recount revealed an error of more than five percent by the Census Bureau, the burden of paying for the recount would fall upon the Federal government. Otherwise, the community would have to absorb the cost.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you once again for taking up the battle for a mid-decade census. In the past several years, your committee has heard hundreds of witnesses outline the growing need for a five-year census. We now know that this need is greater today than ever before. A decennial census was more than adequate in the eighteenth and nineteenth century but, in the second half of the twentieth century it clearly is not. I urge you to favorably report this legislation to the Floor as soon as possible.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1973.

HON. RICHARD WHITE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The federal government is turning more and more to grant programs with allocations based on population. General Revenue Sharing is only one of the newest and most prime examples of this fact.

If the federal government is going to expand this practice, there must be a more accurate accounting of population than our present decennial census allows. With a highly mobile and fast-growing population, our nation's most current statistics are badly in error five years after they are taken.

Consider the example of my own Congressional District in Colorado. When the preliminary estimates of the distribution of general revenue sharing funds were released early in the last session, I was shocked to discover that three cities in my district, with populations between 28,000 and 93,000, were not even listed. These three cities had been incorporated during the decade of the sixties and as far as the federal government was concerned, they did not exist yet. Obviously, for such a program to succeed, it is imperative that the population statistics used by the government agencies need to be more accurate.

The Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which you Chair, has already held extensive hearings on the need of a mid-decade census, and I wish to express my appreciation for the work you have already done. Hopefully, these most recent hearings will result in a bill being reported at an early date so that the first mid-decade census can be taken in 1975.

Sincerely,

DONALD G. BROTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF HON. DON FUQUA, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I welcome this opportunity to submit testimony in support of legislation to provide a mid-decade census. I have introduced identical legislation each year that I have spent in the Congress and I hope that early and favorable attention can be given this important matter.

The needs for comprehensive census reports more often than once every ten years have been stated many times. The federal, state and local governments need this information to assist in the efficient administration of many of their programs and to help in the planning of programs and facilities. Certainly, with the enactment of the general revenue sharing program and the Rural Development Act this fact is highlighted. The President has reduced categorical grant programs for our rural areas dramatically and has replaced these program funds with general revenue sharing money and Rural Development Act funds. Notwithstanding the fact that the latter two programs cannot provide as much support as the support previously given, the allocation of these funds depends in part on accurate population counts.

The number of people in the United States has increased considerably even since the last census, but this growth has not come evenly year by year, nor has it come evenly in all parts of the country. Florida's population increased by some two million persons from 1960 to 1970 and yet, during the last few years of the 1960's we were using census figures far out of phase with the actual figures.

The need for a National Census of Population, Housing and Unemployment beginning in 1975 and every ten years thereafter is manifest. There is a real need for this program at this point in our nation's history. Government, business, industry, education and virtually every aspect of American life would benefit from such a program.

While the cost of conducting a national census is high in one sense, I believe that its actual impact would be to save money for government and business, those who must now conduct special census and statistical counts because of the long lapse in time between our national enumerations.

There is another problem that affects every congressional district and which is a most serious problem for rural districts. That is the problem of underemployment rather than unemployment. There are many individuals who support their families on marginal farms and who must supplement their income by part-time work or seasonal work. They are ready, willing and able to work; yet, if they live in an area with little or no industrialization, they may be out of the labor force for a long period of time—long enough to be off the unemployment compensation rolls of the state governments.

Regular surveys on unemployment are conducted by the Bureau of Census in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, which are localities over 50,000 in population. Raw material producing areas such as farm lumbering, or mining communities are often not covered by these surveys since most of them have fewer than 50,000 inhabitants. The impact is great, of course, on rural communities as accurate figures are simply not available.

Each year, the information which guides us grows more and more out of date. The House will be asked during the next few months to appropriate billions of dollars which will be distributed to state and local governments to help meet local needs: more jobs, more training in occupational skills, better schools, better care for the elderly or for the sick. Yet, we have inadequate information from which to make decisions as to where these funds should be allocated. There is little question but that waiting until 1980 to make the next census would be penny wise and pound foolish. Considerable administrative savings would be possible as well as insuring that those areas in greatest need would receive the necessary relief. Those areas which are presently in need, not those areas which were in need when the last census was taken.

I appreciate this opportunity to present this point of view to the subcommittee and I urge your prompt approval of the mid-decade census legislation.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1973.

HON. RICHARD WHITE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: Reference is made to our conversation about the matter of public access to the 1900 U. S. Census.

I hope your Committee does not undertake to withhold this census from examination by researchers, scholars, and others under proper safeguards. For years historians and genealogists were told by the National Archives and the Bureau of the Census, if I am properly advised, that this census would be made available in 1972. It is my understanding that it was not made available at the request of Congressional committees. No one, of course, wants to make data of this kind available to embarrass anyone or to support claims in courts of law that would not be otherwise available.

As I told you on the telephone, in my own State we are completely cut off from knowing anything about who the pioneers of the State were. There was no 1880 census of Oklahoma, and this is the last census available to the public except for a few fragmentary pages which were preserved when the 1890 census was destroyed.

On general principle, it would seem to me that after 73 years the necessity for complete confidentiality of a census record is exhausted; however, as a shitorial heritage the census is a veritable national treasure. Without jeopardizing the work of the Bureau of the Census or the credibility of future census reports, I hope that a way can be worked out that will enable American historians and genealogists to have access to the 1900 census records under reasonable safeguards and circumstances.

Sincerely,

CARL ALBERT, *The Speaker.*

NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
LINEAGE RESEARCH COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1973.

The CHAIRMAN,
Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is requested that the following letter be incorporated in the record of the hearing on the proposed Bill, HR 4426.

As Chairman of Lineage Research for the Daughters of the American Revolution, an historical society whose membership is based on lineage, I am very much concerned about the possible effects of Sections 4 and 5 which I believe have not been considered in depth. I therefore present the following in opposition to Sections 4 and 5 of HR 4426.

In my work I study history continually. History is the all encompassing study of life and every aspect of it. The Census Schedules are a part of American History, because they record the westward movement and growth of our population. It is important to us that this information be available.

A census records all the families and proves their whereabouts in the year of that census. A historian and genealogist needs that information. This data is recognized documentation of a family's composition and location.

The Censuses from 1830-1880 are ancient history. There are relatively few persons alive today who were alive in 1880. They would have to be 93 years of age or more.

There is nothing in a Census that was not already known to the neighbors. That a family had 10 children was not news; the estimated value of the farm was not news, because the neighbors had paid the same price and for the new states the public land office had the records.

In olden days, if someone could not read and write, it was nothing unusual. What person among us does not know that the quality of public instruction was extremely poor in many parts of our nation in the years in question. I am not ashamed that one of my ancestors could not read or write. That family lived on the frontier and had little time for anything but necessary labor. Besides, there were few books there, except for the Bible which they probably knew by heart. Those

were the brave pioneer people who carved farms out of the wilderness and they also were the people who took action to develop a public school system so that their children would be educated. One should be proud of them.

If there were a retarded child, what of it? There are retarded children born today, and everyone is charitably concerned about it. It is not a disgrace. In fact I have read the report of a scientist which stated that such a child is very often born when both father and mother are of extremely high intelligence.

Surely everyone in this country knows that this is a nation formed from immigrants. Our people derive from everywhere in the world. That is a source of National pride, because it has made Americans a virile and ingenious people.

In over 20 years of research I have found nothing in the Census that anyone need be sensitive about.

The alleged reasons for this Bill seem much ado about nothing.

It is recommended that the records of the United States decennial censuses remain open to the public.

Sincerely,

EUNICE B. HADEN,
National Chairman, Lineage Research Committee.

COUNCIL OF STATE PLANNING AGENCIES,
Lexington, Ky., April 4, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: AS President of the Council of State Planning Agencies (CSPA) which comprises the chief state planning officers of the states and territories, I wish to express our very strong support for H. 4426, which would authorize a mid-decade Federal Census.

In prior years CSPA has expressed similar support for such legislation—most recently, I believe, through Kenneth Olson, then Chief Planning Officer for the State of Utah and CSPA President. Certainly as we move toward more positive state and Regional regulation of land use, settlement and growth policy, and a host of interrelated federal and state programs, it becomes increasingly essential that we have the basic data derived from the Federal Census and comparable across state lines. In the past, change occurred relatively slowly, and it was possible to bridge the period between the receipt of one set of Federal Census figures and those available a decade later. Now it is very clear that critical changes are occurring with increasing rapidity. We must have more up-to-date information on what is happening, yet few states have the capability for such work.

However, an even more critical need has emerged with the inauguration of general revenue sharing, and with the possibility of one or more special revenue sharing programs. The entitlements of state and local governments are affected critically by both the numbers and income levels of their citizens, and also by many other demographic factors. I and my colleagues can testify that all units find it difficult enough to provide firm figures when the Federal Census is relatively recent. It will become very difficult indeed as the years go by, and "guesstimates" and approximations must be made in respect to eligibility for shared revenues. The prospect of doing this over a ten-year period is dismal indeed. We would anticipate that there will be increasing complaints of unfairness in distributing shared revenues unless there is some reliable check of these approximations such as would be provided through a Federal mid-term census.

Finally, we would suggest that the legislation authorizing such a census might include a requirement that the Bureau of the Census should immediately form an advisory committee of state and local representatives to help in formulating the proposed "midseventies" census, so that the problems encountered after the 1970 census, both the census process itself and including the slow pace of putting out the results—could be minimized as much as possible. The Council of State Planning Agencies would be very willing to assist in any such endeavor.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MARDEN, *President.*

NATIONAL GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1973.

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the National Genealogical Society, an organization of approximately three thousand members, its officers and the councilors, I recommend that sections 8 and 9 of H.R. 4426 be clarified by addition of a subsection to the effect that "the restrictions provided for in this Act shall apply to decennial and mid-decade censuses and surveys conducted in 1975 and thereafter." We further recommend that a bill be introduced to direct by, say, 1 September 1973, the National Archives to provide micro-film copies of the 1900 census for research purposes.

There is a mistaken idea that, except statistically, census returns are of use only to the ancestor hunter and to scandal-mongers. The latter is easily dismissed; for the census is the least likely type of record to contain information deleterious to the reputation of an individual.

The importance of the census returns of 1900 and subsequent decades for genealogical purposes is to evident to be dwelt upon. Public vital records of many states are non-existent or incomplete for the period, and the other resources most commonly used in later years for locating persons—directories and telephone lists—were compiled for only certain large communities at the turn of the century. Moreover, the information recorded in 1900 is more significant than that on previous censuses.

Unless amended as recommended, the present bill would definitely discriminate against minorities. Those of us with colonial or even early nineteenth century ancestry in this country have been able—partly with the aid of available census records—to find and follow our direct and collateral ancestors in their peregrinations. But descendants of late nineteenth century immigrants need the information on the 1900 census to determine dates of birth and immigration of an ancestor and his place of origin. Moreover, blacks, Indians, and other groups, the members of which are only now seeking identity, need the information concerning their forebears and their migrations. Many of the queries that come to this office could be answered only from this census. But under the proposed terms, if they are applied retroactively to the 1900 and other censuses, only *verification* of information would be possible; research in depth would be forbidden.

Moreover, continued suppression of this information would be a great loss to the history of the United States. The very fruitful study of migrations prior to 1880 has depended in large part on tracing individual families that became parts of groups that went from one area to another, the clue to the reason often being the occupations of the heads of the households. For this and other scholarly purposes, mere statistics from census schedules can be most misleading and, as statistics are certain to be, superficial.

The Centennial celebration of 1876 stimulated so much interest in both national and local history that significant publications resulted. Now, in connection with the Bicentennial observance, communities—especially those founded during the past century—are planning local histories. Many of the early residents do not appear in deeds and related records, as they were not land-owners; yet they helped shape the nature and progress of the community. The census is a prime source of information concerning them.

Often documents that have achieved historic significance are in the possession of descendants of persons known to have had them or had custody of them at the turn of the century. Finding the members of the family at the time is the first step in trying to trace the present possessor. Furthermore, the documentation of residences and other places preserved by the National Trust, on the National Register, or protected by state and local agencies requires knowledge of occupants as well as owners at specific times. Art galleries and museums seek biographical facts concerning artists, investors, and others represented in their collections. Similarly, several types of medical research require not only statistics but knowledge of family groups.

These matters and many related ones are of concern to us, partly because practitioners of other disciplines call upon genealogists to use their expertise in reading and interpreting census records.

Although I reside in New Jersey, I shall be glad to appear before the Sub Committee to amplify any of these statements or to answer questions concerning this topic.

Respectfully submitted,

KENN STRYKER-RODDA,
President.

THE WESTERN RESERVE HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 4, 1973.

Mr. AUSTIN BRAY,
Subcommittee on Census and Statistics,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRAY: Through long distance telephone I have learned of HR4426 and have been told of the possible effect that it might have on limiting the use of government records of wide popular interest, in particular a continuation of the delay in the opening of the 1900 Population Census Schedules.

Speaking for myself (I was a member of the National Archives staff for 19 years), and for many members of our Society, I wish to urge the opening of the 1900 Schedules and the discouragement of action that would hinder this objective. Greater availability of Population Census Schedules 70 years or more is a stepping stone toward stimulation of greater interest in our historic heritage. Often it is through an interest in people that there is generated an interest in our historic past.

Sincerely yours,

MEREDITH B. COLKET, Jr.
Director.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1973.

Hon. RICHARD C. WHITE,
Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: On behalf of The American Institute of Architects, the national society for the architectural profession representing 24,000 licensed architects, I would like to express our support for the establishment of a mid-decade census.

While change has always been an important factor in the American way of life, the acceleration of change in recent years has been dramatic. The pace of change is so rapid that the decennial census no longer adequately meets the variety of uses and widespread needs to which the census data are put. A United States Department of Commerce statistic indicates that between March of 1967 and March of 1968, over 36,000,000 Americans changed their place of residence. This statistic, symbolic of the rate of change in recent years, would have been unimaginable to the drafters of the Constitution. The American Institute of Architects believes that the decennial census should be replaced with a mid-decade census.

The need of architects, planners, and government officials for accurate data is undeniable. The Institute believes that the Federal Government has the only machinery to produce data the credibility of which will be unchallenged. Statistics gathered by state and local governments and other interested parties are invariably based on the last comprehensive survey made by the Federal Government. Because of the rapid rate of change, such figures are bound to be distorted and subject to criticism. No one can make intelligent decisions without accurate, comprehensive, and up-to-date data. The Institute strongly believes that the establishment of a mid-decade census by the Federal Government will meet the need for accuracy in the decision-making process.

While it is clear that a mid-decade census will cost money, the Institute is convinced that in the long run it will mean a savings to the American people. The possibility—perhaps the inevitability—of error in operating under the current ten-year figures results in undetermined economic loss. How, for instance, does one measure the cost of a misplaced hospital? The people who use census data spend a year or so awaiting the data, two to three years analyzing it, and the next five years waiting for fresh data. But the problems of growth do not wait. The Institute submits that, when weighed against the cost of error and the importance of the decision-making process, the cost of a mid-decade census would be slight indeed.

The American Institute of Architects wholeheartedly supports the establishment of a mid-decade census. If intelligent decisions are to be made, it is imperative that current, comprehensive, and accurate data be available. We thank you for this opportunity to present our thoughts for the record and trust that the Committee will give them careful consideration.

Sincerely,

S. SCOTT FEREBEE, Jr.,
FAIA, President.

CITY OF OPA-LOCKA, FLA.,
April 5, 1973.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the testimony of the City of Opa-locka, Florida, which we wish to present to your honorable Committee, in favor of a Mid-Decade Census.

To substantiate the increase in population in the City of Opa-locka since the last 1970 Census, our Building Department records indicate and the Certificates of Occupancy substantiate them that 1,331 units of residences were constructed since the 1970 census was taken. These units of residence were located primarily in the low-income areas of our city. There is an average of 3.5 persons in each unit for a total increase in population of 4,659 persons, which represents a 39% increase in population over our 1970 census figure of 11,902 persons. This increase of 4,659 persons would give us a total population of 16,561 persons.

Based on the Revenue Sharing Funds which we received, which were based on the 1970 census figures, in the amount of \$201,948, an increase of 39% of this amount would give us an approximate additional sum of \$78,760. This additional sum of money would enable the City Administration to expand their participation in the priority expenditures as listed under Section 51.31, permissible expenditures in the Code of Federal Regulations, Sub-Title B, Part 51.

The City of Opa-locka recognizes their responsibilities to the citizens of Opa-locka, therefore we respectfully request that consideration be given by your honorable Committee to a Mid-Decade Census, in order that we may receive our just share of the Federal Revenue Sharing Funds.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM S. GRIFFITHS,
City Manager.

CITY OF HALLANDALE, FLA., April 3, 1973.

CHIEF CLERK,
Subcommittee for Census and Statistics,
Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The City Commission of the City of Hallandale is presently preparing a resolution to Representative Lelman of our district and to your Subcommittee requesting that the mid-decade census be taken. A copy of this resolution will be forwarded to you as soon as it is legally adopted at the April 3, 1973, Commission meeting.

Since both the Federal Revenue Sharing and proposed Special Revenue Sharing fund allocations are based partly on population and revenues of the local government units, the City of Hallandale is of the opinion, as are other government units in rapidly growing South Florida, that to use the 1970 census as a basis for fund allocations is discriminatory against growth centers and an inaccurate method of Revenue Sharing allocations. While we realize the difficulties and expense of keeping track of population on a yearly basis, a mid-decade census update would be more equitable. We understand that this is presently being done as part of annual Revenue Sharing adjustments. It would be possible, however, to track revenues with accuracy on an annual basis since all government units are required to prepare an annual audit.

To provide you with an example on how our population compares with the 1970 census, we are forwarding to you as enclosures the following data:

1. *July 1, 1972 Population Estimate*—The City of Hallandale's population on July 1, 1972, as computed by the Division of Population Studies, University of Florida for the State of Florida for the purpose of State Revenue Sharing allocations, is 30,851 as compared to the 1970 U.S. Census of 23,849. This is a population change of 7,002. The 1973 estimate made by the Broward County Area Planning Board shows a City population of approximately 34,000. The State of Florida estimate of 30,851 uses 1970 Census factors such as 72 percent vacancy in residential units and 1.72 persons per residential unit. However, the estimate was raised by the use of such data as building permits and certificates of occupancy issued since 1970 and the fact that we have over 21,000 units using City water.

2. *Units under construction with Certificates of Occupancy not yet issued.*—At the present time we have approximately 3,300 residential units under construction for which no certificates of occupancy have been issued, indicating that between 1973 and 1975 there will be another approximately 6,000 to 7,000 population increase. So you can see by mid-decade the population make-up and statistics for

the City of Hallandale will be totally changed. A City of approximately 24,000 will become a City of close to 38,000. We are enclosing the list of residential units under construction with certificates of occupancy not issued.

We hope that this information will aid your Subcommittee in determining the need for a mid-decade census. If you should have any questions or need any further information, please contact us.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. BENSKO,
Assistant City Manager.

Enclosures.

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, Fla., February 22, 1973.

Mr. ROBERT BENSKO,
City of Hallandale,
Hallandale, Fla.

DEAR MR. BENSKO: Enclosed is the revised estimate of population for Hallandale for July 1, 1972, as we discussed on the telephone today.

Please return one signed copy as soon as possible for our records.

Sincerely yours,

DAPHNE Y. BELL,
Division of Population Studies.

Enclosures.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNIT: HALLANDALE (BROWARD COUNTY)

Provisional population estimate for July 1, 1972

	Amount
1970 U.S. census	23, 849
Population change due to annexation	
Population change	7, 002
Preliminary population estimate for July 1, 1972	30, 851
Less inmates	
Preliminary adjusted population estimate for July 1, 1972 ¹	30, 851

¹ Population estimate proposed for State revenue sharing in fiscal year 1973-74.

Your provisional population estimate for July 1, 1972, is 30,851.

I, as an official of the local governmental unit, certify that this estimate of population is considered reasonable.

Signed:

Title:

Date:

PLEASE return the SIGNED copy in the enclosed envelope. (Please retain second copy of this estimate for your files.)

CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY NOT ISSUED

Owner	Permit No.	Date certificate of occupancy issued
Single family residences (19 units):		
Boyer	17535	None.
Belle	16742	Do.
Hepburn	17785	Do.
Letize	17432	Do.
Lavrich	17127	Do.
Maislin	16934	Do.
O'Leary	17800	Do.
Do	17913	Do.
Piercon	17353	Do.
Ross	16353	Do.
Raulerson	16988	Do.
Sica	17526	Do.
Sisto	17902	Do.
Do	17922	Do.
Do	17920	Do.
Do	17919	Do.
Sanders	16878	Do.
Do	17152	Do.
Warren	17135	Do.

CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY NOT ISSUED—Continued

Owner	Permit No.	Date certificate of occupancy issued
Duplexes (16 units):		None.
Lar Construction	17355	Do.
Do	16466	Do.
Do	17452	Do.
Do	17451	Do.
Do	17450	Do.
Do	17361	Do.
Do	17356	Do.
Do	17357	Do.
Triplex (30 units):		
Lar Construction	17359	Do.
Nowogrocki	15798	Do.
Pinto	17969	Do.
Do	17968	Do.
Balista	16839	Do.
Costantino	17964	Do.
Chilton	17961	Do.
Do	17960	Do.
Gonzalez	17950	Do.
Giaconna	17297	Do.
Duplexes (24 units):		
Hibbits	17745	Do.
Higgins	17759	Do.
Kuczynski	16219	Do.
Lar Construction	17358	Do.
Lar Construction (triplex)	17360	Do.
Sisto	17908	Do.
Do	17909	Do.
Selma Investors	17753	Do.
Townsend	17975	Do.
3140 Corp.	16639	Do.
Virga	17959	Do.
Ves Construction	17254	Do.
Apartments (3,217 units):		
Aiken & Stearns (44 units)	16441	Do.
Arrow Construction (60 units)	17423	Do.
Arrow Construction (Cristal—34 units)	17110	Do.
Haldale Corp. (140 units) Avant Garde	17555	Do.
Haldale Corp. (139 units)	17556	Do.
Arrow Construction (26 units)	16711	Do.
Brown (208 units)	16422	Do.
DeMora (4 units)	17551	Do.
Duven (18 units)	16739	Do.
Drakus & LeCroix (84 units)	17122	Do.
14th Towers (56 Units)	16665	Do.
Do	16667	Do.
Do	16664	Do.
Do	16663	Do.
La-Mer (165 units)	15773	Do.
La-Mer (111 units)	17284	Do.
Laffer (4 units)	16366	Do.
Lar Construction (146 units)	16925	Do.
Mailman (1,165 units)	15445	Do.
Mailman (137 units) Hotel	16475	Do.
Nelson (90 units)	17561	Do.
Patchard Corp. (10 units)	17305	Do.
Parkside Towers (102 units)	16291	Do.
Sage (249 units)	17867	Do.
Samada (3 units)	17179	Do.
Do	17183	Do.
Do	17180	Do.
Do	17182	Do.
Do	17181	Do.
Do	17178	Do.
Strelitz (14 units)	17091	Do.
Samada (3 units)	16346	Do.
Do	16383	Do.
Do	16382	Do.
Smith (8 units)	17634	Do.
Wallace & Brandman (8 units)	17025	Do.
Zuckerman & Vernon	16509	Do.

Note: Total units under construction and certificates of occupancy not issued: 3,306 units.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., April 2, 1973.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN WHITE: My name is Nancy Day, and I am a citizen interested in H.R. 4426. I would like to have my statement submitted in the record.

I am opposed to certain sections of H.R. 4426, "A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests of the Bureau of the Census, to provide for a mid-decade sample survey of population, and for other purposes". My opposition is directed to those sections of the proposed bill which would eliminate access to the census for valid genealogical purposes. In particular, I am opposed to the following proposed sections of H.R. 4426:

(1) Sec. 4. (a) which would amend Section 8 of title 13, U.S. Code. I am against that which is proposed to be the new subsection 8.(a).

(2) Sec. 5, which would amend Section 9 of title 13, U.S. Code. I am against that which is proposed to be the new subsections 9.(a), 9.(b), and 9.(c).

In general, I am against the above stated sections of H.R. 4426 since it is my honest and sincere belief that existing provisions of title 13, U.S. Code adequately provide for protection of the census respondent's privacy. Further, it is my honest and sincere belief that information in the Federal Censuses should be made available for valid genealogical research.

My reasons for the opposition expressed above are as follows:

H.R. 4426, SEC. 4(A)

In effect, this section eliminates the current provision of title 13, U.S. Code, which allows the Secretary of Commerce to, at his discretion, furnish data from the census, for genealogical and other proper purposes. Instead, access to census data is specifically allowed ". . . to any [census] respondent, or to the heir, successor, or authorized agent of such respondent, . . .".

As a result of correspondence to the former Senator William B. Spong, Jr. of Virginia regarding access to the 1900 Federal Census for genealogical purposes, I received a letter from Mr. Leon Ulman, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel. In his letter dated October 13, 1972, Mr. Ulman stated that the Department of Justice had ". . . suspended indefinitely further consideration of the legal question . . ." of release of the 1900 Federal Census, due in part to H.R. 14153, 92d cong. (which I understand was a forerunner of the current H.R. 4426). Shortly after receiving Mr. Ulman's letter, I spoke with him by telephone in order to obtain clarification of the terms "heir", "successor", and "authorized agent" as used in the bill. Mr. Ulman stated that these terms would be interpreted in the legal sense, and would not refer to a mere decedent of the census respondent. Therefore, the proposed subsection 8.(a) would, for all practicable purposes, eliminate the use of census data for genealogical research.

H.R. 4426, SEC. 5

I am opposed to the portions of this Section that are proposed to be the new subsections 9.(a) and 9.(b) of title 13, due to the use of the phrase "the respondent of his heir, successor, or authorized agent". My opposition is again due to the fact that such use of the phrase eliminates the availability of the Federal Census for genealogical purposes. In principle, I am not directly against a confidential provision in title 13, since the Bureau of the Census may include sensitive questions in their surveys; however I do wonder about the purpose of the Government seeking *truly* personal and sensitive information.

I am in *no* way opposed to the portions of this Section that are proposed to be the new subsections 9.(c) or 9.(d). Although subsection 9.(d) has included the phrase "respondent or his heir, successor, or authorized agent", I believe the purpose of the subsection is proper considering the confidential purpose of Section 9. of title 13, as was the very similar subsection added to title 13, by P.L. 87-813, approved October 15, 1962.

My opposition to the portion of this Section that is proposed to be the new subsection 9.(e) is due to the fact that the purpose of the subsection is already adequately covered in the current provision of title 13.

At this point I would like to explain why I believe that Federal Census data should be available for genealogical purposes.

With the sole exception of the 1900 Federal Census, every census taken by the Federal Government has been either non-confidential or available for genealogical purposes. Although I have not had the opportunity to research the legislative history of the various census laws, it seems apparent to me that Congress has almost always recognized the value of using information already obtained to increase the historical knowledge of the American public. In fact my belief is even strengthened by the fact that use of census data for genealogical purposes was provided for by Congress *after* the one occasion (the 1900 Federal Census) that the census was to be completely confidential.

Based on correspondence received from the Bureau of the Census, there are approximately 7 million persons alive in 1970 who were enumerated in the 1900 Federal Census. I submit that there are an equal number of Americans enumerated in the 1910 through 1970 Federal Censuses, who are now deceased. As the Bureau of the Census seeks to protect the living by retaining the confidential provisions of the 1900 Federal Census, I seek to protect these Americans who relied on the belief that their census data could be used for genealogical purposes. If the proposed H.R. 4426 were passed, the Government would be robbing their decedents of historical information, as I understand the bill would apply to the 1900 through 1970, and all subsequent, Federal Censuses.

It is my opinion that current confidential provisions of title 13 are already adequate. I quote from the statement of the former Director of the Bureau of the Census, Dr. A. Ross Eckler, made during the 1971 hearings before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics:

"I believe that it is clear that the subcommittee and committee showed much wisdom in not yielding to the widespread allegations of public concern over the issue of invasion of privacy."

"It is generally agreed that the census record for protecting the confidentiality of individual records greatly reduces the significance of any allegations regarding invasion of privacy."

"But the other point is, in the main, the census information is not highly sensitive. . . . But I think that the problem of getting that across is part of a census publicity, and articles were written and certainly we tried in every way we could to put that across to the citizenry, and I think we just have to continue to do that."

At this point, I believe that the Census Bureau is doing their job too well, since the amount of information obtainable under the current genealogical provisions is very limited and restricted.

Finally, I have to wonder why the census forms are designed to identify a respondent, if the purpose of the census is to provide unidentifiable statistical information.

In closing, I only wish I could convey to the subcommittee the new pride and love of my country that I have experienced since I started research into my family tree. With all of the Federally funded activities being designed to celebrate the bicentennial of our nation, what better way could there be than to encourage individual genealogical research? Just as all men desire immortality in some fashion, I believe we should respect similar desires of our ancestors, through love and remembrance. In the main, our ancestors were ordinary Americans, who built this country without being famous or infamous. For this great service, we should seek to honor them for it.

I appreciate this opportunity to present my opinions to the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

(Miss) NANCY H. DAY.

APRIL 5, 1973.

Mr. AUSTIN BRAY,
Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BRAY: Before you today gentlemen, are gathered the interested men and women of a profession devoted to preserving the real history and traditions of this nation, and who draw a wealth of information from the Federal Censuses of the United States in question; those during the years, 1830-1880.

Genealogy is an integral part of the all encompassing study of history; history being the all encompassing study of life and every aspect of it. We argue your premise that information contained in said censuses are discriminatory in any

manner. The information is already public knowledge, as anyone with a background of history, received formally or through availing one's self to it, can testify. What intelligent person amongst us does not know that the quality of public education during the years in question, was extremely poor, the product being a widespread lack of people who could neither read nor write. What person amongst us does not realize that this nation is a 'nation of immigrants' and that our very greatness is a product of such. What person does not realize that Albert Einstein and the grand-parents of John F. Kennedy were immigrants and that George Washington Carver and Frederick Douglass were once slaves.

Obviously the proponents and supporters of Sections 4 and 5 of HR 4426 fail to realize that Genealogists are the majority of these who use the Federal Census and obviously the interest and work of the Genealogist in this instance is grossly misunderstood. People of this profession are contracted to set down family histories, which also become in their own way a personal history of our nation. Certainly in our modern civilization we do not and cannot hold ourselves responsible for the deeds of family members who predated our existence.

Thus far, all reasons for the passage of this bill have been displaced as irrelevant and as being ignorant of the situation in its entirety. I call your attention to the 1880 census gentlemen, to be used as the perfect example, it containing the largest individual information of any census publicly available. Realistically, what slanderous interest or purpose could business, government or individuals have with the 1880 census in the year 1973. Certainly we are prompted by our government, and by our own motivation for progress and for advancement to place emphasis on our plans and deeds for the future, and not those of the past. I ask you to consider gentlemen which to be the more discriminatory; that said person in 1880 was an outlaw, was an invalid, was mentally retarded, was uneducated, was of mixed parentage, was the product of an unlawful marriage, or to pick up a copy of the April 9th edition of a daily newspaper to read that said person was convicted of murder, of treason to his country, or of perjury to a court, when he, his family and friends have to live their life with the possible ramifications and prejudices thereof. There can be no analogy gentlemen, and you have before you no grounds for this intended bill.

I end by asking you to give further thought and consideration to articles 4 and 5 of HR 4426, and make an impassioned plea before you to be realistic, representative and to display sound judgment and consideration to the arguments and reasoning here presented before you.

Sincerely yours,

SHARON M. POLLARD,
Historian and Professional Genealogist.

STATEMENT BY DR. CARL H. MADDEN, FOR THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF
THE UNITED STATES

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States supports a program of mid-decade censuses beginning in 1975 and to be conducted every ten years thereafter, a program in addition to the regular decennial census, to include population, employment and housing.

In response to the suggestions of the Subcommittee as to matters of interest to their review of the mid-decade census proposals, this statement is organized in outline form.

A. NEED FOR A MID-DECADE CENSUS

1. *Political representation*

Only if population in small areas is accurately known, can representation proportioned to population be achieved in State legislatures, county and city councils, school boards, and other local bodies. The Supreme Court doctrine of "one-man, one-vote" makes representation an important continuing question in a mobile society.

2. *Distribution of funds in federal and state programs*

More than \$10 billion annually is now allocated by the federal government to the states or their subdivisions according to formulae using population or housing data as a major component. Additional large amounts are distributed by states to their counties and municipalities largely on the basis of population.

3. *Relevance of population data for federal and state policy-making*

Both federal and state governments use population, employment, and income data in a variety of ways to develop, analyze, and administer government policy. In states, the legislative power, taxing authority, and sometimes even the form of government that may be adopted by counties and cities depend on the population of the jurisdiction. Some types of banking regulation, including bank reserve and capital requirements, the power of a political subdivision to license or tax businesses, occupations, or products, school policy in purchasing and many other exercises of governmental authority may depend in some states on population.

At the federal level, a multitude of policies ranging from tax policy to poverty policy depend on accurate calculation of population estimates.

At both federal and local levels, the need for small-area data analysis, and the ability to manipulate data in analyzing the hypothetical consequences of policy actions, are converging through the demand for higher standards of competence in policy-making.

4. *The need for better migration data*

Much better and more frequent information on both internal and external migration is needed. Given the increasing ease of communications and travel, legislators at all levels of government need correct information on internal population movements to make good policy. External migration data also needs strengthening to measure changing values of people.

5. *The need for better social data*

There is a growing need for better data and more frequent data useful in measuring many types of social change so that lawmakers and government administrators make informed decisions in the field of governmental social policy. The advent of the computer makes it possible for a city, local jurisdiction, combination of local jurisdictions, or even a state or the nation to calculate the hypothetical impact of changes in many different areas of policy. For example, it is now possible to calculate in detail the impact on a city of a change in taxes or in the supply of public housing, or in many other variables, through the use of a mathematical, computer-based model of the dynamics of change in the social entity under study.

The need for small area data on population, income, and employment or of crime, health, etc. associated with population, is growing. Very large economies can be achieved in government by modeling hypothetical policy changes—economies derived from avoiding technical errors and economies derived from correct diagnosis of policy needs. A mid-decade census would contribute to the data base needed for improved modeling of hypothetical social change.

6. *The need for better sampling bases*

Many government programs not based on data from decennial censuses are based instead on sample inquiries. But sample inquiries, in turn, depend for their accuracy on correct definition of parent populations from which samples are drawn. As the data from a census become obsolete with the passage of a decade, the value of the census as a sampling frame declines. A mid-decade census would yield benefits to all levels of government and to business—and therefore to owners of stock and to consumers—through the cost-saving which goes along with improved accuracy of sampling.

B. MANDATORY RESPONSE TO CENSUS QUESTIONS

Mandatory response to census questions is desirable for technical reasons. Without the requirement to be counted, complete enumeration would be difficult. The requirement to answer questions truthfully reduces to a minimum biases that would result from non-response. If census queries are voluntary, then statistically the population enumerated is voluntary-respondents-to-the-census, not the U.S. population. Mandatory response is useful in generating persistence in enumerators in finding the hard-to-enumerate.

A mandatory census seems well within the power of Congress to ask and the citizen's duty to answer. Even though the Census has never breached confidentiality defined most stringently, the government should continue to take the strongest measures to assure confidentiality of information about individual people in the Census. The government should respect and remain empathetically sensitive to the U.S. public's fears about the invasion of privacy. And although the individual may be required to answer questions reasonably related to purposes

of programs set up under prior legislation, the questions and the way they are asked have to accord with people's sense of propriety, on the grounds of common civility as well as to avoid increasing the cost of census-taking.

C. LEVEL OF PENALTY FOR NON-RESPONSE

The level of penalty for non-response should be sufficient to make mandatory answers effective but not out of proportion to the relative seriousness of intentional non-response.

D. GEOGRAPHIC LEVEL

The mid-decade census should enumerate the U.S. population, and therefore it should be developed and designed by the same census process as is used by the decennial census.

E. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF QUESTIONNAIRES

A mid-decade census should be less extensive than the decennial census in subject matter and should give first priority to demographic elements—population, population characteristics, migration patterns and behavior.

The U.S. business community has developed an elaborate and highly complex system of information in analyzing the demand for and supply of products and services in a trillion-dollar economy. U.S. business uses information in vast quantities daily to reduce the risks of loss inherent in a world of uncertainty. Business uses census data as bench marks; it uses there data as it uses any other data it can develop—because such information is relevant and available. Business, however, was generally satisfied with the 1970 census questions, and its interest in either adding or subtracting questions is at a low level. Surveys of business opinion concerning the 1970 census reflected that even experts, such as marketing analysts and economists, take the census for granted but at the same time process such large amounts of information that the census as such is perceived as only one among thousands of data sources.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, *Washington, D.C., April 10, 1973.*

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 your invitation to present the Commission's views on a mid-decade census.

The Commission views the census operation of the Federal Government as an important intergovernmental activity, essential to effective cooperation and coordination among Federal, State, and local governments. Census data provide the factual basis for a multitude of policy decisions by the Congress, governors, mayors, and other Federal, State, and local officials and are required for the development of long-range plans for public facilities and services at Federal, State and local levels; the allocation of grants-in-aid by Federal and State governments; and the measurement of changing demands upon all governments as a result of shifting population patterns. The question of the need for a mid-decade census is therefore relevant to the responsibilities of this Commission. It might be noted that there is a close parallel between many of the requirements of individual governments and the research needs of the Commission itself, since frequently we examine the same questions of policy within the largest context of intergovernmental relations.

Because basic governmental problems at all levels are now and will continue to be shaped by the dynamics of population change, more current statistical measures of the demographic characteristics of our citizenry are indispensable for designing and implementing governmental programs and policies to meet these challenges. We emphasize the importance of more current data, since the tempo of population movements is altering significantly the characteristics of urban as well as rural areas over short periods of time; yet the census of population and housing is taken only once in ten years.

The availability of current data on a national basis is important as research functions become increasingly significant for local and State governments. But we would call attention to the limited resources available to these units for basic data gathering, particularly in small communities currently or prospectively

experiencing rapid change. Furthermore, it is highly desirable for State and local government research activities to be carried out on a standardized statistical basis throughout the country in order to facilitate interarea comparisons and establish a wide base for the kind of estimating and prediction which are required for planning and development. The strategic position of the Census Bureau for providing the statistical tools is readily apparent.

Enactment of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972—general revenue sharing—makes the availability of current data on the characteristics of our changing population all the more urgent. The accurate and timely distribution of revenue sharing funds to some 36,000 large and small local governments requires the annual updating of both population and income data for each one of them. A once-in-ten-year benchmark for such updating is inadequate for this purpose. A mid-decade census would contribute significantly to this effort.

It is our understanding that complete replication of the 1970 Census of Population and Housing is not absolutely necessary to provide adequate mid-decade census information. Indeed, this Commission suggested in 1962 that a 25 percent sample survey might well do the job—and at considerably less cost than a full-blown census. Your Subcommittee should consider the various alternatives—including sampling—to a full-count mid-decade census.

A close working relationship between the Census Bureau and the States and localities in the planning of any additional census activities to include the kinds of coverage desired in supplemental enumeration would ensure effective utilization of this information in government planning and policymaking. If the Congress should provide for a mid-decade census, the Commission recommends advance notice of the census and its prospective content to enable localities to assess their additional needs and formulate requests for supplemental data collection on a reimbursable basis. Inclusion of such supplements with a regular census would offer substantial cost savings to all levels of government.

To summarize our view: since 1962, the Commission has strongly supported a mid-decade Federal census to serve the needs of different levels of government in carrying out their responsibilities and in cooperating with one another.

Finally, may I quote a recommendation submitted last year to the Director of the Bureau of the Census by the Census Advisory Committee on Small Area Data on which ACIR is represented:

The Bureau has been well aware of the reasons for requiring annual or biennial data and/or estimates at: (a) county and/or multi-county level, of population and other indicators of change; and (b) jurisdictions and/or smaller than county-level areas (e.g., "neighborhoods," tracts or tract-groupings, etc). Both levels are "small areas" for which redistricting, campaign expenditures, revenue-sharing, and a host of "small areas", statistical needs will be with us for the remainder of this decade and for decades to come, given the present legislation and trends in social programming.

The Committee commends the Bureau for its cooperation with the States in developing current population estimates for counties, and for its efforts to utilize administrative records to develop improved population estimates for States, counties and intermediate as well as large-sized cities. We expect that in the long run there will be substantial gains from these efforts. These efforts, hopefully, can lead to improved annual population estimates for such areas.

However, the needs of the nation for small area statistics to serve programs such as health, education, revenue-sharing, transportation, housing and other subjects of current concern require information for small areas within cities and counties. Several members of the Committee point out the increasingly important role which local units smaller than the county—cities, boroughs, townships—play, and will play, in the metropolitan development of suburban areas. More informed bases for their participation would enhance their contribution to joint regional, State and federal planning and policy-making.

The Committee feels it will be unfortunate if the U.S. finds, during the years 1976 through 1981, that it is still using 1970 small area data to guide the planning and administration of programs, instead of updated information that would be provided by a 1975 or 1976 census or major sample-survey effort. We strongly urge the Bureau of the Census to give additional attention to fulfilling this need. The needs are well documented in Congressional hearings, many meetings the Census Bureau staff has held throughout the nation, and elsewhere. We hope that this Committee's urgent recommendation will be called to the attention of the appropriate Congressional and government groups. A strong program utilizing administrative records to support annual estimates, coupled with a major mid-decade sample survey or census, should greatly aid in fulfilling the needs for small area statistics to serve the Federal, State and local programs.

We appreciate the opportunity of submitting the Commission's views on a mid-decade census. If we can be of further assistance to the Subcommittee in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

WM. R. MACDOUGALL,
Executive Director.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY,
Bowie, Md., April 13, 1973.

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE,
*Chairman, Census and Statistics Subcommittee, U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: It has come to the attention of the members of the Prince George's County Genealogical Society that Bill HIR4426 has been introduced into Congress which would prohibit the opening and use by the general public of the 1900 census. While we realize the reasoning behind the question of release of censuses, as genealogists and historians we feel that there are many compelling reasons for the censuses being opened.

For historians compiling local history data there is a need for data on the people who were residents in 1900, as this was a very formative period for some of our communities. Around the turn of the century, there was a large influx of immigrants to this country, and data on this group is not available through other channels. The lack of data after 1880, partly due to the fact that the 1890 census was almost completely destroyed, is very limited.

Many counties throughout the United States did not keep data on residents until after 1900. This makes it difficult for some persons who need certificates of birth, which are not available. The census provides the proof needed for filing delayed birth certificates. The census can also be essential in establishing relationships and tracing missing heirs when estates are being settled.

It has become apparent over the last decade that many of our young people lack pride in their country and its history. By making available every tool that would foster an interest in history, we would hope to instill some enthusiasm and patriotism in the younger generations.

With this letter, the members of this society would like to voice our opposition to the bill as it now reads.

Respectfully,

Mrs. JOYCE C. PERRY, *Secretary.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS,
NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1973.

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the trade association representing the homebuilding industry, the National Association of Home Builders is acutely aware of the need for accurate, current data on housing conditions in the United States. We, therefore, support the establishment of a mid-decade census beginning in 1975 which would include a census of housing.

We firmly believe that the Nation, private business, and the Government are seriously handicapped by the lack of current data during a large part of each decade. We believe you will find that this is also the case with respect to the Congressional Committees dealing with housing legislation and attempting to discuss future needs and courses of action in mortgage finance and housing production.

Under the present system, housing data gathered by the census are often out-dated even before they become generally available. Furthermore, a housing census conducted only once each decade provided a too infrequent basis on which to measure and evaluate the housing policies of Government and industry. The partnership of Government and private industry in providing necessary housing would be greatly benefited by having a more speedy and detailed check on its progress.

On behalf of the 67,500 members of our Association, I urge favorable action by the Congress to provide a mid-decade census of housing beginning in 1975.

Sincerely,

GEORGE C. MARTIN, *President.*

J. ROSS WILDMAN, INVESTMENTS,
Oklahoma City, Okla., April 16, 1973.

Mr. AUSTIN BRAY,
Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We cannot understand why the 1900 Census has not been released to the public.

There is no reason it should not have been released during the year 1972, as there is no violation of any law to release it. Also, no guarantee of confidentiality nor is it classified material.

All genealogists are anxious for the information in the 1900 Census to be released.
Sincerely,

J. ROSS WILDMAN.

COLONIAL DAMES XVII CENTURY,
OKLAHOMA SOCIETY,
April 16, 1973.

Mr. AUSTIN BRAY,
Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Oklahoma Society Colonial Dames XVII Century is concerned about the release of the 1900 Census.

May I quote from the National Society Colonial Dames XVII Century Bylaws, Article I, Section 4:

"The particular business and object of the National Society Colonial Dames XVII Century is to aid in establishing chairs of historical research in Colleges and Universities; to cooperate with the International Genealogical Society in the establishment of a College of Heraldry; to commemorate the heroic deeds of the founders of our country."

One of our best sources of information in carrying out our purposes is Census records—they are invaluable.

We would be most grateful to you for your help in securing the early release of the 1900 Census.

Sincerely,

MARGUERITE RICKS WILDMAN,
Past President.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION,
New York, N.Y., April 12, 1973.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: Each year the Department of City Planning of the City of New York makes decisions with regard to the local area distribution of a five-year capital improvement program of almost ten billion dollars. Many of the sixty-two communities into which the City's five counties are divided would place high on the list of the nation's cities in rank order.

In the complex decision-making process we rely heavily on the census on where to spend our increasingly scarce financial resources for schools, parks, playgrounds, libraries, police stations, firehouses, welfare, health and day-care centers and the dozens of other community based facilities. City-wide and borough improvement programs in the fields of transportation and provision of employment opportunities via the growth of commercial and industrial facilities are also developed within the frame of reference of their impact upon specific communities and population groups within them.

As we move further into the decade away from the Decennial Census base data, our platform for these expensive decisions gets extremely shaky. Our concerns in the comprehensive planning process are not confined to capital construction but rather extend deeply into the whole administrative process of community outreach and the provisions of services to the population most in need. So many of our programs affect children and the aged that it is particularly important to the many agencies in this City with whom we work closely to have current small area figures on age groups by race. But this is only basic minimal data.

Perhaps the most pressing need is for current estimates of family and unrelated individual income distributions and similar measures. The Bureau of the Census

went to elaborate lengths in the 1970 Census to define and describe the numbers and characteristics of the families and persons below the poverty level. We are now left for ten years to improvise methods of measuring the impact of the various poverty programs upon reducing such numbers. With probable in-migration of poverty population adding to the 1970 levels, we are on a treadmill without the means of realistically evaluating the situation until 1980.

Proposals for a one or two percent sample census will only yield City-wide figures. While we will eagerly await these, there is no question that what is really needed is a sample of sufficient size to permit census tract tallies. Census tracts are our basic building blocks for a whole variety of administrative and statistical districting schemes.

I therefore urge the Subcommittee to recommend that Congress authorize a mid-decade census. At the same time, it is important to press the Administration for sufficient funds to execute such a census at a significant geographic level.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. ZUCCOTTI, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES A. VANIK, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support of the concept of a mid-decade census. In our increasingly complex society, there is a continually growing need for additional data and information. As Lincoln once said, in a classic understatement of the problem of government: "If we only knew where we were and whither we were going, we might better know how to get there." The Census is the means by which governments can determine "where they are" and whither they are going."

I might add that the need for census data by my own Committee—the Ways and Means Committee—is nearly insatiable. We have passed new Revenue Sharing legislation which is wholly dependent on Census data. We are attempting to develop new tax reform legislation—and it is vital that we know the economic health and trends of the various segments of America society. We will be dealing with trade—and will need new information on the economic status of American business. We may be dealing with health again in the near future—and will need to have Census data on the age and income of various sectors of our society. The same needs apply in our consideration of Social Security and of welfare. If we are to legislate effectively, we continually need the latest possible information.

But I would also like to take this opportunity today to point out some of the problems which can be created by the scheduling of a Census. For example, I am particularly concerned about the timing or scheduling of the Census proposed by H.R. 4426. The bill says that the mid-decade Census is to be completed by April 1st. Now in order for a census to be as accurate and thorough as possible, it is desirable to give the recipients of Census forms a reasonable length of time to complete the forms. At least as far as the business and economic parts of the proposed census go, the present schedule fails to meet that test.

I would like to bring the Committee's attention to the case of one of my constituents, Mr. A. A. Vosen, a public accountant from Solon, Ohio. As Mr. Vosen stated in letters to me, he and many other small accountants—and probably even the larger accounting firms—are faced with an impossible burden of government forms to fill out in the early months of the year—the same time of year that the Census proposed by H.R. 4426 would be conducted.

To provide some idea of the number of forms required in the first few months of the year, I would like to submit the list provided to my office by Mr. Vosen. In the month of April alone, four separate forms are due. Adding to this already heavy load is dangerous. One has to expect that many businessmen faced with this mass of papers, may fill out their forms with imaginary or "guesstimate" figures just to meet the filing deadlines. We cannot afford to base our future policies on distorted and inaccurate figures.

In reading the hearings on "The Federal Paperwork Burden," another example comes to mind. A small businessman in New Hampshire reported that in 1961 his restaurant in the course of a year was required to file government forms on at least eighteen separate dates at a personal cost of \$325. In 1971, the number of forms to be submitted had increased to 27 at a total cost of \$820. In addition, to the proposed mid-decade census, this particular business would be required to fill seven separate forms in the month of April.

It is my hope, under the circumstances of this paperwork burden, that the final determination of census filing dates will be made only after this Committee or

some other appropriate agency reviews the time demands on American citizens in filling out and submitting these forms. With this information at hand, it is my hope that the Committee can ensure that the Census is conducted during a "slack period," which will place the least additional demand on our constituents and which will also assure more accurate reporting. Periodic review by the Committee of the forms that are actually used will, perhaps, help avoid unnecessary paperwork, duplicative questions, and multiple filings.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I am seriously concerned about certain forms used by the Census Bureau. In particular, I question the accuracy of the "mail census" in many neighborhoods of our larger cities. Statistics formulated from a mail-in census (even with street follow-up) can only be roughly representative of those returning the forms.

I would like to include in the hearing record some comments I made in 1966 before the House Committee on Public Works concerning the Economic Development Act Amendments of that year. In that hearing, I offered a detailed census study of certain neighborhoods of the City of Cleveland and I expressed my concern about the accuracy of existing census data—as collected by the mail census—in the City's areas of highest unemployment. I would like to include in the hearing record portions of my testimony from 1966.

To best effect the administration of existing programs and future programs, an accurate census is vital. Without improved procedures, present censuses will not be accurately returned from areas in which the major government social aid programs exist.

To briefly summarize my statement, I feel that much more consideration be given to choosing or coordinating the best time for the mid-decade census. I also hope that this Committee will investigate the administration and accuracy of these censuses, especially in those areas where it is vital that Federal social programs be most clearly directed.

(Excerpt of testimony of Congressman Vanik before House Public Works Committee, June 24, 1966:)

I have been told that more accurate unemployment statistics are only available during the decennial census year when professional interviewers from the Census Bureau enumerate the employment conditions existing in every tenth household.

I have also been told by the Bureau of the Census that they are as yet unable to portray accurately the general levels of unemployment in the hard-pressed areas of the city, since under present methods, many persons do not respond to questions on forms either written or in personal interviews. Therefore, there appears to be agreement that the present indicated levels of unemployment in poverty areas and cities is inaccurate and probably significantly understated. My fear is that the rate of inaccuracy is much higher than is currently admitted by the Bureau of Census. If this conclusion is true, then we have yet to have an accurate basis upon which to determine the application of existing employment efforts.

As an additional example, I would point to the definition which the Census Bureau uses to determine various categories of employment. One such definition is "service worker," excluding the private house worker. I was informed by the Bureau of the Census that this particular category includes various occupations from elevator operator to policeman and fireman. In my attempt to determine the total number of unskilled workers, a categorization like "service worker," which includes a wide variety of skilled and unskilled workers, precludes division into "skilled" and "unskilled" and renders such definitions useless in terms of developing adequate manpower employment policies which depend so heavily upon these census statistics.

In addition, at the conclusion of the list of occupations, which are enumerated, is a category called "Occupation Not Reported." It has been indicated to me by the Census Bureau that it is safe to assume that, of the number listed in this category, most are unskilled. It seems difficult to me to justify such a listing when the numbers which are so listed are of such a high proportion of the total number of employed enumerated in all occupation categories.

Finally, the city of Cleveland was one of two cities in which the Bureau of the Census tested a technique of census data gathering through the U.S. mails, to determine whether such a system can be applied throughout the nation in the 1970 census. I had an opportunity to study the forms which were utilized in this test. The format was sufficiently complicated to preclude many persons from completing them.

While I have been assured that the results of this special census were followed up with a personal interview, it is my considered opinion that the information from this type of census are highly suspect.

Since it is of the utmost importance that accurate statistical profiles of these hard-pressed areas be obtained to assure the meaningful application of the Economic Development Administration Act and economic opportunity programs, it is my hope that more accurate census gathering techniques can be developed to produce more dependable results.

A. A. VOSEN,
PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT,
Solon, Ohio, February 15, 1973.

Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: In accordance with our recent telephone conversation, concerning the Census Reports required to be filed by February 15 with the United States Department of Commerce, I am listing the various Federal, State, County, and City tax returns that Public Accountants must complete for their clients.

Form number	Title of return	Due date
Federal:		
940	Federal unemployment tax return	Jan. 31
941	Employer's quarterly Federal tax return	Do.
W-2	Wage and tax statement (1 for each employee)	Do.
W-3	Transmittal of wage and tax statements	Do.
1099	U.S. information return on commissions, dividends, and interest	Do.
1096	Transmittal return for form 1099	Feb. 28
1120	Corporation income tax return	Mar. 15
1120S		
1165	Partnership income tax return	Apr. 15
1040	Individual income tax return	Do.
State:		
IT-941	State return of income tax withheld	Jan. 31
IT-3	Reconciliation of Ohio income tax withheld and transmittal of wage and tax statement	Do.
UC02	Employer's contribution report (State unemployment tax report)	Do.
DP21	State workmen's compensation report	Do.
FT-1120	Corporation franchise tax report	Do.
IT-1040	Ohio individual income tax return	Apr. 15
938-939	Security valuation and investor's list	Mar. 31
ST-10	Semi-annual sales tax return	Feb. 28
County	Tangible and intangible personal property tax returns for individuals, proprietorships, and corporations.	Apr. 30
City	Employer's quarterly withheld municipal tax return	Jan. 31
	Reconciliation of municipal income tax withheld and transmittal of wage and tax statement.	Do.
	City business returns and city individual income tax returns	Apr. 30

If these various tax returns are not filed by the due date, the small businessman or taxpayer is assessed a penalty plus interest by the various governmental agencies. Having to complete the long and involved Census Reports by February 15 places an undue burden upon the small independent accountant.

Your reply to my telephone call was greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

A. A. VOSEN, *Public Accountant.*

114 LUCAS LANE,
Bethesda, Md., April 17, 1973.

AUSTIN BRAY,
Administrative Assistant, Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in reference to H.B. 4426. Release the 1900 census report immediately. Retain the 72-year law of release. Disregard a 5-year census schedule.

Yours truly,

ONETA N. MCGANN.
LEONARD A. MCGANN.

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES B. RHOADS, ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

On April 2 I had the pleasure of appearing informally before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics to describe the work of the National Archives. This statement has been prepared to reiterate our deep concern for the availability

of census records—especially the records of the 1900 census—and our objection to Section 5 of H.R. 4426 which would keep those records closed in perpetuity.

Although the National Archives and Records Service and the Bureau of the Census differ on this particular issue, there is a long history of close and cooperative relations between the two agencies. In 1936 and 1937, shortly after the National Archives was created, the farm census schedules for 1925 and 1930 were accessioned into the National Archives because it was believed that they would be useful for research on post-World War I agricultural history. Nevertheless, it was agreed that immediate public access to the records could be detrimental to the farmers. The 20th century population and economic census records were accepted during the next few years on condition that access would be granted only to persons authorized by the Director, Bureau of the Census. However, the Director and the Archivist of the United States agreed that the early population and economic census records, 1790 to 1870, would, on the other hand, be opened to all researchers immediately. The 1870 census records were made available as they were transferred in 1942, 72 years after the census was taken.

In 1944 the Bureau requested an exception to this policy concerning 19th century records. The Director proposed that the 1880 schedules "should remain closed to public examination for reasons that the paper on which the names were enumerated [had] become so brittle that it breaks easily and public handling would damage the records beyond all hope of repair." As a result, it was agreed that the National Archives staff would perform occasional searches among the schedules until a microfilm copy could be provided to all qualified researchers.

After the completion of the microfilm project and certification that the copies were adequate substitutes for the paper records, it was decided to offer the original copies to the States and to negotiate an agreement on access to all subsequent population censuses. Consequently, on August 26, 1952, the Director of the Bureau of the Census, Roy V. Peel, in conformance with the "policy of the Bureau of the Census to make available to as many people as possible the information contained in [census] records, consistent with National Security and the rights of individuals concerned," proposed that "after the lapse of 72 years from the enumeration date of a decennial census, the National Archives and Records Service may disclose information contained in these records for use in the legitimate historical genealogical or other worthwhile research." The Archivist of the United States, Wayne C. Grover, accepted this proposal on October 10, 1952. A lapse of 72 years, it was felt, was sufficient to protect private interests.

Under the agreement and with the knowledge of the Bureau of the Census, in 1952 the National Archives released the 1880 census returns and in 1962 the fragment of the 1890 census returns that had survived a fire in 1921.

In 1970, at a time when the Bureau of the Census was under criticism as it prepared to take the decennial census, the Director, George H. Brown, wrote to me stating that access to the 1900 individual returns should be delayed until "at least the year 2000." In my reply I stated that the 1952 agreement should not be amended without soliciting the opinions of leading associations of economists, genealogists, historians, political scientists and ecologists. Our negotiations on the issue were inconclusive. In 1972, at the request of the Department of Commerce, we agreed to delay the opening of the 1900 census records that could have been released on June 1, 1972, pending further efforts to resolve the issue.

The proposed Section 5 of H.R. 4426 seems to assume a promise of permanent confidentiality of the 1900 and later returns and an overriding public interest in closing the records for the protection of privacy. The former assumption is a question of interpreting law. The 12th Census Act of 1899 (30 Stat. 1014) provided in Section 21, as follows: "That any . . . employee, who, having taken and subscribed the oath of office required by this Act, shall . . . without the authority of the Director of the Census, communicate to any person not authorized to receive the same any information gained by him in the performance of his duties, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor." The historical background to this section, as we understand it, was to prevent enumerators from revealing personal information to neighbors.

From 1830 to 1870 census returns had been made public by depositing a duplicate copy in courthouses and State Governments. Enumerators for the 1880 census were required to take an oath to reveal returns only to their superior officers. Upon request, individual data could nevertheless be supplied to State Governments. In 1920 President Taft assured the American people that the census would not be used for taxation, with army or jury service, compulsory school attendance, the regulation of immigration, or with the enforcement of laws. Census employees were prohibited from disclosing any information in the

returns. It would appear that President Taft would have added that the confidentiality was to be permanent, if he had so intended. The 15th Census Act of June 18, 1929, (Section 9 U.S.C. Title 13) forbade access to individual reports to anyone other than sworn employees of the Census Bureau.

In contrast to these earlier census statutes the Federal Records Act of 1950 (62 Stat. 568) imposed a fifty year limit on statutory and other restrictions on access to records of Executive agencies unless the Archivist of the United States (who has been delegated this authority by the Administrator of General Services) determines that they should remain in force for a longer period. When the Act was being debated, the Archivist noted to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that census records were among those that could be restricted beyond 50 years. In accordance with the bill, these records eventually would be made available to scholars.

The problem of public interest in revelation of census returns is more perplexing than the purely legal question. In 1908, Joseph A. Hill, Chief of the Division of Revision and Results, Bureau of the Census, in addressing the American Historical Association (Annual Report, 1908, Vol. 1 pages 197-208) recommended use of the original returns.

"I may perhaps render a service to students of history," he said, "if I call attention to the original material in the possession of the Census Bureau and make some suggestions regarding its further use for historical purposes." He went on to suggest research on social and economic history and local, family and genealogical research. He did not mention future restrictions on access to the 1900 schedules.

Mr. Hill proved an excellent prognosticator in envisioning future studies of slavery, demography, ethnic groups, marital conditions, and occupations based upon census returns. There is certainly a growing interest by the Government and private researchers in such topics as the decline of the extended family, changes in the nuclear family, the persistence of poverty among many families and in certain geographic areas, social and geographic mobility of individuals and families, and the cultural assimilation of ethnic and racial groups.

We have considered the many facets of this question. We have discussed with the Bureau of the Census and others the desirability, on the one hand, of opening the records for significant research and, on the other hand, the potential harm to individuals. We have also reviewed the intensive use made of the 1880 census returns. Some 40,000 requests for the 1880 census are received each year in the National Archives Building; there are steadily increasing requests in our 11 Regional Archives Branches; and 500 microfilm copies of the 1880 returns have been sold to historical societies and universities. Since we have received no complaints about invasion of privacy, this has suggested to us that such release after a reasonable period will not adversely affect future enumerations. We find no evidence that genealogical research has been detrimental to individuals. On the contrary, such research, has often resolved legal problems of heirship.

Thus, we feel that Section 5 of H.R. 4426 would overturn the policy agreed upon in 1952 under which late 19th century census records have been opened, and, it would deny to researchers one of our most important sources for study of the American people. The Section would also be incompatible with the way comparable material is handled by the National Archives. Even investigative files (including dossiers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation) may be made available after 75 years. Other files containing sensitive personal information are also released after 75 years.

It is the role of the National Archives to preserve the genuinely valuable historic records of the Federal government. But their preservation alone is not enough. Ultimately, they must be used or their preservation is meaningless. The substantial research use which the open census records receive from private researchers suggests the importance of making available those other census records which are still closed.

On the outside of the National Archives Building are inscribed these words:

"The glory and romance of our history are here preserved in the chronicles of those who conceived and builded the structure of our nation."

Much of the history of the great and the powerful has been written. Most of the history of those groups of ordinary folk who also shared in the building of our nation has yet to be set down. The availability of the census records for research will make such historical writing possible and will enrich our understanding and our appreciation of our nation's past.