

1378 AMENDING SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

c. The allocation of expenses by the three military departments was as follows:

[in percent]

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Salaries (military and civilian).....	85	87.5	91.0
TDY.....	2	2.7	2.3
Equipment supplies.....	9	5.6	2.9
PCS travel ¹	4	4.2	3.8
Total.....	100	100.0	100.0

¹ Permanent Change of Station travel.

d. *The Industrial Security Program*: Data for fiscal year 1967 discloses that 217,866 National Agency Checks, or 13.5 percent of the total, and 28,017, or 12.5 percent of the total background investigations, were required in support of the Industrial Security Program.

It is concluded, therefore, that the investigative costs of the Industrial Security Program, included within the overall costs mentioned above, were:

1. National Agency Checks.....	\$920, 835
2. Background Investigations.....	4, 843, 000
Total	\$5, 763, 835

It is estimated that the equivalent of 679 investigative and support personnel of the military departments support the Industrial Security Program.

With the foregoing as a background, I will now discuss the particular provisions of section 5A of the Subversive Activities Control Act as proposed in the bill.

We feel that the Industrial Security and Industrial Defense Programs authorized by section 5A should be applied and operated in the light of an overall standard. We realize that subparagraphs (a) and (b) of the bill allude to or require determinations in the light of a standard, but additional clarity is desirable.

We suggest as an acceptable standard, for both industrial security and industrial defense, a statement—perhaps in a separate paragraph—such as the following:

The authorization for access to a defense facility, employment in a defense facility, and access to classified information shall be based on a determination that such access or employment is clearly consistent with the national interest.

We also believe that the term “national interest” is broader than the phrase “national defense and security interests” referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of the bill.

Also, as a general observation, we note that this bill is less specific than H.R. 15018 in providing that the rules of the program’s administrator may operate summarily on persons determined ineligible for access or employment at a defense facility or on defense facilities, and also less specific as to authority to enforce determinations by seeking an injunction in the courts. We think that if the present bill is enacted it would benefit by the more specific language, in regard to these particulars, now contained in H.R. 15018.

Subparagraph (a) of proposed section 5A provides new authority solely in the Industrial Defense Program. It would authorize the Pres-