

life, family situations, religion, personal habits, childhood, and other matters.

The fourth amendment was designed to protect our people from unreasonable search and seizure. Yet today our Government is engaged in a much more insidious form of search than going into someone's home or through personal papers. We are now searching their minds, trying to pry out the most hidden and intimate thoughts.

But not all of the news concerning invasion of privacy is bad. One heartening development was the order by Postmaster General John A. Gronouski to discontinue the "peepholes" in the men's washrooms of some 5,000 post offices.

The Postmaster General said the peepholes originally were installed to investigate stealing from the mails by postal workers, but he came to the conclusion that the washroom lookouts are "an unfortunate invasion of privacy." Mr. Gronouski should be commended for this action.

Now I would suggest that the District of Columbia and other cities around the country seriously consider the abandonment of peepholes which they have built into public restrooms in order to catch homosexuals. More frequent checking by uniformed officers or the employment of attendants would accomplish the same purpose without invading anyone's privacy and at the same time possibly prevent activities before they become crimes.

There are a number of things which Government can do by simple administrative action to insure a greater right of privacy for many citizens. One of these involves the security clearance forms which must be filled out by employees of private companies doing classified work under defense contracts. As it stands now, these employees must fill out an extensive security clearance form which contains several questions of a highly personal nature.

This special inquiry received a complaint from a South Carolina engineer, who was handed such a form by his employer and told to fill it out and return it to him. This citizen said he had no objection to answering all of the questions completely and accurately if the form was sent directly to a Federal security agency. However, he did object if the form had to go through the employer on its way to the security agency.

This man had adopted another religion and legally changed his name. He did not feel that he should have to make known to his employer this fact, especially when it was not included as a question on his original employment form with the company.

He also did not want to list the names of his relatives who had the same previous name as his own. In addition, he saw no reason why the employer should know to which organizations he had belonged during his lifetime. He believed these disclosures to his employer might hurt his chances for promotion and even adversely affect his personal relationships at the company.

This man's attitude is typical of many Americans. Privacy to them is a very relative thing. There are things which they would tell their best friends but would not tell their wives. There are things which they might tell a fellow employee they would not tell their employer. And of course, the opposite would be true. There are things they would tell their wives but not their best friends. There are things they might tell their employer but not their fellow employees.