

He attached to this memorandum a list of questions which should not be asked of either a subject, or of another individual. For example, he included in the questions involving religious matters that should not be asked, such questions 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? Do you believe in the doctrine of separation of church and state?

On racial matters, he set forth the following questions which should not be asked: What are your views on racial matters such as desegregation of public schools, hotels, eating places, et cetera? Are you a member of the NAACP? Do you entertain members of other races in your home? What are your views on intermarriage? Do you believe one race is superior to another?

He had prohibited questions on domestic matters, political matters, such as: On political matters: Do you consider yourself to be a liberal or a conservative? Are you registered to vote in primary elections? These questions were collected, I believe, because they were asked by security investigators, and even what is more horrendous is the fact that some of them are still being asked.

Since this was issued, I wrote to each of the Under Secretaries of the three services and asked for their regulations to determine whether their investigators were instructed not to ask these questions. In every case, I was refused the regulations on the grounds that they were internal management guides.

Some of the services indicated that there were no changes in the regulations because their regulations already covered questions of this kind. I do not believe this is the case.

Just recently, the Army published some regulations which seemed to cover this kind of ground, but certainly they were not as specific as this memorandum of Mr. Skallerup. Since this memorandum was issued, I have had three cases in which people have been interviewed, and have been asked questions that are listed as being barred.

In two of the cases, there were apologies and an admission the questions should not have been asked. In one case, there was a denial that the questions were asked. In no case has disciplinary action ever been taken against the investigator.

We come back again to one of the points Dr. Beaney was making that the individuals involved, who do invade privacy, are generally not being malevolent. They are just being overzealous.

Government executives are unwilling to discipline or to punish those employees who are under their jurisdiction—and who are merely being overzealous. What they are doing is what they conceive to be for the public good, but the fact that they are invading someone's privacy is not considered serious enough for the Government to take any kind of disciplinary action to show it really means what it says when it says, "Do not invade any individual's privacy."

Secondly, in this area, the Government, itself, sets a bad example. There is not this kind of regulation for all Government agencies. If it has been issued by the three services, it is not being rigorously applied.

The Civil Service Commission has the job of screening Government employees, prospective Government employees, and probationary Government employees for suitability for Government employment, and it has shown a complete insensitivity to the kinds of questions that should be asked and the kinds of questions that should not be asked.