

enacted and hopefully it is consistent with the thoughts of generations to come, but the important thing would be the spirit and the attitude—of both governmental officials and nongovernmental actors of all kinds who face this problem, and it would seem to me that the President, with his tremendous capacity to capture the attention and the imagination of the American people, is the one person who could do so much to make all agencies aware of the problem and not just the governmental agencies, but I think would have some influence on the behavior of all of us in the private sectors because I am just as much worried about this area as I am about government.

That is, we might end up with situations in which government is very scrupulous in its dealings with employees, but in the rest of the society, individuals and groups are pushed around by employers and institutions of all kinds. We might then not be much farther ahead, because the typical citizen deals with other institutions more frequently than he does with government.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Then you feel the Federal Government has a very grave responsibility to set an example so that there could not be a pointing of a finger to the Government as a justification for invasion of privacy.

Mr. BEANEY. I think VA is of great importance.

Mr. GALLAGHER. One question. Up until now we have all had the tendency to view technology and the advancement of technology as the enemy of privacy. Do you see any hope that we can use this same technological advancement in order that it can be used to protect privacy?

Mr. BEANEY. One would certainly hope so and given the ingenuity of scientists and technicians, one would assume that if it is important enough, that we find countermeasures, it would be done.

Thus far, and I am not technically qualified here, I can't even fix a light plug, but I understand from hearing those who are competent discuss this, that there so far have been real difficulties in devising truly effective countermeasures such as devices that could be used on telephone lines which will inevitably detect a tap, because there are ways of tapping, or accomplishing the same purpose, which will not be revealed through these devices.

Of course, as we know with our embassies and other places where security is important, one way of checking is by dismantling your house, your rooms, and putting it back together. But this doesn't seem terribly feasible. I suspect, though, that so far the energies and the thoughts have gone in principally to the use of these measures for invasionary purposes and not for defense purposes.

I understand that people who suspect that perhaps they are subjected to close surveillance have, by substantial expenditures, managed frequently to discover the nature of the invasion and can do something about it.

I would put my weight, though, on policies which would—and laws which would—dissuade people in engaging in the practices. On the other hand, if we are to have enforcement, in one area in which Mr. Horton mentioned, these are very difficult areas in which to imagine substantial enforcement because of the very secretive nature under which they are carried on.

I don't think, for instance, that my home is tapped because nothing important goes on or is ever said there, but I have no way of knowing or that somebody has planted a bug under some article in my house.