

fact. Scientific law is not concerned with the multiple aspects of free will and individual personalities; it deals solely with nature's constancy, or if you will—mechanical regularity.

In today's world, however, these two totally distinct definitions of one term seem to have fused and been confused. And in this commingling of definitions, it is indeed unfortunate that the scientific appears to have taken precedence.

This precedence is well illustrated in the case before us at present. The individual's right to privacy has always been recognized in the full course of our Nation's history. The protection of the individual by law against infringements attempted upon this right by others is incorporated in our Nation's Constitution. And yet in the name of scientific advancement, this right is now potentially threatened.

Although the proposal to establish a national statistical data center, if adopted, promises greater efficiency in many Government operations, the possibility that such a center might become a depository for extensive personal information on every citizen raises questions fraught with serious implications.

Should the Government establish a centralized statistical data center with its interchangeable counterpart a personal dossier bank, there would be a tremendous store of data already available to feed it. That list includes tax returns, census responses, social security data, military records, security files, fingerprints, FHA and VA mortgage guarantees, credit records, health data, and research involving individuals. If State and local governments were tied into the proposal, such data as school records, police files, driving violations, and property holdings would also be on file.

The Bureau of the Budget contends that no one has proposed such a personal dossier bank. That is quite true. But it is also a fact that detailed information on millions of individuals and corporations would be poured into the national data center. Group data is made up of individual data. Testimony by computer experts before our subcommittee shows clearly that a data center could easily become a dossier bank. Simply stated, our concern is what an innocent statistical center could turn into as the years roll by and pressure mounts to program into the computers more and more information on individuals. Computer experts stressed that the same technology that put the information in for statistical data could be retrieved instantaneously on any individual.

At present, the confidentiality of some of this information is protected by the law. Centralization, however, would create the need for a new set of safeguards to protect the privacy of the material on file. It would appear obvious that the Federal official who has the authority to press the button to produce a dossier on any individual in the United States would possess a power greater than any ever before known in America.

We must remember that our citizens give the Government personal information on a confidential basis and for a specific purpose. Americans deserve the assurance that this information will not be used for any other purpose in the future. Our Government must decide now before we embark on this new and dangerous course whether we can properly protect the civil rights and civil liberties of each citizen.

Without carefully established safeguards, there exists a very real threat of great injustice. Safeguards, which incidentally, do not now exist in a technological sense. It is certainly conceivable that a potential Big Brother—in the frightening Orwellian tradition—might make excellent use of a big button on a dossier bank for his own purposes and for the sake of increasing his own power.

Writing on this subject, the Wall Street Journal, August 5, 1966, stated:

"We do not suggest that many officials would attempt to abuse the power. Yet the fact is that even as it is, Federal agencies have been known to harass individuals or businesses, just as some of them have not been above electronic prying and other violations of privacy.

"It is a cardinal requirement of a free society that the people do not entrust their liberties to the whims of men in power but rely rather on wise laws to protect them from oppression."

It seems evident that if the proposal to create a national data bank is adopted, we will have to rely only on the hope that benevolent people with benevolent purposes will operate the system. History, however, has already taught a terrible lesson illustrating exactly what can happen when large stores of information become available to nonbenevolent powerseekers.

The detailed European census, long in effect even before the advent of the Nazi Party, provided a most convenient and efficient tool for Hitler's use when he led