

AMENDING SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950 1391

Mr. LIEBLING. Not necessarily. It depends upon the factors we would use.

Mr. CULVER. But you would feel it perfectly compatible with your responsibilities under this legislation to carve out an exception?

Mr. LIEBLING. Yes, we would.

We have positions that would be designated as sensitive under the program. Also, the facilities' sensitivity would be taken into consideration.

The man's specialty need not be relevant, if we consider the factors as we now have them, and which we suggested to you, we consider all the factors in the Industrial Security Program, which I will swing over into the Industrial Defense Program, so I would have the same factors applicable regardless of the man's employment.

Mr. CULVER. I have nothing further.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, all of you.

Mr. LIEBLING. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. We have a letter dated April 29, 1968, expressing the views of the Department of Defense with respect to the bill H.R. 15626; a letter dated April 29, 1968, expressing the views of the Department of Defense with respect to a bill H.R. 15018; a letter dated April 29, 1968, expressing the views of the Department of Defense with respect to the bill H.R. 15336; and a letter dated April 23, 1968, expressing the views of the Department of Defense with respect to the bill H.R. 15828.

The CHAIRMAN. I now direct that the said letters from the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense be inserted in the record at this point.

(The documents referred to follow:)