

m6584

OGC Has Reviewed

06-3221

Legislative Counsel

Asst. Director for Communications

S. J. Res. 96

1. This is in reply to your memorandum dated 21 September 1953, which forwarded a copy of S. J. Res. 96, Senate Report 602, a memorandum of referral by the Bureau of the Budget, together with a proposed Department of Defense statement and a letter from the Department of the Air Force to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Your memorandum requested the comments which I may have on the above.

2. I entirely agree with the comments made by the Air Force with respect to Section 10 (b) of the Joint Resolution, now Section 10 (c) of the revised Joint Resolution. The same objections raised by the Air Force (in the interests of security) seem equally applicable to Section 10 (a) of the revised Joint Resolution. You will note that in Section 10 (a) " * * the production of such books, papers, and documents * * * , as the Commission or such sub-committees or member may deem advisable. ", is provided for. Section 10 (a), together with 10 (c) could easily be interpreted to require extensive disclosure of matters which CIA should not disclose. I do not know how effective would be the suggestions of the Air Force that an administrative agreement be made with the Commission to protect classified information. You know better than I the provisions of law which the DCI can invoke to prevent unwarranted attempts to "fish" in our pond.

3. Insofar as S. J. Res. 96 is concerned, I believe that we will have to take the same position that the Secretary of Defense has taken in his letter to the Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate. There is nothing in the language of the Resolution insofar as its purpose is concerned to which we can take valid objection. However, the objection to Section 10 (a) and 10 (c) of the revised Joint Resolution should be communicated either formally or informally to the Bureau of the Budget.

4. With respect to Senate Report No. 602, I have reason to believe that it is inspired by a strong lobby. This, of course, we can not prove, nor is it any of our business. I do not believe that this lobby is sponsored by the legitimate television interests, but by a company of promoters. It is unlikely that it will be successful once carefully examined. I am much more concerned with regard to the language of Section 10 of the Joint Resolution.



25X1A