

citizen should not have the authority to grant immunity, but if it went before the Board, it would be up to the Board. I am thumbing through the bill and am unable to locate the immunity provision to give you a better answer.

Mr. NITTLE. That is on page 19, subsection (n).

Mr. YEAGLEY. I believe the answer would be yes that it could be done that way. As you know, it provides for regulations to be issued by the President under which process can be issued apparently by the Board to bring a person in. And if the person refused to testify on the grounds that it might incriminate him, apparently the Board can compel his testimony regardless of whether it was a Government witness or employee witness. Apparently there is no distinction and that immunity could be given.

Mr. CULVER. I have one last line of questions regarding how the operations of a screening program could be narrowed consistent with the national security interest.

I think, Mr. Yeagley, you suggested in your prepared statement, or at least seemed somewhat receptive to, a narrowing of the proposed legislation. The thing that disturbs me is that the basic criterion for clearance, "consistent with the national interest," seems to me to be so broad as to vest almost unlimited discretion in the authorities administering a screening program, whether it is the Secretary of Defense or whoever he may be.

At page 22 of the transcript Mr. Liebling suggested the "consistent with the national interest" standard in preference to, and as broader than, a standard focusing on "national defense and security interests." This makes it clear—

The CHAIRMAN. I might advise my good colleague that the bill had the words "security interests" and changed, or what were the words? Would you respond to that, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, "national interest" and we had "security interests."

Mr. CULVER. And I much prefer the committee's language and I would like to discuss this.

The CHAIRMAN. We might go back to it. I don't know.

Mr. CULVER. It seems to me that this would enable someone in the executive who was conducting the screening to see that the considerations to be protected in administering the screening program were not limited to military or industrial security and other national interests might be taken into account. There are, of course, virtually an infinite variety of national interests. It seems to me that it is in our national interest to have harmonious relations with other nations.

Mr. Liebling, do you think to have harmonious relations with South Africa, a gold-producing and strategically situated country, with bases that could be of significant military utility, the employment of Negroes in certain positions be barred?

Would employment of an individual who is widely known as being dogmatically and eloquently opposed to dictatorships of any form whatsoever be "in the national interest" in maintaining good relations with such countries?

With respect to good relations with Nationalist China what about an individual who thinks that the cause of peace would be served by increasing interchanges between the United States and Red China? I would be interested in your views on this.