

Mr. LIEBLING. These would be my personal views I presume based on my experience.

Mr. CULVER. Just based on the wisdom of providing such a broad authority.

Mr. LIEBLING. I will admit that the executive branch—if you get into the legal aspects of what we mean by national interests or national security, I will have to defer to Mr. Yeagley on this aspect, but as far as national security and national interest to me is concerned, as such, in administering a program like this, obviously your prime application of the program, your prime consideration would be your ability to defend yourself so national interest or national security to me would be one political harmony, yes, to answer you generally, here and abroad, economic stability, military capability to defend yourselves against adversity.

Mr. CULVER. What do you find undesirable about the initial committee language, which I think is much more tightly drawn and narrow and responsible than the administration language?

Mr. LIEBLING. We don't find it objectionable at all. We merely indicated a change which to us—

Mr. CULVER. Would broaden it.

Mr. LIEBLING. Because we have been working under an Executive order which uses the phrase "consistent with the national interest."

Mr. CULVER. So you have just gotten comfortable with the phrase.

Mr. LIEBLING. I understand it, I presume.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were those words initiated, in whose administration?

Mr. YEAGLEY. It was under 10865 under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. LIEBLING. I believe in '59 or '60.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Whenever 10865 was issued, I believe in 1960.

The CHAIRMAN. During the "new frontier" days.

Mr. LIEBLING. As far as security management was concerned.

(At this point Mr. Roudebush left the hearing room.)

Mr. CULVER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Yeagley, with respect to proposed provisions to preclude judicial intervention pending exhaustion of all administrative remedies, would there be any limit to the time that authorities could take in rendering a final administrative decision?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I don't recall any limitation in the bill.

Mr. CULVER. Would it not be a reasonable accommodation of the differing interests concerned for the legislation to place a time limit, say, of 3 months for administrative proceedings to take their course, at the end of which time judicial intervention should not be precluded in appropriate circumstances?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I don't know what period of time would be reasonable. There is such a variation in the requirements in different cases. Sometimes there are reinvestigations, as I understand. Mr. Liebling would know more of the time problems. As far as we are concerned, it is a matter for the Congress and for the Defense Department.

Mr. CULVER. I was interested, Mr. Yeagley, based on your vast experience in this area. I wondered whether or not you felt that it would be in the interests of the administration of justice and due process