

ported on twice. So, each time the computer has to verify back the individual and ask a new set of questions. So, even though the operators themselves may not know the name, even though the information relating to that person will never come out under his name but only as a statistic, the system still has to know his name. I believe that is correct, is it not?

Mr. PACKARD. I do not think the whole system would have to know his name. I think the agency contributing the information would need to know his name.

Mr. FORSYTH. By "system," I meant the one main computer.

Mr. PACKARD. No; I do not think so. I think you could have an automatic altering of numbers and setting up a new system of numbers so they would not be tied to the social security number.

For purposes of consolidation, you could assign any individual a number that would not be revealing of anything about him except this would go back to the same building block.

Mr. FORSYTH. Within that computer. Somewhere in the central system, some group of people have to have a code which codes that number to the person.

Mr. PACKARD. It should be the department or agency that supplied the information in the first place. I think you do get the hazard when there is a central knowledge of the individuals.

Mr. FORSYTH. The problem with that is that another agency sends in information, some of which is duplicative and some not. It is fed into a central computer, and if it is set up under a new number, then you have the same number reporting twice, with some duplication. So the same number has to come each time from computer to computer.

Mr. PACKARD. That I think would be the heart of the problem. I do not know the technicalities of it. I think this would be a good point to explore with computer experts rather than with me.

Mr. HORTON. I think one of the points you are trying to make is if there is any way to disperse the information within the computer bank, this at least would be some type of safeguard, just as the dispersal of this information now without computers is somewhat a safeguard to the individual.

Mr. PACKARD. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. HORTON. You do not know technically how this can be accomplished.

One other thing I wanted to ask you about. Do you feel there is a basis for the Congress perhaps, or whoever is in control of this system, limiting or having a limit placed on it as to what data can be placed in the bank? Do you see what I mean?

Mr. PACKARD. Yes, I think this should be a concern of this committee. What type of data can be properly and safely put into central data systems should be a concern of this committee.

My own feeling is that you are getting into danger as soon as you get any data that can be identified in terms of an individual citizen or taxpayer.

Mr. HORTON. You made the point with reference to the census, that it was basically, in the beginning, just an enumeration of the population, but now it has gotten into a lot of personal questions. The thought I was trying to follow with you with respect to this is whether