

For example, the Supreme Court determined in a case of *Cole v. Young*, that a security program which covered Government employees should be restricted in its coverage to sensitive agencies and sensitive jobs. Under the guise of determining "suitability," the same kinds of information that is collected and utilized in security investigations is also utilized by the Civil Service Commission and is applied against all Government employees.

Within the past year, I have had three cases brought to my attention involving three people who worked for nonsensitive agencies, or were applying for nonsensitive jobs.

Yet the Civil Service Commission conducted investigations and attempted to extract information that had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the kinds of jobs they were doing, or whether or not they were security risks. Furthermore, they couldn't have been security risks because they weren't in that kind of situation.

For example, interrogatories were sent to one person, alleging that in 1959 and 1960 she had served as the "contact" at Swarthmore College for the Young Socialist Club of Philadelphia.

It alleged that she was reportedly on the mailing list of the Philadelphia Socialist Workers Party in 1959, and had received an invitation to attend a forum sponsored by that branch to be held in 1959. This was an allegation in 1964 about events even if true referred to matters 6 years ago.

The person involved here had absolutely nothing to do with security, with sensitive materials, or with classified information. Why the Government is spending money in making investigations of this kind of Government employees to determine their suitability for Government employment, I fail to see. The effect is however, that when you have cases like this, it means that individuals in our society are going to restrain themselves in the kinds of things they do. Whether they are going to get into security or sensitive positions, or not, they are not going to explore ideas, they are not going to be intellectually curious, and they are going to restrain themselves, if there are investigations like this.

Another individual, a young woman, received information that in 1958 that she is alleged to have attended a gathering held at the residence of a certain person in New York at which there was a guest speaker.

The guest speaker was alleged to be a member of the Communist Party's national executive committee. It doesn't allege this person was a Communist, the one who received the interrogation. It does allege she reportedly organized a "progressive youth group," whatever that means.

I thought that we had gotten over this era that we called McCarthyism—but we haven't. We have institutionalized it.

There is no law on the statute books which authorizes the Civil Service Commission to utilize these criteria in this fashion. There is no Executive order which presently is in effect covering this. These are regulations of the Civil Service Commission which they have adopted themselves.

I have had extensive correspondence with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission who justified the interrogatories and indicates that he feels the Commission is on a sound basis in continuing to do as it has been.