

constant review of the nature of the work actually being done in any of these industries?

Mr. LIEBLING. Going back to your previous question, sir, as to whether or not it would be—no, I think in the implementation of the program or the administrative procedures that would be set up we would have to consider that.

We would have to have a revision of these things on a continuous basis unless we accepted the assumption of what you just discussed.

Mr. CULVER. Do you have any formal program presently under the administration of your current security program whereby you procedurally review on a systematic basis your standby characterizations, or your present defense facility designations?

Mr. LIEBLING. Well, if I may separate the Industrial Security Program from the Industrial Defense, I would like Mr. Haas to address himself to the industrial defense aspect.

Mr. HAAS. Yes, we do have such a program, going continuously.

Mr. CULVER. Would you describe it, please?

Mr. HAAS. This is the Department of Defense Key Facilities List, a classified document. And as such, it is under continuous review, and there are changes and it is dynamic. There are additions, deletions, and changes in the product, based on program requirements, technology in industry, the ratio of supply and requirements.

Mr. CULVER. Then you have a systematic review of both those industries which are characterized as active as well as standby status.

Mr. HAAS. Yes, sir. Standbys are reviewed on the same basis. As a matter of fact, perhaps even more critically, because many of the standby plants as we define them are Government-owned plants.

Mr. CULVER. Could you tell me, in numbers in the past fiscal year, how many firms have moved off the standby status into a status whereby they would not fall under the sweep of this particular legislation?

Mr. HAAS. No, sir, I could not give you a number.

Mr. CULVER. Could you tell me roughly?

Mr. HAAS. It would be relatively few.

Mr. LIEBLING. We can provide it for the record if you want.

Mr. CULVER. Would you provide it for the record?

Mr. LIEBLING. Yes.¹

Mr. CULVER. I would also be interested in the number with regard to the active designation, defense work status, where you have made a change, where they have been on a top secret project 1 month or producing something of a strategic nature.

Mr. LIEBLING. You want round figures in the readjustment, I presume?

Mr. CULVER. Yes.

Mr. LIEBLING. Yes, we will be glad to provide that also.¹

Mr. CULVER. Thank you.

You mentioned on page 11 of your statement, Mr. Liebling, that it is apparent there from the above discussion that if the bill is enacted that even on a minimal basis the activities of the Department would need to be expanded, and to accomplish such aspects as go beyond our present programs the Department would, of course, need additional resources in both manpower and dollars.

¹ See June 25, 1968, letter from Department of Defense, pp. 1564–1567.