

Now, I don't agree with you. I think on very sensitive information, they probably would uphold the right, on the basis of the past history of the Communist Party, to say that the Communist, ipso facto, can't be allowed, and the Government has a right to refuse a Communist to be allowed to handle top secret information.

Mr. SPEISER. They had another factor, which the bill ignores, and that is the question of the scope of jobs. I think Mr. Liebling was making the point that not all jobs in defense—

Mr. ASHBROOK. The sweeper in a factory wouldn't—although he could pick up information, I concede—would not be as sensitive as an electronic-computing or data-processing person.

Mr. SPEISER. And when you set up a security program, which is going to consider the factors of organization, association, reading habits, and things of that kind, I don't think you can ignore the fact that that does have an inhibiting effect on whether people will go to a public meeting or hear someone speak or will subscribe to a particular magazine or newspaper, even though they disagree with it. That inhibiting factor, the fear that somebody is making a note of their activities, does have an effect on first amendment freedoms, which is the reason why, if you are going to have a program, as I concede that there should be, you must limit it as much as possible. You must limit it simply because, in a society where all jobs, especially with the scope of jobs that you have here, would come under a security program, that program is going to dry up the kind of dialogue and debate that we should have in a free society.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I thought, too, that the point, I think, in this regard, is that it is not only limited to the situation where you have a sign on the door that says "Communist Party Welcome," but we are talking about Communist-action groups, Communist-front groups, with all kinds of misleading names, and intentionally so, and I think the point with regard to the first amendment sensitivity is the extent to which that results in an inhibition as far as participation in the fullest sense, even by way of a threshold inquiry, into what is going on in the political process and what views and ideas and advocates are being given expression in a society at any one point in time.

Mr. SPEISER. I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman. I am willing to answer questions.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Your testimony has been illuminating and appreciated, and I don't want you to think we ever badger you. I like to hear your views. You and I wouldn't agree on a lot of things, but I certainly think you do a very able job of presenting your organization's view.

Mr. SPEISER. Thank you, Mr. Ashbrook. You are very kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday, April 30, 1968, the committee was recessed, to be reconvened at 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 1, 1968.)