HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION	bill analysis 4/17/2001	HB 678 McCall (CSHB 678 by Elkins)
SUBJECT:	Regulating the collection and use	of biometric identifiers
COMMITTEE:	Business and Industry — commit	ee substitute recommended
VOTE:	9 ayes — Brimer, Dukes, Corte, J Solomons, Woolley	. Davis, Elkins, George, Giddings,
	0 nays	
WITNESSES:	For — Michael Angelo, Compaq	Computer Corp.
	Against — None	
DIGEST:	leasing, or otherwise disclosing a	n or governmental body from selling, person's biometric identifier — defined as piceprint, or record of hand or face
	! the disclosure was required or law; or	e disclosure; ancial transaction requested by the person; permitted under another state or federal to a law enforcement agency for a law
	The bill would prohibit a person from capturing someone else's biometric identifier for a commercial purpose without that person's consent.	
	person's biometric identifier to sto at least as protective as that used information. The open-records rec	erson or governmental body possessing a ore and transmit the identifier in a manner to protect the person's other confidential quirements of Government Code, chapter identifiers held by a governmental body.

The bill would impose a civil penalty of not more than \$25,000 for each violation of the bill's provisions and would authorize the attorney general to institute an action to recover the civil penalty.

## HB 678 House Research Organization page 2

## The bill would take effect September 1, 2001.

SUPPORTERS
SAY:
biometric identifiers. Like a driver's license or personal identification number (PIN) code, a biometric identifier can be used to confirm a person's identity and limit access to sensitive or personal information. These identifiers are preferable to standard passwords or PIN codes because they cannot be forgotten and are much harder to forge. Various industries, from computer companies to automated teller machine (ATM) makers, have begun to incorporate this technology into their products. Within a few years, biometric identifiers could be the industry standard for completing transactions from ATM withdrawals to e-commerce. However, this use of biometric identifiers poses a threat to privacy, as the identifiers cannot be changed and could be used to track a person's preferences, transactions, or whereabouts.

As this new technology develops, the state must protect the privacy of this personal information. By limiting the instances in which a person or governmental body could sell, lease, or disclose a biometric identifier and by requiring that this information be stored securely, CSHB 678 would ensure that this sensitive information remains private. Furthermore, the bill would ensure that biometric identifiers could not be collected for a commercial purpose without the knowledge and consent of the individual. This is particularly important because some biometric identifiers, such as a voiceprint or record of face geometry, can be obtained easily without the individual's knowledge.

CSHB 678 would not place the same collection limitations on biometric identifiers by governmental bodies as it would place on collection by individuals, because legitimate reasons exist for authorizing the government to collect these identifiers, such as taking fingerprints for law enforcement purposes. Governmental bodies need to be able to collect biometric identifiers from people without their consent for certain law enforcement purposes, such as scanning groups of air travelers for known terrorists.

OPPONENTS HB 678 would not go far enough in protecting the privacy of an individual's biometric identifiers. The bill would not prohibit a company from requiring an individual to supply a biometric identifier to initiate or complete a

## HB 678 House Research Organization page 3

transaction, such as making a purchase online or withdrawing money through an ATM. Like medical information, a person's biometric identifier is highly sensitive, and a person should not have to share that information to do business that now is conducted without that information. People should have the right to withhold this information and still be guaranteed the same level of service as people who choose to share it.

Also, CSHB 678 would not protect people from the collection of their biometric identifiers by governmental bodies without their consent. Although in certain instances it may be necessary for a governmental body to collect a person's biometric identifier without that person's consent, that authority should be limited by statute and should contain provisions prohibiting a governmental body from holding this sensitive information on individuals who are not the subject of the government's search.

NOTES: The committee substitute removed a provision in the original bill that would have prohibited a governmental body from making a voiceprint of a person without the person's consent. The substitute also changed a similar provision prohibiting the making of a voiceprint by a person to prohibit the collection of any biometric identifier by a person for a commercial purpose. The substitute added a provision that would allow a person to sell, lease, or disclose a biometric identifier if that disclosure completed a requested financial transaction.