The proposed requirement that each employee or applicant for employment be required to sign a statement that he knows that such facility has been so designated as a defense facility is particularly good—that is page 4 of the bill. May I suggest that this provision would be strengthened if it were required that such signing be witnessed by a representative of management who must also sign with a statement that he made certain that the employee or applicant fully understood the term "defense facility." Many applicants and employees have a language or other barrier to a complete understanding of Federal defense procedures, problems, and need.

The proposed new section to be inserted after section 5—page 4 of the bill—is a much-needed provision as it makes the legislative intent very clear as to the authority being given to the President. This is the section entitled "Protection of Defense Facilities and Classified Information." With reference to subsection (5) on page 8 of the bill, it is suggested that the word "known" be inserted in line 10, so as to read: "establishing or continuing sympathetic association with a known saboteur, spy, traitor, seditionist * * *."

The Supreme Court has reversed a number of cases on the ground that a statute is vague in its wording.

It is suggested that subsection (3) on page 12 of the bill be amended by deleting in lines 16, 17, and 18, the words: "the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or any Federal agency." As a subordinate bureau, the FBI does not make such determinations, nor does any other Federal agency, other than the Department of Justice itself.

It might be well to add the words "or found to be such by a committee of the Congress or a Federal court." In the event the Congress authorizes by legislation a central security agency, such an agency might be given such authority in addition to the Attorney General.

It is also suggested the subsection (6) on page 13 of the bill be amended by deleting the words "at common law," in line 18. Or, substitute the words "in fact" for the words "at common law." The State of Louisiana, for example, inherited its legal system from the civil law of continental Europe rather than from the common law.

It is suggested that subsection (1) on page 17 of the bill, lines 21–25, and page 18, lines 1–5, be amended to read:

> In cases where the President, or his designee, at any time personally determines that the procedures authorized by other subsections of this section cannot be employed with respect to any individual consistently with the national security, the President may authorize his designee to determine the facts and deny, suspend, or revoke such individual's employment in or access to any defense facility engaged in classified military projects or access to classified information released to any facility if the facts in his opinion so justify. An appeal on the record may be made to the President whose decision shall be final.

If an appeal were denied in such an instance, I personally feel that the Federal appellate courts, and especially the Supreme Court, would hold that due process had been denied.

The provision that no court of the United States shall have jurisdiction of any action or proceeding on the complaint of any person except after exhaustion of the administrative remedies is a splendid goal, but I would like to see a further provision to the effect that decisions of the Federal circuit courts of appeal shall be final. Surely, one appellate review is sufficient, and the Congress has the authority to set such a limitation. The President bears the responsibility for the