

than try to judge them against any standard definition of invasion of privacy.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Well, the standard that we have been trying to set is that questions along this line, not being relative, are in themselves the business of the individual concerned and should not be the business of the Government or be part of the file of a young person who is starting on his career. And if this should become part of his file then the answers he gives to this would follow him for the rest of his life, with the possibilities of damage in his future life.

Mr. Horton?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Werts, I asked you a question earlier, and as I indicated, I was not satisfied with the answer. You have indicated that there is a change in policy, and you have referred to this statement that you read that, in your judgment, the use made of the test materials for the selection of youth counselor trainees was not an invasion of privacy.

Now, that, apparently was your policy before. You have indicated that your policy has not really changed, and yet, at the same time, you say it has changed. So I would like to know what your policy was before with regard to personality tests, what your policy is now, and when, if it did change, did it change?

Mr. WERTS. Congressman, the policy, as I indicated earlier is to prohibit personality tests, or invasion of privacy. The statement which I have made today would, I think, support that this is the present policy.

I think if there is a change, it is a change of interpretation and procedure. As I indicated, these matters had not come to the attention of the Secretary's Office—

Mr. HORTON. Let me ask you at that point, why did they not come to the attention of the Secretary's Office? These were put out, or promulgated from the Secretary's Office. I am not talking about the personal attention of the Secretary of Labor, but certainly, the Office has constructive knowledge of it, or should have.

Mr. WERTS. We were aware, obviously, of the Project CAUSE I last year, and the responsibility for carrying out this program was delegated. We would not, in the Secretary's office, review individual pieces of paper, or implementations of a program except when we become aware of the nature of it, we did then take over and look at it very carefully, and that has caused, or has brought about a different practice under the policy this year.

And having looked at CAUSE II application questionnaire, I wouldn't say our judgment is a hundred percent perfect, but this was gone over in great detail in the Secretary's office, and a great many changes were made, eliminations were made.

Hopefully, our judgment has brought us to a questionnaire which will be consistent with the committee's judgment as to what is appropriate and proper.

With respect to this youth opportunity programs trainee's test, part 2, from which these questions were read, it is not a part of this year's test. I don't have a copy of that test, the test that will be given, but I talked to the HEW people who prepared this test—I have looked at it very hurriedly because it wasn't available yet for distribution—and from what I saw, all of the questions are related to the knowledge that the counselor trainee should have to be a successful