

Mr. BOWMAN. I think not. I think if you expand it so it includes everything known; yes. If you do not expand it that way, I have the feeling, Mr. Gallagher, we might even be improving confidentiality.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Except for an elite who will be in possession of the information. It is that elite that the average citizen has a right to fear if you are going to put military statistics, crime statistics, census statistics, IRS statistics in there, and all that is retrievable if you just press the right button.

Mr. BOWMAN. That is why I said we probably have more carefully to scrutinize and specify what we are going to put in. I am not sure all of the things that people can think of as being there need be there for the Center to perform its most important function.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You have had a great deal of experience and I have great regard for your experience and for what you have done in the Government, but you know that once you start this thing as a "foot in the door," next year there will be someone else who will want to make use of your data bank. If it is that good, it will be expanded, and it will be expanded beyond a reasonable point.

Mr. BOWMAN. I think I agree, except on this point: You cannot stop moving forward in order to be sure that nothing bad will ever happen.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We do not want to impede progress. The computer is here to stay, and it can be a great source for good. We would hope that you are not underestimating the computer. I think you are. I think in centralizing this information in one giant computer, you have not realized the potentialities of the computer, because if you feel that you can control this kind of information and that the computer itself can make this decision, you are not being realistic. You are placing tremendous power in the hands of an elite.

I have a higher regard for the computer's capabilities than I think you have. I do not think we ought to abandon computers. We ought to utilize them as a source for good. But they also can be a source or mechanism for totalitarianism. I do not want to overstate the case, but if all this information is there and someone has total access to it, you can see there are a few dangers in it.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, on that point I am not only concerned about the wrongdoer who may seek this information, but I am concerned about the attitude that will be created by this great source of information. The Internal Revenue Service information was very confidential at the start, but now it is available to States and, I think it was mentioned, 17 or 18 other agencies. You can justify every one of these uses of the information. There probably will be hundreds of uses of this central information that you can have that will be very good uses. Every one of us would agree right now that this would be a very fine thing. We want to stop criminals. We want to do this and that. This is a good reason for having this information.

But in the middle of that is a little guy who has now become a statistic. This can cause, I think, the loss of the privacy that he has, and this is what we are concerned about here.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Horton, would you not agree on this point, however: If we make it clear that the center that I am talking about does not release information that can be identified with an individual, then it should be obvious, also, that information should not go into the center if the only reason for putting it there would be because people are interested in getting information about individuals.