

assume that you are going to stress those things that are the most significant and important—even though they are in the documents, and indeed some of this is discussed here—so that we can then direct our colloquy toward these important things.

Now, I can prepare a series of questions, and you can answer. But, I am familiar with these personal appearances of the administration. This is the occasion, I think, to point up those things that are the most significant. I think I can draw the proper conclusion that those areas, not included in your paper, are those that the administration feels are not particularly critical.

Secretary WIRTZ. I think that is right. In your terms, Mr. Curtis, my statement does represent those things which I think are most important. I am really more interested today, and I think the country ought to be, in the scenery than in the garbage. I think it is more important. And that is the reason it is emphasized here.

Representative CURTIS. Well, we can take our rhetoric out in another forum than this. I have listed things that are not garbage by any means. The impact of the war on the unemployment situation is not garbage. The impact of inflation on employment as I have described it, with respect to exports and imports, is hardly garbage. The impact of high interest rates on unemployment and employment, and certainly productivity increases, are hardly garbage.

But we will develop our rhetoric in other forums. And believe me, I shall.

Secretary WIRTZ. I should prefer that.

Representative CURTIS. Now, having said that, I would like to devote a little time to some of the things that are discussed in this report.

Referring to—in your prepared statement—the first stage in development of national policy with regard to employment and unemployment—and I am skipping: “* * * to increase the number of work opportunities.” The second stage, “* * * to assist the disadvantaged individual in qualifying himself for the work opportunities which are available.”

What I find missing in here is a discussion of the machinery that—to identify what work opportunities are available, because without this kind of material and data, it is very difficult for me to conceive how any of the training programs that you mentioned in your report can be fully effective. They can be partially effective.

Two of the tools are, one, updating the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. The recent updating goes back really to 1965. Where is this sitting? Is there a new revision that is about to come out?

Secretary WIRTZ. I will check on the specific schedule, and we will supply it for the record. The answer to your question is that we are continually working on it. But the answer to your question is also that that work has been somewhat slowed up. That has a lower priority now under the economic pressures than it would otherwise have.

(Information below subsequently filed):

The “lower priority rate” is assigned because the current edition of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles is a comparatively recent (December 1965) publication. We are planning on a full revision every 4 to 5 years, and are contemplating the next revision (fourth edition) for 1970.

This is possible through arrangements that are underway to computerize the revision, maintenance, and printing of the DOT to make the information