

sel of all security agencies within the United States Government make the same recommendation that this would pose problems of compromising evidence which would not be in the national security interest of the country?

That is the reason you are hamstrung right now, is it not, and it would not be in the national security interest to bring forward informants and bring forward FBI sources which would publicly compromise this terribly important information?

Under those circumstances, I raise the very serious question of which disclosure is more important in the national security interest. Is it the forced disclosure of informants and intelligence information which is of crucial importance in this vital area?

Does it override the importance and value which you suggest is available by way of the public disclosure of the nature and operation of the Communist conspiracy in this country?

Mr. YEAGLEY. The Attorney General said a short time ago that he will enforce this law as he recognizes that he is bound to enforce all of the laws for which he is responsible. If he feels that he has adequate, usable evidence to file an important case, I am convinced that he will file such a case.

Mr. CULVER. It would not be then in the national security interest, for example, given our present example with the *DuBois* case, regardless of how important you view the disclosure value to the United States public of the nature of the Communist Party, to perhaps come forward with wiretapped evidence of that kind which would serve to compromise your whole operation.

Mr. YEAGLEY. This is another problem of the last year or two that comes to us in an entirely different context than it was in before, partly because of the recent court decisions concerning electronic surveillance.

As you know, the executive branch over the years has believed it has the right and duty to resort to electronic surveillances in national security cases which are of sufficient importance to warrant it.

Obviously, if there are electronic surveillances as has been testified to by the Attorney General and Mr. Hoover, these are facts of life which we must deal with in light of what the law is, and they do have a bearing on our entire operation. We have to find out in every potential case exactly the nature of our evidence and whether it is evidence we can use.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Yeagley, I understand you have the same view that I do, that it is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce the laws passed by the Congress whether it is wise or unwise as long as those laws remain on the statute books.

Mr. YEAGLEY. Yes, sir, that is our position.

Mr. WATSON. If the chairman will yield, I understand that my friend and colleague's concern about maybe if you pursue this matter with a petition before the SACB that you might reveal the identity of your informant.

Is it not a fact that one Julia C. Brown and Lola Belle Holmes have already identified before this committee—and they have been already publicly identified as informants—Brown 100 members and Holmes 75 members, and you have already used these two informants for the 44 petitions that you brought earlier?