

safeguard and threatens to make available entire dossiers, rather than simply a social security number.

An injustice which deepens the privacy invasion constituted by such an information center is the individual's complete ignorance of what is contained in his dossier—whether it be scattered throughout various agencies as it is now, or available in one bank. Certainly it is not unreasonable that individuals be given the opportunity to see their files and to rebut information they feel is fallacious or, as it may often be, the result of prejudiced reports.

On July 28 I issued a statement supporting the idea for a symposium of educators, social scientists, lawyers and computer technologists to study methods to prevent large computerized data banks from invading the privacy of the American citizen. I would like to share with my colleagues the text of my remarks regarding this Government-sponsored symposium:

"Computer technology is advancing so quickly that we are in danger of allowing machines to bare the most private facts in our lives.

"Our hearings have pointed out a tremendous need for knowledge in this area of computers and privacy. This symposium would fill that gap and allow us to work out adequate safeguards against unauthorized release of private information to people with no right to have it.

"Vance Packard, a witness at our hearings, warned that 'Big Brother, if he ever comes to the United States, may turn out to be not a greedy power-seeker but rather a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency. And he, more than the simple power seeker, could lead us to that ultimate of horrors, a humanity in chains of plastic tape.'

"Packard, whose best-selling books have documented some of the country's social ills, said, 'The filekeepers of Washington have derogatory information of one sort or another on literally millions of people. The more such files are fed into the central files, the greater the hazard the information will become enormously tempting to use as a form of control.'

"Computer technology is so complex that we can't pass adequate laws immediately to block release of private information. This symposium must study the question with the aim of defining the problems involved.

"This committee should be commended, since it is one of the first groups to recognize the dangers inherent in the use of the giant, information-storage devices. For, as another witness at our hearings, Paul Baran of the Rand Corporation, predicted, computers of the foreseeable future could be 10,000 times the size of those available today.

"As I said during the hearings, there is a danger that computers, because they are machines, will treat us as machines. They can supply the facts and, in effect, direct us from birth to death. They can 'pigeonhole' us as their tapes decree, selecting within a narrow range the schooling we get, the jobs we hold, the money we earn and even the person we marry.

"It is not enough to say 'it can't happen here'; our grandfathers said that about television."

It is clear that a computer bank offers great potential for advancements in efficiency; yet, it also offers great potential for invasion of privacy. I do not propose to limit the progress of science or knowledge, but to control the use of knowledge scientific advancement makes available so readily. The concept of such control is not new; man's greatest helpers can also be his greatest destroyers if not controlled—we need only consider basic elements as water and fire to confirm this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by inserting an editorial entitled "To Preserve Privacy," which appeared in the August 9 edition of the New York Times. Following the editorial is the text of a letter I wrote to the editor commending his editorial and reviewing the necessity to protect the freedom of individuals with private lives:

"TO PRESERVE PRIVACY

"Can personal privacy survive the ceaseless advances of the technological juggernaut? Many in public and private life now fear to use telephones for conversations they would keep confidential, while the variety of electronic 'bugs' available to eavesdrop on even whispered communications staggers the imagination. And young lovers would be well-advised to remember that the skies are increasingly full of sputniks equipped with cameras capable of taking extraordinarily detailed pictures of what transpires under the moon as well as on it. George Orwell foresaw the logical end of this trend in a device that would enable 'Big Brother' to keep an eye on everyone anywhere.