

Mr. GALLAGHER. But with two friendly chiefs—a friendly chief in New Jersey and a friendly chief in New York—the friendly chief in New Jersey could call his friend in New York and get information that you have?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In other words, they could short circuit the system.

Mr. GALLATI. Well, this is not now an operating system, Mr. Chairman, and the situation which you propose is one which we are considering in terms of our total development. We feel, in reference to this matter, that the improper utilization of the information in this system by any user would be one of those things which we would concern ourselves with greatly in terms of overall security and also in terms of the internal discipline of the users within the system. So that today, when sharing of information might conceivably be improper between two chiefs of police, a lesser penalty would derive therefrom in the eyes of the chief from breaching any confidentiality than would obtain in a system of this type where he would be cut off from sources of information because of his failure to comply with security directives.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, but there might be a criminal in New Jersey that you have in your files and they are trying to cooperate with each other.

Mr. GALLATI. Well, today, of course——

Mr. GALLAGHER. In order to bring him to justice.

Mr. GALLATI. There is a series of cooperative endeavors among chiefs of police and people in the agencies of criminal justice which is on a voluntary cooperative basis between chief to chief, agency head to agency head, and it is this that we are trying to encourage in our own State so that we can maximize the information sharing which exists.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Therefore, this information could really be transferred to another State quite easily on an unofficial basis?

Mr. GALLATI. This information could not be transferred in the sense of the data base transferred to another State, except through interface techniques which would be possible if, for example, the State of New Jersey were to develop a system similar to this and we then considered the problems of interface.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No. What I am saying is you have a chief who is a user of your information in New York, properly authorized. Now, he acquires information and he gets a telephone call from somebody in New Jersey saying, "What do you have on John Jones?"

Mr. GALLATI. Well, of course, the user of the system will receive from the system that information which he has a need to know, a right to know, and which the contributor of the information has said this person can receive. Corruption, of course, is always possible; however, it will be extremely difficult and it will be heavily prosecuted and punished. I would like to remind the chairman that we did mention the fact that the person who contributes the information can put whatever restraints he desires upon the information which we then would be required to respect. In other words, if he were to say "I will put this information into the system but only my own agency can retrieve this" or "only my own agency plus this agency and that agency and that agency," we respect this type of constraint, and necessarily so.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Does your computer have the technical ability to accept the information with restraint?