

AMENDING SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950 1475

As to your other question, the balance of your question, it is rather speculative for me to answer that. It would be my feeling again as I indicated before, I think, that the proceedings under this law have been useful in the manner in which I have described, and you don't quite get that type of disclosure in espionage cases or neutrality cases or trading with the enemy.

It is not quite the same.

Mr. TUCK. The Subversive Activities Control Board is a part of our judicial body, is it not, and it has no powers to institute proceedings on its own.

Mr. YEAGLEY. I am sorry, I did not understand your question.

Mr. TUCK. I said the SACB is a quasi-judicial body and it has no powers to institute proceedings of its own. That is right, is it not?

Mr. YEAGLEY. The petitions have been filed by the Attorney General—do you mean the Board can file petitions?

Mr. TUCK. I mean the Board for its work and existence is dependent upon the activity of the Attorney General or the divisions of the Attorney General's office in filing proceedings before that Board?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is correct.

Mr. TUCK. Whatever failings or shortcomings there may have been or whatever criticism that was made against the SACB, and there was much, for its failure to do any work was really the failure of the Attorney General's office rather than the Board; isn't that correct?

Mr. YEAGLEY. The only petitions they have are the ones filed by the Department of Justice. They cannot file petitions on their own.

Mr. TUCK. They can only hear petitions that are filed. No one can file petitions except the Attorney General; is that right?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is correct.

Mr. TUCK. I am somewhat astonished in light of all of the conditions of unrest going on in the country now that you would be unwilling to tell this committee that you recommended to the Attorney General of the United States either that these proceedings be inaugurated, or that they not be.

Mr. YEAGLEY. I may be old fashioned. I have seen and heard of other Government employees who tell privately what they recommended to their boss. I don't think it is the way to play the game. I am sorry.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Yeagley, you were also on the Attorney General's staff during the administration of the Republican Party as well, as I recall.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Yes, I was.

Mr. CULVER. I think the thing that interests me, and perhaps it may be misleading based on our present discussions, but has it not been true generally throughout the course of the last 18 years there has not been a large number of petitions ever initiated by the Attorney General to the Board.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Twenty-three front organizations and forty-four membership petitions were more or less scattered. They were not all filed at one time.

Mr. CULVER. It has generally been a light system.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Yes. That is right.

Mr. WATSON. You filed 23 organizational and 44 individual, I understand, but since the amendments which we passed and were signed