

Mr. BOWMAN. That is right. The only thing we could do later on is propose a survey in 1972 for which we could make similar comparisons, but—

Representative BOLLING. Well, now, would that work as well? Will your going from the larger to the smaller work as well?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes.

Representative BOLLING. It would?

Mr. BOWMAN. I think it could be done that way.

Representative BOLLING. I just wondered if there are any technical problems in going from the big census to the smaller survey.

Mr. BOWMAN. I think the reason, Miss Martin is explaining to me the reason why we are curtailing the appeal to the Senate from the larger survey to a somewhat smaller is because so much time has elapsed now and without getting the supplemental funds we would not be able to conduct it.

Representative BOLLING. OK. Go on on the other one. I did not mean to interrupt you.

Mr. BOWMAN. The other one is the Labor Department request. We had what we thought was an excellent program in there. One of them—one item was a million dollars for some further detailed study of employment and unemployment in large metropolitan areas, similar to the type of survey which is made in the CPS monthly. This was denied. We think this is very important. The second item that I can remember that was denied, in fact, I think there was only \$340,000 of increases approved out of a budget request for increase of about \$2 million, but the other main item, which was missed, which is very dear to my own heart, although I recognize there are different positions on it, is the sector price one.

The House did approve some money for quality improvement in price work but this and the preparatory work for revisions of CPI weights were the only two items that were approved by the House.

Representative BOLLING. Based on the figures that you appended to your statement, showing a very substantial increase from 1950 to the present, this is not what you would call one of the good years.

Mr. BOWMAN. Not—

Representative BOLLING. So far.

Mr. BOWMAN. So far, that is right.

Representative BOLLING. Thank you very much, Mr. Bowman. That is all I have.

Mr. Curtis?

Representative CURTIS. I could not agree more with the Chairman on his comments. This leads me to a point that I have been very much interested in. You comment on the job vacancy statistics. This subcommittee actually held specific hearings in this area because it was our judgment that this is very important. We wanted to be sure that the series would be practical and that industry would cooperate. The hearings clearly revealed that it is practical. It is a necessary thing for the Manpower Training Act or any of the training programs to be meaningful. In fact, we wrote it into the Manpower Training Act. To my regret the administration withdrew its request—I think that was a \$2½ million request—on the grounds that Congress had denied it twice before. Therefore, they just did not ask for it again. Well, I have had a running colloquy with Secretary of Labor Wirtz on this subject and I went to the trouble—at least from my side of the aisle—