

by the President on January 2 of this year, there have been none; isn't that correct?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WATSON. Now why the sudden change in philosophy? It is not a matter of whether the Department wishes to do this—I am not critical of you—but I am speaking of the Department. It is not a matter of whether you wish to disclose these organizations and membership.

You know it is a matter of law and this act says, "Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided in this Act is essential to the protection of the national welfare."

That is the law of the land passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

It is not optional with anyone as to whether or not disclosure is good or bad. If we want to change this law, anyone can introduce a bill to change it. This is the law of the land.

I fail to understand why, in view of the good job you have done before, the SACB cannot do a thing without petitions filed by the Department of Justice.

You have been the longtime head of this Department. Why haven't we had any petitions filed? That is a simple question and I believe this committee is entitled to an answer since this is the law of the land as passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. YEAGLEY. I will try to answer it. I don't think the answer is as simple as the question.

First of all, it is not easy to routinely produce FBI informants as witnesses and thereby destroy the coverage of the area they are covering. Sometimes there are other factors militating against any particular informant becoming a witness. In each case, on a front organization, we must maintain a burden of showing that the organization is dominated and controlled by the Communist Party.

Mr. WATSON. That is no new burden. You had that in prior years, prior to the advent of this act.

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is right, and the Communist Party influence has diminished.

Mr. WATSON. Your position now is that the Communist Party influence has diminished in this country? Is that your position?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I am trying to talk now about facts. We have to produce witnesses that the party in fact dominates and controls the organization. The *National Council* case that came down a few years ago defined that burden of proof in a more strict manner than we had interpreted it, which makes a stronger burden on us in our opinion.

When a party or organization declines in membership, from say 80,000 to well, less than 10 percent of that, the extent of its influence in organizations cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be as influential or as widespread as it had been before.

What I am trying to say is that when you combine the reduced influence of the Communist Party in these organizations with our problem of producing FBI informants as witnesses it is not an easy matter.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Yeagley, isn't this exactly what President Truman predicted and isn't this exactly the reason you had the uniform coun-