

somewhat differently, if I may. Is any preference or security of employment tenure afforded the people who are already working at the facility and have, for example, been performing their work there in a manner satisfactory to their employer?

Mr. LIEBLING. I would presume this is an employee-employer relationship and if the contract is curtailed obviously it would be an old bunch of employees; if they are required in another facility, for example, if the space program requirement emerged in Houston, Texas, and we curtailed many programs in New York; so the tenure aspect is a labor problem.

Mr. CULVER. It is a labor problem. Would the same be true for future operations under the personnel screening program that would be authorized by the pending legislation?

Mr. LIEBLING. Yes.

Mr. CULVER. If a longtime employee loses his job because "clearance" is denied, would he ordinarily lose pension or retirement rights?

Mr. LIEBLING. You are talking about a labor requirement again. Let me say this:

If a longtime employee loses his security clearance, he still can work in the same facility on an unclassified basis. It does not necessarily mean he is curtailed from employment.

Mr. CULVER. I understand. If so, does the Government compensate him at all in any way for any adjustment if he is forced to take an inferior position?

Mr. LIEBLING. I presume the labor laws would be applicable to him as well as anybody else, the security factor notwithstanding.

Mr. CULVER. Would the pending legislation make personnel screening requirements with respect to—I think this is the point that disturbs me—the subcommittee statement of the principle provisions of this bill stated in the second paragraph, paragraph 1, that the bill, "narrows the type of facilities" which may be designated as defense facilities. On the other hand in your prepared statement at page 5 you say the new definition of "facility" for paragraph 7 of section 3 "is more comprehensive than the existing law" so that you think it will enlarge, contrary to the subcommittee statement, the total number.

Mr. LIEBLING. Enlarge the number of facilities that would be involved?

Mr. CULVER. And individuals.

Mr. LIEBLING. I can't comment on what the committee's intent is as such in this. I indicated and I would say again that the increase for this would not be substantial and, therefore, I would consider that, as the committee proposed, it is narrowed in this sense.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Liebling, I wonder, would personnel screening programs be administered under the proposed legislation in substantially the same manner as they are under your present authority?

Mr. LIEBLING. Yes, sir, they would.

Mr. CULVER. In a case where investigation discloses no reason why an individual should not be cleared who would make the initial, and any subsequent, determination that such an individual was cleared?

Mr. LIEBLING. In the case of Confidential clearances, the contractors are authorized under our Industrial Security Program to grant Confidential clearances at the present time.

Mr. CULVER. The contractors.