

manner, and it does not make any difference whether it is Government questionnaires or some other kind.

If I am convinced that the information that is being asked for on the questionnaire is needed and will serve a useful purpose, and is a proper concern of whatever agency is responsible for the questionnaire, I will be glad to fill it out to the best of my ability. But if I think they are asking for information that is not essential to the express purpose of the questionnaire, I will tend to throw it in the wastebasket.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You are fortunate. This is one of the things that we encourage, but unfortunately, many people in Government service until recently, if they did this, would be throwing their career in the wastepaper basket, including some people who worked in very sensitive jobs, who felt that their sex lives and their religious beliefs had no bearing on their typing ability, and did just that, and they ended up where the questionnaire ended up.

So we encourage this kind of thinking, and I am glad that this spirit still prevails. If we could engender a little more thinking like this, perhaps we could not only acquire better and more significant information, but at the same time we would be protecting the individuals involved.

Mr. ROMNEY. I do not know which one of you gentlemen would care to comment on this, but this is a followup on a question that was just asked.

On the farm census form, section 11, there are columns 11 and 12 which seem to have lumped together in them a number of sources of income. I am wondering whether or not it may not have been a rather arbitrary grouping for this reason. Some of these sources of income would tend to be stable or even constant. Others would tend to fluctuate in accordance with the economic conditions.

If the totals of these columns are to be benchmarked for your further statistical analysis, how can they really serve that purpose well when they may consist of categories of income which are not compatible?

Mr. RANDALL. I will comment on that and if any of the rest of you want to comment, that is all right too.

I would say, Mr. Romney, that even this four-component setup is in itself a compromise back from the most desirable situation.

If you had what the statistician himself would really like to have, you would have asked for a good deal more detail. But you have to make compromises between what you want and what seems to be practicable, and this is the compromise that was arrived at through this review in the advisory committee process as giving us as much useful information as possible without becoming unreasonable in terms of the question on the questionnaire.

Yes, you could have asked for additional detail, but you also have to compromise between what seems to be the most desirable from the standpoint of what you need and what is practical from the standpoint of inclusion in the questionnaire.

Mr. ECKLER. You see Mr. Romney is getting to be a statistician. He looks at these parts and sees some behave one way and others in another way, so we ought to have additional categories.

Mr. RANDALL. As a statistician and in charge of making these estimates, if I were asked what I would really like to have, I would and probably did ask for more detail than this. But this is the