

gory of marked individuals. I will use one of my colleague's phrases when we talked about this in a faculty meeting one day. He said we would be tying a tin can around this man. All the rest of his life, wherever he went, he would have a tin can jangling along behind him. I think this is a proposal to tie tin cans around all kinds of different people, some of whom are guilty, some of whom are not, indiscriminately. It is like marking people by cutting their ears or something.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The "Scarlet Letter."

Professor REICH. That is right. That is a more American example and it is a very good example. I think it is a very good example of a proposal where it is not necessary.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The present proposition that we are considering is not necessarily a data center to select individuals for employment although there seem to be many areas where this presently exists. The present proposition is one in which the 20 collecting agencies would centralize the information they have collected, distribute it—ostensibly for such purposes as broad planning of cities and urban renewal—and much of the data could be used in the long-range planning of the Federal Government.

This is the foot in the door as we see it to the further use of central data planning. Would you accept it on the narrow base that is presently offered?

Professor REICH. I would not, unless somebody showed me how this would help the planners to plan. I work in the field of planning and I teach a course in it. I am never sure about why they need to know X or Y or Z for a plan. For instance, if you want to decide we need new housing, do we need this kind of information I was talking about today to know that we need new housing? I don't think we do. I don't think it would help us a bit. It is again an example where most of the things that we know don't help us to make decisions and they get in the way.

That is to say, I would like the planners to go out and work on getting better housing and not spend their time reading all this useless information. I would like them to get to work and I think the more they leaf through heaps of paper, the less time they will have for planning.

Unless somebody says, "We want to know how many people live five in a room in New York City," now that would be useful. That isn't information about individuals with names. If I were trying to figure out where we needed housing, I might like to know that, but I wouldn't necessarily like to know about the emotional stability of the five people in the room. I think they would have to be pretty stable to be able to stand each other, but that is all I would need to know.

I should say, sure, some information is needed, but probably not this. I would say the burden of proof is on those who propose it to show that it is valuable.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Some of our economists and our planners feel that one of the great sources, untapped, for information, is in the Bureau of the Census. That is, that it is this kind of information they would like to have access to—even though I understand last week they came up with a planning concept which showed there were 1 million Indian maidens under the age of 19 who now live in Westfield, N.J. I am not quite sure what the spinoff is, and how accurate this particular