

razors and shaving supplies, candy and confection items, paper goods, timepieces, dietetic foods, writing instruments, and photographic equipment.

Joseph Kolodny, managing director of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, and Mr. W. B. Bennett, a staff assistant, accompanied these three top-place salesmen to Washington, where their induction into the academy took place.

They explained to me that the academy has been established to champion the cause of salesmen everywhere in the Nation, and to enhance the profession of the salesman as an honorable and a dignified one. The association is convinced that selling is accountable for the rapid growth and achievement of some 50 gigantic consumer product industries and that the heartbeat of our flourishing national economy is rooted in the record of accomplishment of the country's salesmen.

Mr. Kolodny, long a spokesman of the tobacco and allied products industries, stated recently:

The sales and movement of merchandise are basic and inherent in the American industrial system. As distributors, sales managers, and salesmen, our role in the scheme of things is that of selling, marketing, and merchandising. When these fundamental functions are belittled or misunderstood, our significance in the industrial spectrum, encounters similar circumstances. When the status of a profession is denigrated, it fails to attract the necessary new and qualified recruits. Creative salesmanship has built this nation into the greatest and most powerful in the entire world. Creative salesmanship has paved the way for countless aspirants in the commercial, artistic, academic, and entertainment fields to achieve the pinnacle of fame, pre-eminence, and world renown. Creative salesmanship has provided and continues to provide maximum earning power and unlimited opportunity for growth in every sphere of legitimate endeavor. Throughout the entire course of American history, scarcely any recital of praiseworthy achievement omits reference to the names of individuals who have risen to the top by virtue of dogged determination and creative salesmanship.

Following a presentation of \$7,000 in scholarship funds for the higher education of the three salesmen's children, I asked Otis Clift of Independence, Mo., point blank: "Otis, what is a salesman?" Gentlemen, I found his answer both eloquent and enlightening.

Being a salesman today—

He said—

no matter what you are selling, means keeping your thumb on the pulse of trends in marketing. It is keeping up on changes in display techniques and learning how to make thoughtful and dignified sales presentations to prospective merchants. In many cases, it is a question of the salesman's having to educate the storekeeper. It is a lot of work, but it is good work. New accounts are extremely important to a salesman. Lose an account for any reason, you search for two new ones. I love my work. I have an intense interest in my customers and my company's welfare. If there are any other reasons for trying to be a good salesman I am not aware of them.

Gentlemen, I do not believe any of us should forget the importance of the country's corps of salesmen and their vital

role in making this wonderful economy go. Accordingly, I would like to salute Mr. Clift of Missouri, Mr. Cacciatore of New Jersey, Mr. Ravn of California, and their thousands of fellow salesmen. I believe the Academy of Creative Salesmanship has taken a healthy and firm step to enhancing the stature of all of them and I hope the idea does not stop with the 30 consumer product industries associated with the National Association of Tobacco Distributors—but that it spreads.

The Nation's salesmen have long needed a rallying point and a reminder as to their importance, and I believe the association's Academy of Creative Salesmanship will serve these needs admirably.

Horton Cites Potential Privacy Invasion by Proposed Central Data System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 5, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking and only minority member of the Special Subcommittee on the Invasion of Privacy of the Government Operations Committee, I am acutely aware of the concern which has been created by the proposal for a computer data center, the subject of our subcommittee's hearings on July 26 to 28. I was particularly impressed with the editorial "Too Personal by Far" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning. This article accurately accounts the concern of our subcommittee's capable chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], and of a Congressman ROSENTHAL, and myself.

Because of the precautionary value of the editor's comments, I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. The text of the editorial follows:

TOO PERSONAL BY FAR

"Monster," "octopus," "a great, expensive electronic garbage pail"—these are among the choicer epithets members of Congress are hurling at the Federal Government's plan to set up a central "data bank" containing lots of information on each and every one of us. In this newspaper's view, the scheme deserves the abuse.

The proposed National Data Center is being pushed by the Budget Bureau ostensibly for the sake of efficiency; centralizing, coordinating and expanding information in the files of various Federal agencies would make the stuff easier to handle and get at. Which, according to a good many opinions expressed at the recent hearings of a House subcommittee, is a large part of the trouble.

The group's chairman, Rep. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER of New Jersey, noted that the pooled information could include a man's schooling, grades, personality traits, credit rating, income, employment and "practically any other aspect of his life." Such a wealth of information in Federal hands is frightening enough, Mr. GALLAGHER thinks, but to make it worse computers are untrustworthy guardians for it.

As a couple of witnesses explained it, the machines lack judgment; they can't take ac-

count of changes in people or their motivations or extenuating circumstances in their behavior. Yale Professor Charles Reich observed that information gets less reliable the further it gets from its source in time and distance and is ultimately "petrified" in computers.

The more fundamental objection, of course, is that a central data bank would be a flagrant invasion of privacy and hence an affront to individual liberties. Both Congressmen and several witnesses cited the danger of its getting out of hand and being used for evil purposes.

Federal spokesmen naturally are concerned to change the unfavorable image of their pet project; a Budget Bureau consultant, for example, insisted that the public's idea of the data center computers as some kind of all-seeing Orwellian Big Brothers is nonsense. The rebuttals, though, are anything but reassuring.

Thus the consultant argued that the machines could be told not to blurt out confidential information and could be taught to disguise identities with a special code and sort out trick questions that pose as statistical inquiries but are actually intended to elicit information about individuals.

The disturbing thing about the explanation is that if the machines can be taught all those lessons, somebody has to do the teaching—namely, Government officials would be programming the computers. In other words, if the officials were so inclined they could reverse the safeguards allegedly built in. Depending on who was in control, the machines could indeed become Big Brothers.

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.

In any event, 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. Unfortunately, this principle has been much eroded in recent years, and its degeneration tells a good deal about what is wrong in the relationship between individual and Government today.

What is chiefly wrong is that the people have permitted their Government to grow so excessive in size and power that it can hardly help being a threat to them even if it doesn't want to. A Government that taxes so hugely and harshly must acquire a vast amount of information about the citizens. A Government that seeks to subsidize practically every segment of the population must acquire still more. No one can safely assume the information will not be harmfully employed.

Bigness being the trend, we see little likelihood that the Federal obsession with accumulating personal information will be curbed in any near future. But at least it need not be further encouraged. Congress should promptly and emphatically dispatch the Budget Bureau's incipient octopus.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to let my colleagues know my personal expression of concern about this proposal. I am extending my remarks to include the statement I made at the opening of our subcommittee's hearings on the computer data center:

STATEMENT AT THE OPENING OF HEARINGS BY THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVASION OF PRIVACY OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman the mission of this Subcommittee, investigating instances of individual

privacy invasion caused by or contributed to as the result of Federal Government action, is important and timely. Clearly, our experiences and endeavors of the past year, have proved this point. And, I feel your exposition of the Subcommittee's work sets forth with special significance the wisdom of Chairman Dawson in chartering this Subcommittee.

Privacy, as a fundamental freedom of the American citizen, is an unquestioned Constitutional right. That this Subcommittee, through examination and exposure, has curbed a brand of overzealousness on the part of certain Government agencies to overlook this right in personality testing is a notable example of the inherent protections to be found in our Federal system of checks and balances.

As significant as those earlier hearings were, I have become convinced that the magnitude of the problem we now confront is akin to the changes wrought in our national life with the dawning of the nuclear age. Proposals to gather in one central location or in one giant data bank all the information which Federal agencies amass on the citizens of this country are sufficiently filled with possibilities for privacy invasion that I believe it is eminently proper for our Subcommittee to conduct this investigation.

These data bank concepts are a product of modern technology. Today, the computer is a central figure in our society. The increasing rate at which it will change our lives exceeds the imagination, exceeds even the imagination of the computermen who foster it. Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Dean of Science at MIT and former science advisor to President Kennedy, has said:

"The computer, with its promise of a million-fold increase in man's capacity to handle information, will undoubtedly have the most far-reaching social consequences of any contemporary technical development. The potential for good in the computer, and the danger inherent in its misuse, exceed our ability to imagine . . . We have actually entered a new era of evolutionary history, one

in which rapid change is a dominant consequence. Our only hope is to understand the forces at work and to take advantage of the knowledge we find to guide the evolutionary process."

We will be fortunate if we are able to keep these processes "evolutionary" and not "revolutionary."

Assuming the best for a moment, let us regard our computer systems as good and fair and the computerman behind the console as honest and capable. Even in these circumstances, there is 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 "pigeon hole" us as their tapes decree, selecting, within a narrow range, the schooling we get, the jobs we work at, the money we can earn and even the girl we marry.

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

Now, let us compound the concern. Assuming a computerman who was dishonest, unscrupulous or bent on injury, there would be nothing sacred. We could be destroyed!

Admiral Hyman Rickover has expressed a fundamental concept concerning these problems; he states that we must realize that the power of these computers is *technology*, and technology must serve man; man must never blindly accept technology, he must take up the challenge and control it. It is a force he has to master and use to his benefit.

The Admiral exhorts us to be faithful to individual basic values, to preserve our right of privacy and independence and to bend this fantastic new technology to our principles. It is the function of law givers, in Admiral Rickover's view, to set the limits within which computermen can operate. He makes it clear that this is not a limit on science or knowledge but only on our use of knowledge and technology.

The concept of such control is ancient. Fire controlled is our friend; uncontrolled it is devastating. The wheel is man's serv-

ant and yet his greatest exterminator. The computer is another two-edged sword. It will take more than the controls of the "horse-and-buggy" days to use computers for our benefit and yet keep them from making shreds of human dignity, privacy, and freedom.

To provide an example, despite the flood of technical language some government consultants use to camouflage their recommendations, the fact remains that a central data service bank would require:

One, that confidential information now in government files would be forwarded to a new group and use for other purposes than it was originally given; and

Two, that a new group would have the code and would know the names, addresses and background of the people submitted the confidential information.

Tying the two together would be an easy matter.

It is held that personal dossiers are not intended, but no thoughtful computerman can deny that they are a logical extension of present plans. I am pleased to say that computermen as a group are deeply concerned with the problem of controlling information storage and retrieval so that no one ever will be able to take away our basic freedoms through these means.

One last point: the argument is made that a central data bank would use only the type of information that now exists and since no new principle is involved, existing types of safeguards will be adequate. This is fallacious. Good computermen know that one of the most practical of our present safeguards of privacy is the fragmented nature of present information. It is scattered in little bits and pieces across the geography and years of our life. Retrieval is impractical and often impossible. A central data bank removes completely this safeguard.

I have every confidence that ways will be found for all of us to benefit from the great advances of the computermen, but those benefits must never be purchased at the price of our freedom to live as individuals with private lives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.—1 Corinthians 13: 7.

O God, fount of all that is good and true and beautiful, whose love endures forever, we thank Thee for the reverence which lifts our hearts to what is real, and for the love of home that reflects Thy gracious spirit. Bless, we pray Thee, those whom Thou hast joined together. May their consecration be beautiful and everlasting.

We invoke Thy blessing upon our labors this day that we may help to build a better world in which men and women can live together in peace and good will and in which their children may grow into fuller manhood and finer womanhood. Teach us that only through love can we begin to perceive the divine mysteries of life and the true glory of man's relationship to man.

Blest be the tie that binds our hearts in steadfast love; the fellowship of kindred minds is like to that above. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 5, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 26, 1966:

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Ball Agency, and for other purposes.

On July 27, 1966:

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

On August 1, 1966:

H.R. 918. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

On August 4, 1966:

H.R. 1407. An act for the relief of Leonardo Russo;

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jacobo Temel;

H.R. 4083. An act for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa;

H.R. 4437. An act for the relief of Bryan George Simpson;

H.R. 4458. An act for the relief of Michel Fahim Daniel;

H.R. 4584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holowecyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zaleski);

H.R. 4602. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7508. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Bossio;

H.R. 8317. An act to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8865. An act for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor; and

H.R. 11718. An act for the relief of Jack L. Philippot.

On August 5, 1966:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland; and

H.R. 14324. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3421. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and