

thing is, but nevertheless, this is the kind of information that is acquired.

The economists advocating a central data bank believe that to acquire all this information and not use it is in itself a great waste. This is one of the chief justifications for the establishment of a central data bank.

What would your comment be to that proposition?

Professor REICH. Many of the statistics are already published in general. I mean, there is a great big, thick volume so the economists can find out how many people live in a particular place and they can find out general information of that sort.

I am not sure they are making very good use of what they have now in planning. That is the first thing.

Secondly, I think we seldom recognize how much planning involves decisions which can't be based upon statistics and information. A good example is deciding where to build a highway. You probably read in the paper they are always having a fight about whether a highway should be in one location or another. Those questions don't get decided by information. They are questions of whether you are going to put it through the park or whether you are going to destroy these people's homes, or whether you are going to make it accessible to a factory. They are really political choices, or value choices, and I think a great deal of planning is far removed from the science that it is claimed to be and it belongs in the area of government, judgment, politics, statesmanship. So again I mistrust the people who say we have to know all of these facts in order to plan. My experience is to the contrary.

Again I would say if there is something they find out, like how many three-member families, how many four-member families, how many five-member families do we have, we might know how big to make apartments. That would be useful; but more than that, I question.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You are stating then that the price we may have to pay for this information is way out of proportion to the use to which the information can be put?

Professor REICH. I am saying that and I am also saying it may be useless information that will just waste people's time, in a sense.

In New Jersey I recall a great case in which they limited—they said that you had to have a certain number of square feet in your house. It was a zoning order and a planning order. No one may build a house without a thousand square feet. That was made on a lot of research showing the average three-member family needs 1,000 square feet to live in.

I say, of what earthly use was that study? People have lived for thousands of years in less space than that. Others live in larger space. It is a completely relative question or idea. It depends on who the people are, how big the family is.

It seems to me if they want to have houses of a certain size in that particular township in New Jersey, that is a political judgment and I can make it, but I think to make it on studies and research and statistics is a fallacy.

I think the Center would produce more fallacious than good thinking.

Mr. HORTON. I don't want to completely disagree with you on this, but I want to illustrate how this type of information can be valuable