

I think the job of the committee is to set up categories of information that are valuable on the one hand and does not invade anybody's rights in one category and have another set of information that does invade people's rights.

Precedents in law, luckily, are not people, so if you were to have all the cases ever decided on paper or computers or anything else, we would never have a person's privacy invaded if we just used the reports. That is a good example of where it seems to me no harm could come from a lawyer being able to have the cases at his fingertips. There must be many other kinds of data exactly like that. I would be very happy to have a computer do my legal research for me. I would welcome it and I hope it comes very soon.

Mr. HORTON. They are working on it.

Professor REICH. I know they are, but they are not working fast enough.

The thing we want to do is to focus on the areas where the individual is in danger, where he is going to be scared, where he is going to be scared with reason and not just put our heads in the sand in general. I hope that was clear from what I said.

Mr. HORTON. I think your testimony before this committee has been very helpful because you have set out some basic areas in which we should be very concerned. I think you have sort of steered us through some aspects of this problem, especially on the constitutional law question. I think it has been very helpful to the committee.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If you did have an opportunity to submit a short brief to the committee outlining your proposals, we would be very thankful, especially as to the basis for regulating interstate corporations and for the regulation of problems relating to State governments and the county and city governments, the overall proposal—how you would arrive at, for instance, a proposal to limit intrusive questioning and enforce this at the local level.

If you had an opportunity to give that some thought and submit a brief to the committee, we would be very pleased.

Professor REICH. I think I will be able to do that. I will at least try. I will try to say some of these things I have said here in a shorter fashion and more precisely.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You can say them in writing just the way you have said them here. We are very appreciative.

Mr. CORNISH. In regard to your second suggestion for a law, I am concerned about the individual citizen who submits information to the Government for a specific purpose. By way of example, let's take the person who submits information on his income for one purpose—and that is to have his taxes computed for him.

Do you feel there is any element of contract in this thing? In other words, the Government asks you to provide your income data to compute your taxes and therefore they should not use it for any other purpose, or is there in a sense some informal or perhaps even legal contract that exists in a situation like that?

Professor REICH. I would call it a moral contract. I would be glad to use that notion because I think that it is a sort of an understanding by the citizen of what is fairly expected of him.

Mr. CORNISH. You did not use the word "contract" in your discussion of that. I wanted to know whether you did feel there was an element of contract in such an arrangement.