

THE PERSONAL INFORMATION
PRIVACY ACT

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Personal Information Privacy Act, a bill to protect individual privacy.

My legislation amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act to make it illegal for credit bureaus to release or sell Social Security numbers, unlisted phone numbers, birth dates, and mothers' maiden names. It also revises the Social Security Act and the Drivers' Protection Act of 1994 to ban the commercial use of Social Security numbers. Under the bill, victims can sue willful violators for up to \$50,000 for damages and attorneys' fees. Businesses have 2 years after the date of enactment to comply with the new provisions.

This legislation is the House companion bill to the bi-partisan Personal Information Privacy Act, S. 600, introduced by Senators FEINSTEIN and GRASSLEY.

It's no secret that it is easier than ever before to learn private details about your friends, neighbors, strangers and even Members of Congress, whether from the Internet, credit bureaus, governments, or a variety of other sources. Time magazine has a story about it in this week's issue—it's called "No Privacy on the Web."

Nor can we soon forget the public uproar that resulted when the Social Security Administration put its earnings data on the World Wide Web. Thousands of users flocked to the site, knowing they could access personal data by just a Social Security number, birth date, mother's maiden name, and a few other bits of information. I was among those in Congress who urged the agency to discontinue the practice, which, thankfully, it did.

Few will dispute that the crime of identity fraud is on the rise. Criminals steal their victims' account numbers, run up debts and even rent apartments in their name, then leave the victims with bad credit reports and a lengthy battle to reclaim their good name. Polls show that the number of Americans who are concerned about privacy is at an all-time high.

Unfortunately, this problem does not end with simple fraud. Stalkers can easily gain access to a person's unlisted phone number and home address. Before the passage of the 1994 Drivers Privacy Protection Act, there were no rules preventing any kind of personal information from being sold by State departments of motor vehicles. Now, over 40 States have laws preventing DMVs from selling this information. However, stalkers and other criminals can still access private information from DMVs in many States in order to find their victims much more easily.

Robert John Bardo, an obsessed fan of actress Rebecca Schaeffer of the television show, "My Sister Sam," wanted to find out her home address. When he got it, he went to her home and shot her to death. How did he get this unlisted address? From the California Department of Motor Vehicles, which included this information on its database.

As the Time magazine article pointed out, a little effort and ingenuity is all that is needed to access personal information about Members of Congress. The reporter was able to

quite easily obtain information about Senator FEINSTEIN, including her driving record, lawsuits in which she is involved, her unlisted phone number, current and past addresses, campaign donations, and even her credit report.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Information Privacy Act transcends party lines. Democrats and Republicans are equally at risk of having their identities stolen on their lives threatened. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

IN TRIBUTE TO RECIPIENTS OF
THE GIRL SCOUT WOMEN OF DISTINCTION AWARD

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to rise today to give tribute to the three women of the Permian Basin who have been presented with the Girl Scout Women of Distinction Award. Shatzie Tighe of Midland, Betsy Triplett-Hurt of Odessa, and Kathlyn Dunagan of Monahans have distinguished themselves as positive role models for young women in their respective areas, and have been honored and recognized for their efforts both locally and now at the State level.

In our uncertain world, having positive influences in young people's lives is essential, but making time to spend with young people is not always easy for adults when demands are great. In touching these young women's lives, in helping them to grow into responsible and giving adults, and in giving them the best possible example to follow wherever they live in the future, these Texas women are truly women of distinction and I salute them.

I congratulate Shatzie Tighe, Betsy Triplett-Hurt, and Kathlyn Dunagan for their extraordinary efforts and for all they have done for their neighbors, their community, their State, and our Nation.

STATEMENT BY MARK OLSON,
CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION
HIGH SCHOOL, REGARDING COLLEGE FUNDING

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by a high school student from Champlain Valley High School in Vermont, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, hello. I am here today, Representative SANDERS and classmates, to talk about an issue that is very pressing for most of us high school students, the increase in college financing and the troubles around it.

If we look at the last ten years, since 1995 actually, at the money that has been put into the cost of college financing it has for the most part stayed the same. Government funding toward financial assistance has for

the most part stayed the same. I know there was in a projected budget next year a \$27 million increase, but that is not—for a national figure that is not a large increase whereas the costs of going to college since 1985 have been 2½ times that of inflation which is over 10 percent.

If you look at the people who applied for financial aid in the 1985 and received the funds compared to what their tuition costs were and then did a cost comparison today, the comparison will be hard to make. We need to increase educational funding at the equal rate of the rising college expenses if we plan to send students who are talented and motivated, ambitious and want to go to college. And I think it is the duty of the Government to not necessarily directly fund but at least provide a means so that a student who is college bound in the sense, literal sense that he is able to go to college.

I know that finance is certainly a contributing factor to a college decision, but in 1985 there were students who were deciding to go to one university or college over another because of financial reasons and there is nothing wrong with that competition, but now it has become not just a persuading factor, but I know there are a lot of students who apply to college and are forced to go to universities or colleges strictly because of unmet financial need, and I am curious about how we plan to remedy that situation.

I think that any student who has the potential to be a college graduate and is unable to finance their way there should not be held back, and it needs to be allowed and the Federal Government is certainly involved in that as it is now, but needs to allow it to happen, whether it needs to come out of their budget or needs to come out of a program.

There is a difference there because pleasure and—I do not want to say extra things, postsecondary school but a higher education right now is not a right, it is not, but I think it needs to be considered that we should not as a nation, not just the Government but as a nation discriminate against the less financially advantaged.

My problem is that my kids are smarter than yours, they work harder than yours, and they are being born into a life that is less fortunate and it is a cycle that has been repeating in this Nation for a long period of time and needs to stop.

I think that they should invest in me because I am an investment that is going to pay off and I am going to pay for their Social Security and I am going to undoubtedly—I mean, the students who are going to go to college have put in the hard work and are going to graduate are not just—I mean that money is not disappearing, it is being invested.

In the last 10 or so years a lot of these programs, like corporate welfare, national defense, they have not stayed the same and there have been in the last—if you look at the last 10 years every year there has been slight increases, increases, increases, and I want to know why those same moneys didn't go to VSAC Program and TRIO?

There has to be initiative taken because while these things were increasing, they were increasing with inflation so in order to have the military and the corporate welfare slowly increase year to year it is sort of like putting it on autopilot in some ways.

They were going up every year and that was actually considered traditional, regular, accepted where it should have stayed the same, so someone had to have gone out of their way to make the initiative to make sure it didn't grow.