

much also. That is in the area of comments we have heard from knowledgeable people in other parts of the world and also from that most sincere form of flattery, which is imitation—a number of States are considering the type of system which we have for their States, and also in terms of scientific reports that we have received.

We recently received such a report from the home office of the United Kingdom in which they refer very flatteringly to the method in which NYSIIS was developed as the most thorough development of computerized systems for agencies of criminal justice they can conceive, and one which they commend for the consideration of the Queen.

Mr. ROMNEY. Is Ohio one of those States?

Mr. GALLATI. I am reminded we are not sure just yet how far or in what direction these systems will go. However, we are made aware of the fact that Ohio is interested in this type of system and may well take the same course we have.

We would like to make, and I think it is important to note, the distinction between some systems which exist of this type in various parts of the United States and our system. Many of these systems that exist in other States are police systems, they are under the jurisdiction of the State police or of the county police department, and they are dedicated to law enforcement, as opposed to the entire spectrum of criminal justice and as opposed to our concept of a totally disinterested agency which has no arrest, investigative, or custodial responsibility.

Mr. FORSYTH. I would like to ask a question on that point. I know you have set up this central system on that concept. Did you have security reasons as substantial consideration when this was done?

Mr. GALLATI. This was one of the reasons.

I think to really answer your question properly, I would have to refer also to the basic common acceptance of the system as a new concept in State government. You do have in New York State—

Mr. FORSYTH. Excuse me. I just wondered if it was a substantial consideration of the setting up of the system independently, for security reasons alone.

Mr. GALLATI. This was a consideration, but I would not say it was the controlling situation. I think perhaps the most substantial reason might be the fact that we did have in New York State, as I assume may be the case in other States, a certain amount of lack of confidence between and among the various agencies of criminal justice.

Mr. FORSYTH. What I am concerned with primarily is the security aspects. Probably it was not really the controlling aspect, a substantial aspect, but you did consider it?

Mr. GALLATI. Yes.

Mr. FORSYTH. Do you think centralizing it increases or decreases security problems it had?

Mr. GALLATI. I think it has decreased the problems of security by centralizing in this fashion.

Mr. FORSYTH. Can you tell me in a few short words why you think it decreases them?

Mr. GALLATI. In the first place, the fact that it was an independent agency, which therefore had no axes to grind, no utilization for the information which was introduced to it other than to properly handle it in the fashion of—perhaps one might use the example of a trustee