

It was conceived also, as a voluntary system and the participants were free to participate or not to participate, as they pleased, and to determine for themselves the degree of their participation.

Access to the information is to be security controlled, it is confidential and is not available to employers, to defense counsel, private detectives, or anyone other than the user agencies officially engaged in the administration of criminal justice. Nor, of course, would it be available to the mass media. Dissemination of information entrusted to the system is restricted in accordance with the wishes, the will, and the desire of those who contribute the information to NYSIIS.

NYSIIS restricts the input of information to avoid entry into the system and into the data base of wiretap information, such things as grand jury minutes, the identity of criminal informants, and likewise the system will not—

Mr. GALLAGHER. Excuse me, Director Gallati. You say "restricts to the system" or "restricts from the system"?

Mr. GALLATI. To bar from the system the identity of criminal informants, and likewise the system will not accept such information as tax information, social security, unemployment insurance, voting information, or family court data. These exclusions were the result of a long series of meetings of the NYSIIS advisory committee and this committee, as I mentioned before, represented leaders in all branches of criminal justice in the State of New York.

They made careful, considered, value judgments as to the inclusion and exclusion of various types of information which would or would not be included in the NYSIIS data base.

We were very much concerned from the outset about the problems of civil liberties and civil rights and constitutional guarantees. It is very difficult for anyone in the field of criminal justice today to ignore the imperatives of these considerations, particularly in the light of recent decisions of the Supreme Court; one has to be continuously alert to the implications of constitutional guarantees. And, of course, as in the *Miranda* decisions, we were reminded that we need to be more efficient in our criminal justice efforts and that we should utilize the facilities available to us presented through research and development, through science and technology, to do a better job in criminal justice.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Inspector Gallati, does the statute that set you up limit the people that you can provide information to?

Mr. GALLATI. This sets up the limitation that it is designed for qualified agencies concerned with the administration of criminal justice. And it expressly states that this means courts of record, probation departments, sheriffs' offices, district attorneys' offices, State division of parole, New York City Parole Commission, State department of correction, New York City Department of Correction, and police forces and departments having responsibility for enforcement of the general criminal laws of the State.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Can you give it to an outside State agency?

Mr. GALLATI. No, not to one who is not a user or who would come under these categories.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In other words, you don't provide information if the State of New Jersey asks you for something about an alleged criminal, you would not provide the information?

Mr. GALLATI. This is not set up, yet, as an operating system, as I will mention shortly.