

be significant data from this work, data bearing on delinquency and school dropout. We believe that this work demonstrates that properly administered, properly explained, and properly protected tests are acceptable to the public.

At the beginning of this statement I warned that I was going to make it quite long because I felt deeply on the matter. I hope I have not sounded as though I were merely being defensive, protecting us from those who would burn tests and who for good reasons are exceedingly sensitive about psychological testing. I am apologetic if I have sounded too much like the professional scientist and have seemed to talk down to the issue or to be too minutely explicit. I have not meant to insult by being unduly simple, but I have felt that I had to expand adequately on the points. As for psychologists who are those most widely applying such tests, I am aware that the public will look with increasing seriousness upon those who are entrusted with problems of mental health and the assessment of human actions.

I will end with a repetition of my feeling that, while it is desirable for the public to require ethical practices of those using tests, the public may be reassured that the psychologists, physicians, and others who use these new tests will be even more alert to apply the intraprofessional controls that are a requisite to professional responsibility. But I must emphasize that it is not to public advantage to so limit these professional judgments that we fail to progress in mental-health research and applications from lack of freedom to use the best instruments we have and to develop better ones.

REFERENCE

Dahlstrom, W. G., & Welsh, G. S. *An MMPI handbook: A guide to use in clinical practice and research.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

[Reprint from "American Psychologist," November 1965]

WHY HOUSE HEARINGS ON INVASION OF PRIVACY

(By Representative Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat of New Jersey,
Chairman, special inquiry, House Government Operations Committee)

Representative Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat of New Jersey, holds an LL.B. cum laude, from John Marshall College of Law, and did his postgraduate work at New York University. Governmental invasion of privacy has been a special interest of his for many years. Representative Gallagher proposed the study which resulted in Congressional investigation of polygraphs 2 years ago (House Government Operations Committee Report 198, Use of Polygraphs as "Lie Detectors" by the Federal Government, based on 1964 hearings of Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee—chairman, John E. Moss, Democrat of California).

Gallagher was the floor manager for the original passage of the law which created the Peace Corps, a bill originated by Representative Henry S. Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin. Thus both Representative Reuss and Representative Gallagher have some familiarity with the Peace Corps and its selection procedures. Reuss was asked to serve on the Special Inquiry Subcommittee investigating invasion of privacy, and sharp questions from him will be found in the section of this American Psychologist which deals with House testimony.

The American people would rise in great protest if the Government of the United States conducted a physical search of the homes of public employees as a condition of employment. I am sure they also would protest if the persons, or mail, or other personal effects of Federal workers were searched without a proper warrant issued by a judge. I do not think anyone would argue that we might find a lot of undesirables working for the Government if such steps were taken. Yet the Federal Government has been engaged in a much more insidious type of search than going through someone's home, mail, or personal papers. It has been searching the minds of Federal employees and job applicants through personality testing. The objective has been a laudable one—to protect the Federal service from misfits—but the means, in my view, violates the 4th amendment to the Constitution and perhaps the 1st, 5th, 9th, and 14th amendments as well, depending on the facts in each case. Federal employees and job applicants have been compelled to take these tests under Government direction, or lose positions, promotions, assignments, not only then but also in the future. There is little or