September 1974
Number 75-3

statistical reporter

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

STATISTICAL REPORTER

Prepared Monthly by the Statistical Policy Division

CONTENTS

SUBSCRIPTIONS ($5.25 a year) should be sent to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Make checks payable to the Superintendent of Documents.

SUGGESTIONS, contributions, and inquiries may be addressed to: Statistical Reporter, Statistical Policy Division, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Management and Budget

Roy L. Ash
Director

Joseph W. Duncan
Deputy Associate Director for Statistical Policy

Emily T. White
Editor of Statistical Reporter

STATISTICAL REPORTER is prepared primarily for the interchange of information among Government employees engaged in statistical and research activities. Views expressed in contributed notes or articles do not necessarily reflect the policy or opinions of the Office of Management and Budget.

Sources and availability are shown for each publication and requests should be made to the source indicated. If "GPO" is shown, order from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The Paperwork Predicament

BY ROYE L. LOWRY, *Clearance Officer*
Statistical Policy Division, Office of Managementand Budget

Almost every American has filled in some kind of Federal Government report form during his life. Most Americans fill in several of them each year, and many spend more time doing this than they wish to or feel is necessary. As individuals, as businessmen, as farmers, as State and local government officials, as university presidents, hospital directors, or heads of other non-profit organizations, regardless of race, creed, color, political affiliation or place of residence, Americans generally seem to share a common concern that the Federal Government has too many forms and questionnaires which seek to collect too much information for no clear purpose.

For over 30 years, it has been the declared policy of Congress that the Federal Government should minimize the reporting burden which it places upon the public in obtaining the information it needs. In the Federal Reports Act of 1942, the Congress gave to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget) far-reaching authority and placed upon him heavy responsibilities to assure the implementation of this policy within the Executive Branch of the Government.

In order to hold down the reporting burden on the public, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was given the authority to designate a single collection agency to meet the information needs of two or more agencies, to order a halt to the collection of unnecessary information, and to require the transfer of information from one agency to another to help achieve the purposes of the act. In addition, the Federal Reports Act provided that:

"A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor the collection of information upon identical items, from 10 or more persons, other than Federal employees, unless, in advance of adoption or revision of any plans or forms to be used in the collection—

(1) the agency has submitted to the Director the plans or forms, together with copies of pertinent regulations and of other related materials as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has specified; and

(2) the Director has stated that he does not disapprove the proposed collection of information."

Only the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of the Public Debt, the Bureau of Accounts, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Division of Foreign Funds Control were left free of any restriction on their ability to collect information from the public. The data collection activities of Federal bank supervisory agencies were likewise not subject to any restriction with respect to any report called for in the "proper performance" of their supervisory functions.

Despite the increasingly widespread use of sampling techniques and the exploitation of existing records wherever possible to meet additional needs for information, the growth of the demand for information by Federal agencies has led to substantial increases in the reporting burden placed on the public.

Congressional criticism of the growth of Federal government paperwork has been persistent throughout the 32 years which have passed since the passage of the Federal Reports Act. On one occasion, in 1953, the Congress went so far as to eliminate the Censuses of Business, Manufacturing and Mining to halt the growth of paperwork, and for a time in the late '60's it appeared that the 1970 Decennial Census might be substantially curtailed. The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and the Senate Select Committee on Small Business have persistently criticized the Executive Branch and OMB for not doing more to cut back "the paperwork jungle" or to bring a halt to "paperwork pollution."

The Nation's Chief Executives have not been any less active in their efforts to try to reduce the Government's reporting requirements. President Johnson and President Nixon, in particular, mounted major efforts to cut back the information collection demands upon the public within the past decade. Each of these efforts produced evidence of substantial success. Yet the reporting burden has continued to increase.

The basic reason for this concern and criticism can be seen by briefly glancing at the following two tables. They show the increase in the number of reports and the increase in the estimated time it took the public to fill them out between December 31, 1967, and June 30, 1974. The figures are taken from OMB records and relate to those agencies which were subject to the Federal Reports Act and OMB surveillance as of June 30, 1974.

NUMBER OF REPORTS

Type of respondent	*Dec. 1967*	*June 1974*	±
Individuals	1,181	1,370	+189
Business	2,019	2,178	+159
Farmers	232	222	− 10
State and local governments	1,060	1,087	+ 27
Non-profit organizations and other	179	289	+110
	4,671	5,146	+475

Reporting Burden

(in millions of man-hours)

Individuals	52.3	63.8	+11.5
Business	23.7	35.6	+11.9
Farmers	3.7	4.1	+ 0.4
State and local governments	16.2	22.4	+ 6.2
Non-profit organizations and other	1.9	4.1	+ 2.2
	97.8	130.0	+32.2

WHY THE INCREASE?

Throughout the numerous examinations into and debate and discussions about the reporting burden placed on the public by Federal activities, little attention has been given to the dynamic forces which affect change in this burden: (1) the changing content of Federal programs and (2) the increase in private activities which call for Federal reporting.

Take, for example, the 50% increase in the reporting burden borne by American businesses since 1967. Major new programs were the principal source of this increase. Occupational safety and health activities, expanded Social Security programs (principally Medicare and Medicaid), environmental protection regulations, equal employment opportunity compliance, and similar Federal programs which did not exist or were only just starting in 1967 have been large contributors to the growth in the reporting burden laid on the business community. The fact that many of these new reporting requirements were associated with new Federal regulatory activities did not make them any more popular among prospective respondents.

In addition to the added reporting consequent to new Federal programs, there were some increases in reporting which were a function of increased activity in the private sector, as, for example, increased reporting to the Customs Bureau arising out of an expansion of imports or increased reporting to the Federal Aviation Administration because of a larger number of sales and transfers of title to aircraft.

Finally, an expansion in the Government's collection of employment statistics completes a list of major increases in the reporting burden placed on American business by Federal agencies over the past several years. A summary of these increases is reproduced in the table below. To some extent these reporting burdens were offset by decreases in the reporting burden associated with declining programs.

SOURCES OF MAJOR INCREASES

IN THE REPORTING BURDEN ON AMERICAN BUSINESS

DEC. 1967–JUNE 1974

(in millions of man-hours)

Occupational Safety and health	+ 4.6
Social Security programs	+ 2.7
Manpower programs	+ 1.3
Aircraft and airport regulations	+ 1.0
Equal employment opportunity	+ 1.1
Housing production and mortgage guarantee programs	+ 0.9
Foreign trade documentation	+ 0.7
Environmental protection	+ 0.6
Employment statistics	+ 0.6
Total	13.5

Similarly, the reporting burden played on individuals is primarily the result of new programs. In this case, however, the increased reporting burden is primarily associated with expanded benefits. For example, the applications and other reports filed to obtain the benefits of expanded social security programs or basic educational opportunity grants accounted for a greater reporting burden than the total growth reported during the period under review. Again, decreases in other reporting requirements partially offset the new demands.

The changes in the reporting burdens recorded for the other categories of respondents serve only to embellish the main theme—that changes in Federal programs constitute the principal driving force for changes in the amount of information sought from the public.

To the extent that these new reporting burdens are associated with new Federal regulatory activities, the Federal Reports Act has not been particularly successful in holding them down. In these situations, there is seldom any substantial information already available from any Federal source. Moreover, as the new regulations apply equally to everyone within the regulated group, there are not many opportunities to apply sampling techniques or minimum-size cut-offs to relieve the reporting burden. While some limited contribution can be made by pruning recordkeeping requirements or reporting questionnaires, the broad coverage of the regulatory law itself assures that the reporting burden will be large.

In cases of this kind, relief is most likely to be obtained by a change in legislation or by the regulatory agency's administrative determination that it has adequate authority to modify the recordkeeping or reporting requirements set forth in the law. This was the path taken to relieve some small businessmen from the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. In response to bitter complaints from small businessmen, legislation was introduced in Congress to relieve all employers of 15 or fewer persons from the OSHA recordkeeping and reporting requirements. While this proposed legislation was pending, a careful review was undertaken within the Department of Labor to determine the extent to which it would be possible to modify these requirements by administrative order. Following this review, it was determined that employers of 7 or fewer persons could be exempted from the requirements. This decision relieved about 1,000,000 small businessmen from the OSHA reporting burden.

The Federal Reports Act can be a more useful tool in reducing the reporting burden when there is some elbow-room for applying statistical sampling or similar techniques. Another example from the Occupational Safety and Health Act is illustrative. Section 24(a) of the Act *requires* the Secretary of Labor to

> " . . . compile accurate statistics on work injuries and illnesses which shall include all disabling, serious, or sigificant injuries and illnesses, whether or not involving loss of time from work, other than minor injuries requiring only first aid treatment and which do not involve medical treatment, loss of consciousness, restriction of work or motion, or transfer to another job."

The Occupational Injuries and Illnesses Survey is the basic response to this legislative requirement. In order to hold down the reporting burden, the Department of Labor collects the information from a sample of employers instead of from all employers subject to the Act. Although the sample is large—about 550,000 employers—the use of sampling freed about 3,000,000 businessmen entirely from this reporting requirement. To 550,000 businessmen the survey is a burden they do not take up with enthusiasm. The 3,000,000 businessmen who are not called upon to share this burden do not have any comparable sense of relief, for they were never confronted with the report.

During the fiscal year 1974, the dynamics of Federal program change and the clearance review activities combined to bring about a small decrease in the reporting burden—from 133.4 million man-hours to 130.0 million man-hours. For the businessman, the decrease in the reporting burden was more significant, a decline of almost 13%, from 40.9 million man-hours to 35.6 million man-hours. The principal cause of the decrease was a change in a Federal program—the demise of the Cost of Living Council. The recent reestablishment of the Council almost surely will be reflected in a new increase in reporting by business.

THE OTHER SIDE

While the major concern of the Federal Reports Act is to hold down the burden on the public of Federal data collection activities, it is clear that Congress intended that Federal agencies should obtain the information needed for them to carry out their functions. Government administrators and program managers are particularly sensitive to their needs for information to plan programs, support budget requests, implement programs, and evaluate them. They are forever being called upon for accountability to the public, to the Congress, to their own superiors, and to OMB itself.

When, in order to meet these requirements for information, they seek some information from the public, they do not always have a full appreciation of the purposes of the clearance process specified in the Federal Reports Act.[1]

Agencies frequently see the Federal Reports Act requirements as just another time-consuming stumbling block placed in the way of the effective performance of their duties, and sometimes they see them as an unwarranted and unauthorized interference in matters which are outside the proper concern of OMB. This latter argument has become more and more persuasive with Congress. In 1973 Congress freed the independent regulatory commissions from those controls to which the executive departments and agencies are subject. These regulatory bodies are now subject to a more limited kind of control over their information-gathering activities administered by the General Accounting Office. In a further weakening of OMB influence over the data collection activities of Federal agencies, legislation creating the Federal Energy Administration treated that agency as though it were an independent regulatory commission as far as these activities were concerned.

IS THERE A WAY OUT?

Are there ways out of this paperwork predicament? Probably not, but there are ways in which its most unpleasant features might be ameliorated. Here are a few:

Try to improve OMB's clearance process. Is OMB doing as good a job in holding down paperwork as is possible? The Director of OMB wants to find out. To this end, he has authorized the expenditure of up to $100,000 to examine the process now used by OMB in its review of agency requests to collect information from the public. This study would be performed by an outside contractor who would be expected to recommend improvements which can be accomplished within the present level of resources and also to outline a "model clearance process" which would not be subject to this constraint.

Improve coordination of Federal, State and local government information gathering activities. In recent years small businessmen have more and more emphasized the *total* paperwork burden imposed upon them by all levels of government. These critics argue that even if each individual report is fully justified as to need and even if each report is pared to the bare essentials, the cumulative burden of reporting to various governments is overwhelming. This is an area which is not well understood. A second part of the study authorized by the Director of the Office Management and Budget will attempt to get a better understanding of the dimensions of this aspect of the reporting problem.

There are, of course, areas of Federal-State cooperation in the collection of statistics and other arrangements for the transfer of information from one level of government to another. The extent to which cooperative agreements may properly be used is worth further exploration, bearing in mind that concerns of intergovernmental relationships and the privacy of individual respondents may limit the possible use of such agreements.

Get better continuing intelligence of the impact of reporting requirements. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget has no continuing source of information about the seriousness of reporting problems except through the clearance process. While this provides excellent information about the reporting problems associated with a particualr report under review, it does not provide any means for getting an overall perspective on the situtation as seen by a respondent who may be more concerned about the total impact of all reports he is called upon to complete.

OMB is considering the development of a continuing source of intelligence about the overall burden of public reporting through a continuing series of quarterly meetings in the 10 Federal regions, using the Regional Councils to provide the logistical and immediate administrative assistance needed to hold such meetings. As contemplated, there would be one meeting each calendar quarter. All 10 regions would be visited in the course of two and one-half years. Participants would be respondents of every kind who were interested in reporting problems.

Such meetings would produce a new kind of information which could lead to the development of new ways of achieving more effectively the goals of the Federal Reports Act.

[1] Sometimes, in order to make sure that Federal agencies have adequate authority to collect information, Congress grants the same authority to two different agencies, thus setting up a potential for duplicative reporting from the public. For example, compare the data collecting authority of the Federal Energy Administration and the data collecting authority of the Energy Research and Development Administration, two agencies which have been established in the last 6 months.

Try to find ways of spreading the reporting burden more evenly among small businessmen. While statistical sampling reduces the reporting burden for any particular data collection, it is possible for a small businessman to be included in more than one sample survey. Some agencies try to assure that such respondents are not included in more than one sample survey, but such efforts, even when successful within an agency, still expose individual respondents to inclusion in surveys conducted by other agencies. Judging by complaints by small businessmen, this is not a rare experience. Possible means of reducing the burden on individual businessmen through an interchange of lists of respondents to surveys is worth exploration, but, again, provisions of law and considerations of privacy and confidentiality may limit the application of such procedures.

CONCLUSION

Whether any of the foregoing will lead to new ways of easing our present paperwork predicament, no one can say. One can be quite certain, however, that we must continually seek to find new approaches for dealing with the matter. The level of frustration is very high among all those involved: the public, the Congress, and the Executive Branch, among those who want less paperwork, and among those who feel that the Government is operating with dangerously inadequate information. Unless this tension can be eased, the Government's data collection activities face a stormy and unpredictable future.

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

COMMUNICATIONS—A TWO-WAY STREET

The Statistical Policy Division has launched a major effort to make the *Statistical Reporter* a real communications channel for all government statisticians. To be effective, it must be a two-way street, so feel free to offer your suggestions.

Reflecting the changes planned for the *Statistical Reporter,* this issue appears in a new cover. While the cover is a cosmetic change, the basic goal of related changes is to improve communication throughout the Government on current developments in statistics. The Statistical Reporter will continue to be dedicated to being a means of telling other agencies about conditions and activities which may affect the statistical information they get from you; a means of learning what other agencies are doing that may be helpful to you; and a means of letting others know when a project is finished and the results are available.

Inside the back cover is a list of people who are serving as representatives for their agencies, either as a channel for news items for the *Statistical Reporter* or to handle distribution, or both. If you are involved in an activity which you think is an appropriate subject for a news note or a feature article, you should work through your agency representative in getting the item submitted for publication. If there is no agency representative, you may mail your article directly to:

Statistical Reporter
Statistical Policy Division
Office of Management & Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

What kinds of information should you write about? The following list outlines what we want.

(1) Articles describing major program changes and new surveys being undertaken, as well as reports on statistical programs by interagency or public committees.

(2) Descriptions of important methodological developments of broad interest, particularly those which improve the quality of data, reduce costs, or provide new approaches to difficult problems. These should be written in non-technical language with a reference for use by those needing the technical details.

(3) Announcements describing major publications. The writeup should emphasize new features, if the publication appears on a regular schedule. Descriptions of publications which are secondary

sources of data should be included only if they make the data more conveniently available. Coding manuals and similar material, if available for distribution, should be included.

(4) Descriptions of significant changes in the organization of statistical activities. (Minor changes should be reported as personnel notes.)

(5) Personnel notes. Changes of key people working on statistical programs, especially where such changes may affect interagency communication. (Biographic information should be included only for appointments or retirements of agency heads and for obituary notices.) For many agencies, the personnel notes are supplied by their personnel offices.

(6) Non-Federal news, i.e. pertinent news from the State and local offices with which an agency has ongoing arrangements. News from international agencies and professional societies will be handled by the Office of Management and Budget but suggestions for items to be included will be welcomed.

(7) Feature articles should describe aspects of the Federal statistical system which are of broad interest. Suggestions for feature articles will be welcomed by the editor.

All submittals are subject to review by the staff of the Statistical Policy Division who make the final decision on whether or not the submittal is appropriate for inclusion in the *Statistical Reporter*.

As an aid in preparing material for use in the *Statistical Reporter,* the following outline indicates the major points to consider.

(1) Length (general rule but exceptions will be made for major articles)
- (a) Usual news items, one-two pages, double spaced
- (b) Feature articles, between 10-20 pages, double spaced

(2) Content
- (a) Description of the purpose or subject
- (b) Outline of procedure being followed in survey
- (c) Principal results or findings (or an estimate of when these will be available)
- (d) How to obtain further details (author's name and telephone number, source of published information, where in agency to write or call for more detail)
- (e) For publications, size (number of pages), price, and how to get copies.

(3) Personnel notes. (List full name, new position and agency, old position and agency.)

(EMILY T. WHITE, STATISTICAL POLICY DIVISION, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, telephone (202) 395-3710).

U.S. POPULATION, 1950 TO 1990

A book-length monograph, "Population of the United States, Trends and Prospects: 1950 to 1990," was published by the Bureau of the Census in August 1974 as a part of the background material for the World Population Conference held in Bucharest, Romania, in August 1974. The report is one of 57 "country statements" that are being prepared by cooperating countries following an outline proposed by a United Nations planning organization, the Committee for International Coordination of National Research in Demography (CICRED), with headquarters in Paris. Preparation of the report was a cooperative undertaking of staff members in the Bureau of the Census, a part of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Social and Economic Statistics Administration.

About 80 tables and 20 graphs or maps are included in the 7 chapters:

I. Population Growth
II. Components of Population Growth
III. Population Composition
IV. Population Distribution and Internal Migration
V. The Labor Force
VI. Demographic Projections
VII. Summary and Socioeconomic Implications

The first five chapters provide a historical background; the sixth chapter analyzes the latest population projections; and the seventh chapter provides an interpretive summary. Some of the material had not been previously published.

Among the highlights of the study, based largely on published population censuses and projections, is the conclusion that the next 2 decades seem likely to bring more moderate changes in the population of the United States than the previous 2 decades. Even the projections that assume relatively high rates of population growth imply generally slower rates of growth in total population, household and family formation, school enrollment, and labor force participation between now and 1990 than the growth rates for 1950 to 1970 or 1973. Yet the projections that assume relatively low rates of population growth imply substantial absolute gains in most of the same areas during the next decade or two. Population projections need to be revised periodically as changes in trends develop.

The rural population was the same in 1970 as in 1930, 54 million, although the farm population declined from 30 million to 9 million. Growth in urban areas accounts for the entire difference between the current population total in 1970 and that in 1930. By 1970, the population in metropolitan areas outside central cities exceeded the population in the central cities for the first time in a decennial census. Migration to metropolitan areas was heavy during the 1950's and slackened during the 1960's; now, some of the larger metropolitan areas have ceased to gain from inmigration.

The monograph presents a comprehensive analysis of differences in fertility among women in various ethnic and socioeconomic groups. It details recent changes in mortality, international migration, and such aspects of population composition and distribution as marriage and living arrangements, national origin, race, religion, and internal migration. The treatment of the labor force covers changes in the employment of men, working wives, mothers, and other women; changes in occupation and industrial distributions; and trends and variations in personal and family income.

Copies of the monograph, "Population of the United States, Trends and Prospects: 1950 to 1990," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-23, No. 49 (225 pages, $2.75) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (PAUL C. GLICK, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-7030.)

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON LOW-INCOME POPULATION, 1966–1972

The Census Bureau recently released a report showing previously unpublished data on the low-income population. This report is entitled "Supplementary Report on Low-Income Population: 1966 to 1972," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-60, No. 95.

The data in this report were extracted from a series of tabulations prepared for and previously distributed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. They supplement the data on the low-income population already published in other Series P-60 reports.

Some of the data in this report have been included in recent Series P-60 reports on the low-income population; however, this is the first time that they are being shown as a historical series. Data are also being shown on residence in the ten standard Federal administrative regions and on the characteristics of persons between 100% and 125% and between 125% and 150% of the low-income level; these data have not been previously published in the P-60 reports. The forthcoming detailed report on the low-income population based on the March 1974 Current Population Survey will include comparable data for the year 1973.

Copies of the report, "Supplementary Report on the Low-Income Population: 1966 to 1972," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-60, No. 95, (64 pp., $1.30), are for sale at the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, or at any Commerce Department district office. (ARNO I. WINARD, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-5790).

BLACK POPULATION, 1973

The Bureau of the Census recently released a report entitled "The Social and Economic Status of the Black Population in the United States, 1973." This special study is the seventh in a series of statistical reports on the status of the black population. The particular focus of this report is the changes which have occurred in the 1970's in population distribution, income, education, employment, family composition, health, voting patterns, and other major aspects of life. Comparisons are made with the mid and late 1960's.

Most of the statistics are from the Bureau of the Census, but some are from other Government and private agencies. The data from the Census Bureau are based primarily on the 1970 Census of Population and Housing and on the Bureau's continuing Current Population Surveys.

In general, according to the reports, the 1970's have been characterized by a mixed pattern of development as compared with the 1960's, the decade when major social and economic advances were made by blacks. Blacks have shown continued progress in education and the acquisition of elected officials. In other areas, such as income, the picture is particularly mixed with significant regional and family status variation, although the overall income ratio between black and white families has declined.

Copies of "The Social and Economic Status of the Balck Population in the United States, 1973," *Current Population Reports*, P-23, No. 48 (146 pp., $2.75) are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, or any of the district offices of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Limited copies for official government use may be obtained upon request to the Bureau of the Census. (NAMPEO MCKENNEY, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-7572.)

MAP OF 1960–70 PERCENT CHANGE IN BLACK POPULATION

The Bureau of the Census has recently published a map entitled "Percent Change in the Negro Population by Counties of the United States: 1960 to 1970."

This map, eighth in the series of racial and ethnic maps, shows the percent gain or loss of the black population in each county throughout the United States from 1960 to 1970.

Copies of the map, Series GE-50, No. 54, (Size: 42" x 30") are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 for 60 cents each. (NAMPEO MCKENNEY AND OLGA FONVILLE, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-7572.)

FAMILY INCOME, 1947 TO 1971

A recent report of the Bureau of the Census, *Family (Money) Income 1947 to 1971: Summarizing Twenty-Five Years of a Summary Statistic*, brings together, in a series of summary tables and charts, family income data in the Current Population Survey during a quarter of a century. The table format permits comparisons for any pair of years of the proportion and number of families with incomes below or above specified income levels, the corresponding index of change in family income, and growth rate. Specified income levels are those coinciding with incomes at the lowest quintile (20%), median (50%), and highest quintile (80%).

To illustrate, in 1971 median family income was $10,285, and there were 26.6 million families with incomes above this figure. By comparison, only 14.1% of the 40.6 million families in 1951, or 5.7 million families, had incomes above $10,285. Viewing changes in median family income from earlier to later years, in 1951, 20.3 million families had incomes above the then median of $5,783 (in 1971 dollars); the percentages and numbers of families above this dollar amount increased to 66.0% and 30.6 million families in 1961, and 77.1% and 41.1 million families in 1971. An adaptation of the table format used in this report is presented in the *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1973*, page 316.

Other sections of the report show annual ratios of family income for highest fifth of families to lowest fifth of families, highest fifth to median, and median to lowest fifth, and selected characteristics of the lowest and highest fifths of families. During the period 1947 through 1971, the National Bureau of Economic Research designated five spells of recession bounded by a peak (P) at the beginning and a trough (T) at the end. For the 5 years in which a peak was identified, the annual ratio of family income for the highest fifth of families to lowest fifth of families averaged 3.07:1, and for the 5 years in which a trough was identified, the average was 3.20:1. This indicates a relatively greater differential impact of recessions on the lowest fifth of families than on the highest fifth of families.

With respect to such economic variables as employment status, work experience of head, and number of earners, there has been an increasing disparity between the highest and lowest fifth of families. The percent of heads employed among the lowest fifth of families declined from 58.8% in 1951 to 43.0% in 1971, whereas the comparable percentages for the highest fifth were 90.4% and 93.0%. Similarly, in the lowest fifth the percent of heads who worked 50 to 52 weeks at full-time jobs moved downward from 24.6% in 1961 to 21.3% in 1971, while among the highest fifth of families there was an increase from 83.6% to 87.1%. Finally, the mean number of earners in the lowest fifth of families declined from 1.01 earners in 1951 to 0.91 earners in 1971, but increased in the highest fifth of families from 1.97 in 1951 to 2.23 in 1971. Accompanying this experience, the average size of family for the lowest fifth declined from 3.16 persons in 1951 to 2.96 persons in 1971; for the highest fifth of families, the estimates were 3.81 persons in 1951 and 3.88 persons in 1971.

Copies of this report, *Family (Money) Income 1947 to 1971: Summarizing Twenty-Five Years of a Summary Statistic*, Technical Paper No. 35 (30 pp., 80 cents), may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (MURRAY S. WEITZMAN, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-7444.)

FEMALE FAMILY HEADS

The Bureau of the Census recently published a report entitled "Female Family Heads." The new report is the first statistical portrait of women family heads, a source of interest among social scientists as well as public and private officials because of their rapidly growing numbers.

The number of women in the United States who are heads of their own families has increased by about 2.4 million since 1955. This number rose from 4.2 million in 1955 to 6.6 million in 1973. Moreover, the increase during the first third of the 1970's (1.0 million) has been nearly equal to the increase during the entire decade of the 1960's (1.1 million).

Some changes in the demographic characteristics of female family heads are discussed in the report. For example, these women are:

Younger on the average than in the past.
More likely to be divorced or separated.
Less likely to be widowed.
More often single.
More often in the labor force because of the availability of wider choices of jobs and better pay.

Since 1960, there has been a 10% increase in the number of white female family heads and a 35% increase in the number of Negro female family heads. Between 1960 and 1973, the median age of women who headed families declined by about 5 years, with Negro family heads now about 9 years younger than their white counterparts. There has been an increase in the proportion of female heads who were divorced, separated, or single and a decline in those who were widowed. Since 1970, the average size of these families has declined after it rose during the decade of the 1960's. In 1973, a higher proportion of children under 18 lived with their mothers only, about 10% of white children and 38% of Negro children. Women who headed families in 1973 reported higher levels of educational attainment than in the past. Most female-headed families lived in metropolitan areas in 1973. Even though their incomes have risen since 1960, the differential between incomes of all families and the income of female-headed families has not declined. About 38% of all persons living in families headed by a woman were below the low-income level in 1972, a decline since 1960. About one-half of the women who headed families in 1970 were home owners, with 56% of the whites and 30% of the Negroes as owners.

The report draws together statistics from various sources to provide the user with a convenient source of information on trends in the incidence of female family headship. Data are presented on the social and economic characteristics of women who head families and, in general, the conditions in which these women and the members of their families live.

Copies of the report, "Female Family Heads," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-23, No. 50 (30 pp., 75 cents) are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (ARTHUR J. NORTON, POPULATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-5189.)

1972 ECONOMIC CENSUSES USER CONFERENCES

During the first half of 1974, the Bureau of the Census participated in 12 economic censuses user conferences. These 1-day conferences were designed to provide users with information on various aspects of the 1972 Economic Census and related economic programs, including current surveys of business and industrial firms and the County Business Patterns data. Census Bureau officials discussed such topics as: subject matter content, census geography, publications, computer tapes, special tabulations, and economic trends. Over 2,200 data users from Government agencies, businesses, and academic institutions have attended the conferences held to date.

The economic censuses are regular 5-year canvasses by the Census Bureau of the Nation's industrial and business activity. They are an important source of information about the structure and functioning of the U.S. economy and provide information essential to both business and Government. From the censuses come benchmark data on retail trade, wholesale trade, selected service industries, construction industries, manufacturers, mineral industries and transportation. Data are available in a wide range of printed reports and on computer tapes.

Because of the enthusiastic reception given the economic censuses user conferences that have already been held, additional conferences are being requested by various local organizations such as chambers of commerce, State and local governments, universities, and the U.S. Department of Commerce district offices. The dates and places for upcoming conferences are shown below:

September 24	Pittsburgh, Pa.
October 22	Minneapolis, Minn.
October 23	Milwaukee, Wis.
November 13	Cleveland, Ohio

Further information regarding the scheduled conferences is available from the U.S. Department of Commerce district offices in the above cities.

Arrangements for economic censuses user conferences are handled by local sponsoring organizations who work closely with the Bureau of the Census in planning the program. Several more conferences are planned for this fall but dates have not yet been set. (JERRY O'DONNELL, DATA USER SERVICES DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-7454.)

1972 RETAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

The Bureau of the Census will release the second in a series containing estimates of capital expenditures, gross value of fixed assets, and lease and rental payments by retail establishments during 1968 and 1972. The earlier release contained estimates of similar data for selected service establishments. The last of this series, "Value Produced In and By Merchant Wholesalers," is scheduled for publication in the fall of this year.

The 1972 data for the retail trade establishments were derived from a sample of retail firms surveyed in conjunction with the 1972 Annual Retail Trade Survey and the 1972 Census of Retail Trade. The 1968 figures come from a similar survey conducted by the Bureau following the 1967 Census of Business. Included within the scope of the survey were all establishments engaged in retail trade including building material, hardware, and farm equipment dealers; general merchandise stores; food stores; eating and drinking places; furniture and appliance dealers; automotive dealers; gasoline service stations, and other durable and nondurable goods retailers.

Copies of the *1972 Retail Capital Expenditures Survey* may be obtained from the Public Information Office, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233. (IRVING TRUE, BUSINESS DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, telephone (301) 763-7661.)

NEW BLS CHARTBOOK GOES ON SALE

With the recent publication of *Chartbook on Prices, Wages, and Productivity, July 1974*, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has placed on sale to the public a series which is to be published monthly. This chartbook presents a comprehensive picture of current changes in prices, wages, costs, profits, and productivity in the U.S. economy, in their historical setting. Most of the charts show seasonally adjusted or annual rates of change.

Rates of change are presented in terms of month-to-month percentage changes as well as over 6-month and 12-month intervals, and are entered in the tables and plotted on the charts at the end of the interval covered. When the data are quarterly, changes are measured from quarter to quarter and over 4-quarter intervals (that is, from the same quarter a year ago). The longer intervals smooth out the short-run fluctuations in rates of change but increase the lag in identifying change in trend.

A short description of the series that have been charted are given in the introduction. The monthly *Chartbook of Prices, Wages, and Productivity* may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 for $1.10, single copy, or $13.20, yearly subscription. (TOMMY C. ISHEE, DIVISION OF SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, telephone (202) 961-5470.)

NSF RECENT SCIENCE RESOURCES STUDIES HIGHLIGHTS

The National Science Foundation has recently published preliminary data issued in the following bulletin series, *Science Resources Studies Highlights*.

"Federal Funding in Higher Education: Academic Science Shows Decline in FY 1973," July 15, 1974 (NSF 74–307) reports on the total Federal obligations to universities and colleges as well as funds for academic science, which are shown by type of program—research and development; R&D plant; fellowships, traineeships and training grants; and general support for science. Also listed are the 100 leading institutions receiving the largest amounts of Federal funds.

A final report, *Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Selected Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1973, A Report to the President and Congress*, will be forthcoming.

"1973 Graduate Enrollment Down Another 2 Percent," July 30, 1974 (NSF 74–308) analyzes data received from the NSF survey of institutions of higher education that grant science Ph.D.'s. Graduate enrollment is shown by level of study, area of science, and sources and types of support of graduate students.

A final report, *Graduate Science Education: Student Support and Postdoctorals, Fall 1972*, will be forthcoming.

"R&D Expenditures of Independent Nonprofit Institutions Approach $1 Billion in 1973," August 16, 1974 (NSF 74–309) reports on the findings of a NSF survey of independent nonprofit institutions, which include research institutes, Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, hospitals, trade associations, agricultural cooperatives, and other. Data are given for both R&D funds and manpower.

A final report, *Scientific Activities of Independent Nonprofit Institutions, 1973,* will be forthcoming.

"Federal R&D Priorities Shifted in FY 1975," August 19, 1974 (NSF 74–310) provides information on Federal R&D programs grouped according to function. These functions in descending order of 1975 R&D obligations are: national defense, space, health, energy development and conversion, environment, science and technology base, natural resources, transportation and communications, education, income security and social services, area and community development and housing, economic growth and productivity, crime prevention and control, and international cooperation and development. Trends in funding of these functions are compared and analyzed over a time span.

A final report, *An Analysis of Federal R&D Funding by Function, Fiscal Years 1969—1975,* will be forthcoming.

Copies of the *Science Resources Studies Highlights* may be obtained by writing to the National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Studies, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20550 or by telephoning (202) 282-7714. (CHARLES E. FALK, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF SCIENCE RESOURCES STUDIES, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CENSUS BUREAU METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The eighth in a series of annual publications which lists published and unpublished papers, memoranda, and reports on methodological research has recently been issued by the Bureau of the Census. The listed papers and publications describe research in progress and give research results when advanced sufficiently enough to be made available.

Copies of *Census Bureau Methodological Research, 1973: An Annotated List of Papers and Reports* (14 pp., 70 cents) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Single copies for official use are available upon request to the Data User Services Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233. (DEANE H. HARRIS, DATA USER SERVICES DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, Telephone (301) 763-5460.)

THE CASH BENEFIT PROVISIONS OF THE OASDI SYSTEM

Recently released by the Social Security Administration, the *OASDI Digest: The Cash Benefit Provisions of the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System* covers changes in the social security law through December 31, 1973, presenting the provisions of the law as they relate to the primary old-age and disability benefits and the secondary dependents' and survivors' benefits. Also discussed are requirements for benefit eligibility, methods for determining the amount of benefits payable, maximum family benefits, basis and calculation of reduced benefits, and delayed retirement credit. These and other terms are defined as they are used.

In addition the *OASDI Digest* contains several step-by-step examples of how various benefits are calculated. The appendix defines the earnings test and presents examples to show how it affects the determination of individual and family benefits.

Single copies of the *OASDI Digest,* DHEW Publication No. (SSA) 74–11917, are available for official use from the Publications Staff, Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration, Room 1120 Universal North Building, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. The report is also for sale for 70 cents by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Order by GPO Stock Number 1770–00246. (ROBERT ROBINSON, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, telephone 202-382-3261 or within Government, 128-3261.)

1973 DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS OF AFDC FAMILIES

The National Center for Social Statistics of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has recently released Part I of the findings of a 1973 sample survey of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, (AFDC) with January 1973 as the study month. The survey included all States and jurisdictions except Guam and Massachusetts. Data are shown for the United States, eight of the ten HEW regions, and 33 States. Statistics are presented for demographic variables related to the AFDC family and household, the children in the family, and for the mothers and fathers of the children. Program characteristics include time on assistance since most recent opening for AFDC and participation in the Work Incentive Program.

Parts II and III, to be released in the future, will include study findings relating to financial circumstances and services to families.

Copies of Part I are available in limited supply from the National Center for Social Statistics, Office of Information Sciences, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201. (BETTY BURNSIDE, NATIONAL CENTER FOR SOCIAL STATISTICS, telephone (202) 245-0534.)

TWELFTH ACTUARIAL VALUATION OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT PROGRAM

The Railroad Retirement Board has released the report of the twelfth actuarial valuation of the railroad retirement program with a technical supplement. The report contains much actuarial and statistical data relating to the age and service of railroad employees, rates of retirement for age or disability, rates of withdrawal, rates of mortality and remarriage, and the family composition of railroad workers. For the first time, dynamic features of benefits and earnings bases implied by the automatic adjustment provisions of social security were considered.

A distinct feature of this report is the two mortality tables for disability annuitants. One table applies when the definition of disability relates to the employee's regular occupation and the other applies when it relates to any gainful employment.

A limited number of copies are available for distribution without charge and may be obtained by writing to Office of Chief Actuary, U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, 844 Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

UN SUPPORT FOR STATISTICAL DATA PROCESSING SEMINARS

In 1968, the United Nations under its UN Development Program (UNDP) entered into cooperation with the Government of Czechoslovakia in the establishment and conduct of a Computing Research Center (CRC) in Bratislava, to undertake research in the use of computers in statistical data processing and related fields. A major project in the CRC's work program is the development of an Integrated Statistical Information System (ISIS). The work on this project has been carried out by the CRC under the guidance of the Working Party on Electronic Data Processing of the Conference of European Statisticians. UN Support for the CRC including the ISIS project (which is near completion) is due to cease at the end of FY 1975.

In 1970, the Czechoslovak Government, on its own account, started a series of annual seminars for governmental experts on electronic processing of national statistical data. The purpose of these meetings was to review the techniques and methods employed in the construction of ISIS. Held each fall, the seminars increasingly attracted top ADP staff from national statistical agencies in Europe, Canada, Australia and the United States (more than sixty participants from 22 countries attended in 1973).

During the March 1973 Geneva meeting of the Working Party on ADP, the United States delegate pointed out that national statistical agencies face unique challenges that are not dealt with by the professional societies in either ADP or statistics. (See *Statistical Reporter*, September 1973, "Some Data Processing Problems of National Statistical Agencies.") He then put forth a proposal that the ISIS seminars become the nucleus for an expanded annual forum under UN support. With this approach, the technical discussions (in conjunction with the meetings of the Working Party itself) could cover the full spectrum of ADP problems faced by national statistical agencies and fill the gap left by related institutions. The suggestion was tabled for discussion at the next annual meeting in 1974. During its meeting in March of this year, the Working Party approved the proposal and recommended it to the Conference of European Statisticians. The Conference meeting in June 1974 expressed support for the project, and, with the concurrence of Czechoslovakia, agreed that the seminars should henceforth be held under its own auspices.

Beginning in the fall of 1975, the Executive Secretary of ECE will probably convene the technical seminar, rather than the Czech authorities. (The Czechoslovak government has expressed willingness to use their Center, to an even greater extent than before, for international cooperation, and the new arrangements for the seminars are a first step in this direction.) Also, a proposal is under consideration for the UN to provide support to the Center for the preparation and conduct of future seminars; specifically, by financing one or two consultants for several months before each seminar to assist with the technical preparations, and to provide for interpreters, translators, and other general expenses. (RUDOLPH C. MENDELSSOHN, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR SYSTEMS AND STANDARDS, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, telephone (202) 961-2448.)

NEW YORK STATE STATISTICAL YEARBOOK

The New York State Division of the Budget has recently announced the publication of the seventh edition of the *New York State Statistical Yearbook* prepared by the Statistical Coordination Unit.

The 1974 edition contains 276 pages and brings together in one volume the major data series, fiscal and nonfiscal, compiled and maintained by 33 different State agencies.

This edition, like its predecessors, continues to meet the needs of all those who wish to know the facts about New York—its people, its government, and its resources.

The *Yearbook* may be obtained from the Publications Office, New York State Division of the Budget, State Capitol, Albany, New York 12224 for $3 a copy. It is free to school and public libraries and to State, Federal and local officials and jurisdictions. (THERESA M. SPECIALE, N.Y. STATE DIVISION OF THE BUDGET, ALBANY, N.Y.)

SELECTED NEW REPORTING PLANS AND FORMS

The following listing gives brief descriptions of selected new reporting plans and forms approved in the previous month by the Office of Management and Budget under the provisions of the Federal Reports Act. These descriptions provide information on surveys and data collection programs currently being started or soon to be started.

Department of Agriculture

Statistical Reporting Service

Survey of Annual Pesticide Use (annual).—Survey to estimate pesticide usage in Minnesota and the acreages of major crops treated for insect or weed control. The survey will be taken by SRS in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture. (For further information: Wilbur Sherman, Statistical Reporting Service, USDA, telephone (202) 447-6201.)

Survey of Potato Stocks Quality (Annual).—Survey to determine the quality of potatoes in storage in Idaho and the Red River Valley areas of Minnesota and North Dakota. The survey will be taken as potatoes enter storage and are removed for shipment, as a means of estimating the çondition and quality of remaining stocks. (For further information: D.V. Fedewa, Statistical Reporting Service, USDA, telephone (202) 447-7720.)

Sheep Predator Survey (Phase I) (Singletime).—Survey to analyze the effects of predator losses on the profitability of the sheep industry. Data will be collected in three phases over a period of several months. Currently in process is a survey to determine the business structure of sheep operations. Firms will be classified on the basis of management practices used. These classifications will later be compared to costs of production (Phase II) and predator losses (Phase III). (For further information: Velmar W. Davis, Economic Research Service, USDA, telephone (202) 447-8151.)

Department of Defense

Cost/schedule status report (monthly).—This report is intended to fill a gap in the Department of Defense cost/performance reporting system on intermediate Research and Development contracts valued between $2 million and $200 million. The current DOD system provides no standard collection formats for contracts in these ranges, using instead a variety of collection methods. The new report provides a single, DOD-wide cost/performance reporting system for contracts in the specified ranges. (For further information: Robert R. Kemps, Department of Defense, telephone (202) OX7-0585.)

PERSONNEL NOTES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Statistical Reporting Service: JACK ASCHWEGE has been named Chief of the Crops Branch, Estimates Division.

Economic Research Service: LYNN M. DAFT, formerly Assistant Deputy Administrator, has accepted a position with the *Office of Management and Budget.* GLENN R. SAMSON, with the Foreign Demand and Competition Division, has been appointed Agricultural Attache in Manila, Philippine Islands. He replaces ROBERT EVANS who is returning to Washington for reassignment.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Management and Budget: GEORGE E. HALL, formerly Assistant Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, has joined the staff of the Statistical Policy Division where he will serve as Chief of the Social Statistics Branch. MARIA E. GONZALEZ, formerly in the Statistical Research Division of the Bureau of the Census, has joined the staff of the Statistical Policy Division where she will work in the areas of general methodology, statistical personnel training, and demography. THOMAS D. BROWN has transferred from the Statistical Policy Division to the *Federal Trade Commission* where he will serve as Administrative Officer for the Bureau of Consumer Protection.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census: The International Statistical Programs Center has reported the following changes in its overseas advisory staff: RICHARD IRWIN has completed a tour of duty as Demographic Statistics Adviser to the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics; and LEO J.A. JUSSEAUME has completed a tour of duty as National Data Systems Adviser to the Government of Honduras. They have returned to the Bureau of the Census for reassignment.

Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of Economic Analysis: DAVID B. HUMPHREY, formerly Associate Professor at San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California, has joined the Interindustry Economics Division. JAMES L. BUMKAMP, JACK C. CORKEN, and RUSSELL L. BIGELOW, formerly of the Office of Foreign Direct Investments, have joined the International Investment Division; and WILLIAM W. LOHR, formerly of the Office of Foreign Direct Investments, has joined the Balance of Payments Division. ROBERT E. GRAHAM, JR., Associate Director for Regional Economics, has retired from Government service.

HONOR AWARD

IRVING KATZ, who recently retired as the Air Force Logistics Command's Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations, received his second Exceptional Service Medal on August 14.

SCHEDULE OF RELEASE DATES FOR PRINCIPAL FEDERAL ECONOMIC INDICATORS

October 1974

Release dates scheduled by agencies responsible for the principal economic indicators of the Federal Government are given below. These are target dates that will be met in the majority of cases. Occasionally agencies may be able to release data a day or so earlier or may be forced by unavoidable complication problems to release a report one or more days later.

A similar schedule will be shown here each month covering release dates for the following month. The indicators are identified by the titles of the releases in which they are included; the source agency; the release identification number where applicable; and the *Business Conditions Digest* series numbers for all BCD series included, shown in parentheses. Release date information for additional series can be found in publications of the sponsoring agencies.

(Any inquiries about these series should be directed to the issuing agency.)

Date	*Subject*	*Data for*
October 1	Construction Expenditures (Press release), Census, C-30 (69)	August
2	Manufacturers' Shipments, Inventories, and Orders, Census, M3–1 (20, 65, 852)	August
2	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, Federal Reserve Board (FRB), H.4.2 (72)	Week ending September 25
3	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week ending September 25
3	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H4.1 (93)	Week ending October 2
3	Consumer Credit, FRB G.19 (66, 113)	August
3	U.S. Government Security Yields and Prices, Federal Reserve (FRB), G.14 (114)	September
4	Manufacturers' Export Sales and Orders, Census M4-A (506)	August
4	The Employment Situation, Bureau of Labor Statistics, (BLS), (1, 21, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 740, 841–848)	September
8	Retail Trade Report (Press release), Census (54)	August
9	Monthly Wholesale Trade (Press release), Census, BW	August
9	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72)	Week ending October 2
10	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week ending October 2
10	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week ending October 9
10	Advance Monthly Retail Sales (Press release) Census, (54)	September
10	Wholesale Price Index, BLS, (55, 58, 750, 751, 752)	September

Date	Subject	Data for
October 15	Manufacturing and Trade: Inventories and Sales, Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), (31, 56, 71, 851)	August
16	Industrial Production and Related Data, FRB, G.12.3 (47, 853)	September
16	Yields on FHA Insured New Home 30-Year Mortgages, HUD, (118)	October 1
16	Personal Income, BEA, (52, 53)	September
16	Condition Report of Large Commmercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72)	Week Ending October 9
17	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week ending October 9
17	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week ending October 16
17	Gross National Product (Preliminary), BEA, (200, 205)	3 Q '74
17	Housing Starts (Press release), Census, C-20 (28, 29)	September
18	Capacity Utilization in Manufacturing, FRB, E.5 (850)	3 Q '74
22	Consumer Price Index, BLS, (781, 782, 783, 784)	September
22	Real Earnings, BLS, (741, 859)	September
22	Advance Report on Durable Goods, Manufacturers' Shipments and Orders, Census, (6, 24, 25, 96, 647, 648)	September
23	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2 (72)	Week ending October 16
24	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week ending October 16
24	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week ending October 23
24	Average Yields of Long-Term Bonds, Treasury Bulletin (115, 116)	September
25	Export and Import Merchandise Trade, Census, FT-900 (500, 502, 512)	September
25	Housing Vacancies (Press release), Census H-111 (857)	3 Q '74
25	Major Collective Bargaining Settlements, BLS, (748)	3 Q '74
25	Merchandise Trade Balance, Balance of Payments Basis, BEA, (536, 537)	3 Q '74
29	Advance Business Conditions Digest, BEA: (12, 33, 69, 813, 817)	August
	(5, 10, 17, 45, 59, 62, 810, 811, 814, 815, 816, 820, 825, 830, 853, 860)	September
30	Productivity and Costs in Nonfinancial Corporations, BLS	3 Q '74
30	Defense Indicators, BEA, (625)	September
30	Condition Report of Large Commercial Banks, FRB, H.4.2. (72)	Week ending October 23
31	Money Stock Measures, FRB, H.6 (85, 102, 103)	Week ending October 23
31	Factors Affecting Bank Reserves and Condition Statement of Federal Reserve Banks, FRB, H.4.1 (93)	Week ending October 30
31	Agricultural Prices (Agriculture)	Mid-October

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 50 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $5.25 domestic postpaid; $1.35 additional for foreign mailing.

Reporte