

security investigations and interviews that the civil and private rights of the individuals being interviewed and also of others not be infringed.

For example, in the memorandum he stated :

Inquiries which have no relevance to a security determination should not be made. Questions regarding personal and domestic affairs, financial matters, and the status of physical health fall in this category unless evidence clearly indicates a reasonable basis for believing there may be illegal or subversive activity, personal or moral irresponsibility or mental or emotional instability involved. The probing of a person's thoughts or beliefs in questions about his conduct which have no security implications are unwarranted.

The conclusion of the memo was to refer the matter to the respective departments to review their applicable regulations and instructions, and requested that they be furnished with whatever changes have been made in their regulations in order to comply with the policies set forth in the memorandum.

The memorandum commendably has attached to it the types of questions which should not be asked during security investigations or adjudications, such questions, for example, on religious matters as "Do you believe in God? What is your religious preference or affiliation? Are you anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic or anti-Protestant? Are you an atheist or agnostic? Do you believe in the doctrine of the separation of church and state?"

With respect to questions on racial matters, "What are your views on racial matters, such as desegregation?" In other racial matters like, "Are you a member of the NAACP or CORE? Do you entertain members of other races in your home? What are your views on racial intermarriage?"

And on through. There are questions on personal and domestic matters, on political matters, such questions as on political matters, "Do you consider yourself to be a liberal or conservative? Do you write your Congressman or Senator on issues in which you are interested or to obtain assistance?"

After becoming aware of this memorandum which, incidentally, was furnished by Mr. Skallerup with no hesitancy, he said that this was certainly in the public domain, I wrote to each of the three services to find out what their regulations were and whether they were in line with this policy memorandum of Mr. Skallerup. I have never received copies of the regulations. I have received replies from the three services, one from one of the services quite belatedly, but in every case they refused to give me copies of their regulations on the grounds that they were internal management guides, and since I have had a number of cases in which the policy of this memorandum has been violated.

Mr. Moss. I wonder if it would be possible for you to return on Monday afternoon?

Mr. SPEISER. Yes.

Mr. Moss. With a quorum call in the House, and probably a roll-call by the time we get back, it will be too late to resume the hearings.

Mr. SPEISER. All right (see p. 189).

Mr. Moss. The subcommittee will stand in adjournment until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I express my personal regrets.

Mr. SPEISER. That is quite all right.

(Whereupon, at 4 p.m. the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m. Thursday, April 1, 1965.)