

roles of alerting, simply by making Federal agency directors aware of the human implications of what they are doing, as, for example, the success which has been achieved in persuading the various departments to make less use of lie detectors and less use of personality testing, the post office to stop using the mail cover, the Justice Department to stop using wiretapping, and many agencies to stop using the snooper buttons. All these have come about not by legislation but by the mere fact that a body such as yours has explored the situation and made the administrators in the various Federal agencies aware, perhaps for the first time, that there are human value issues involved, and this is what they have been doing, and that they have usually responded by establishing safeguards.

Mr. HORTON. Thus, you feel the action of committees having hearings such as this focusing attention on the problem will have some benefit?

Mr. PACKARD. I certainly do, yes, sir.

Mr. HORTON. You referred to Mr. Macy's comments in an article in the Saturday Review. What was your reaction to this? Do you feel the Government is going too far in this automated process in regard to civil service?

Mr. PACKARD. I think Mr. Macy is a fine man but—

Mr. HORTON. I am not talking about him personally.

Mr. PACKARD. I think he is overly fascinated with the wonders of electronics in terms of reducing the cost of sorting personnel and processing personnel. Since the Federal Government is involved in dealing with millions of people, he sees it in terms of millions, and dollar costs per unit. I think from the standpoint of all that is being learned by the behavioral scientists on human motivation and what makes people perform better, people perform better if they are given a chance to perform in a unique way, and also they perform best if they have a sense that they are being trusted. When people have a feeling that they are not being trusted, they tend indeed to become more untrustworthy. This is what I think you had. The agencies that were using the lie detectors and similar things were simply digging the holes deeper because they were making people more untrustworthy by that fact.

Mr. HORTON. Another point you indicated earlier was the removal, if possible, of the individual identification. It seems to me this would be difficult to accomplish, or else the information would not be beneficial to the Federal Government. It seems it is an impractical possibility.

Mr. PACKARD. As I understand it, the Bureau of the Budget has proposed the central data bank for reasons of overall planning, rather than for information about individuals. Ostensibly, there would be no gain to the Bureau of the Census in having the names attached to all this information it is getting. The problem is apparently it would be difficult to wash out this information from the tapes if it were fed into a central computer. That is the heart of the problem, I believe.

Mr. HORTON. That is all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Horton.

I agree that is the heart of the problem, and that is what we are trying to spotlight today—the necessity of eliminating the individual name if we are interested merely in statistics for problems of planning.