

Mr. WATSON. It is totally within his authority, and I believe Mr. Yeagley will agree, to bring petitions. The Board itself cannot initiate petitions, and rightly so, because they are supposed to adjudicate them, but certainly the Attorney General is the one who holds the key to it.

If nothing is done for 8 more months, we can readily anticipate that this Board will go out of existence, and we all agree and Congress has so mandated that exposure of these groups and these people are essential to the national welfare.

That is the law of the land.

Mr. YEAGLEY. I would reiterate that Mr. Clark has said more than once he intends to enforce this law. I know he intends to review the material we have given him to determine whether or not he thinks good cases are made, whether or not he thinks in conjunction with the FBI that the informants we would have to use can be spared and determine what the ultimate result would be. This I don't think he has done yet.

I might add, in view of some of the comments here, I can assure the committee every lawyer I have ever had work for me in the security division has always had the desire and intent to enforce the law. They have all done the best job they know how and they have done it with the best spirit conceivable and they have been an excellent group of lawyers to work with.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, Mr. Yeagley, you can understand our anxiety. I would not withhold any from you. Everyone is aware of the fact that this bill signed by the President amending the Internal Security Act was opposed by the Department of Justice. When we couple that opposition with the inaction, then I think some people might draw erroneous conclusions. I want to give you and the Attorney General the right to refute those erroneous conclusions that may be drawn.

Mr. CULVER. Does your testimony represent the position of the Attorney General, consolidated Justice Department view, or merely the views of the internal security section of the Department?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I would not pretend to say when I answer questions here that I am speaking for Ramsey Clark, nor that I know of his every thought.

On the other hand, he had no hesitation at all in sending me up here as his representative to testify.

He did not have the time to study these bills. He had some familiarity with them. He had no time to go over our proposed statement.

Mr. CULVER. Then it does represent the view of the United States Department, as headed by the Attorney General of the United States, on this bill?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I would say the statement represents the views of the Department of Justice. I think I have used some of my personal opinions in answering questions.

Mr. CULVER. It seems to me generally in the recommendations you have made regarding the correction of the present potential problem areas that you detect in the legislation before us, you consistently refer to existing administrative authority under which you now operate the Government security program.