

3. The total of all social security payments, pensions, veterans' payments, unemployment compensation and welfare payments.

4. The total of all rent for farm and nonfarm property, interest, dividends, soil bank payments, oil lease, and miscellaneous income from other sources.

In addition to information about income, the farm operator also had to provide the ages, the amount of education, and the number of days worked off the farm for all persons living in the farmhouse. Presumably, if he did not know the answers from his own knowledge, he had to ask the persons involved to give him the information.

I am sure that many persons would not object to this. On the other hand, I am equally certain there are persons who would. Privacy is a relative thing. Each person makes his own decision as to what personal information he will share with another; and, as we all know, this varies greatly, depending on the relationship of others and the circumstances in which the information is sought and given.

In my opening statement at the start of this special inquiry early this month, I expressed the hope that the Federal Government would take the lead in helping to protect the right of each individual to decide himself what he wants to keep private. Ordinarily, he should not be put in a position of being forced to give information which may be no one's business other than himself. Moreover, there is the important question whether the Government should, as a matter of policy, ask others to invade the privacy of individuals even though the information may be valuable and necessary to the Government. It is usually possible to ask the person directly involved, instead of someone else. Procedures could presumably be worked out to insure and facilitate this. They could make it crystal clear that if any person living in the farmhouse objects to giving the farm operator the information, he would be welcome to file it separately and away from the eyes of others.

The Pennsylvania farmer who complained to the subcommittee also indicated he felt the detailed information sought on outside income was beyond the needs of the farm census. This, I am sure, is a debatable question, but should be given consideration. Perhaps the Government could well do without these details and content itself with a total figure for outside income alone. Perhaps not. Our inquiry is trying to emphasize that the Government should weigh the need for information against protecting the right to privacy. This is a delicate balance sometimes. But the measure should be taken, deliberately and consciously.

To discuss these questions, the special inquiry has invited leading officials of the Bureau of the Census, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget. We welcome them and hope, that by working together, we can perhaps do more to preserve the right to privacy without detriment to the legitimate needs of the Government for information.

Now the Chair would like to call, and ask that they testify together, Mr. A. Ross Eckler, Acting Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; Mr. C. Kyle Randall, Chief of the Farm Income Branch, Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture; and Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Census. I would also like to insert in the record at this point the text of section 11 of the 1964 Census of Agriculture questionnaire: