

the different cases and the sort of testimony produced and the kind of witnesses that were called, I don't remember any proceedings now that we thought at the time or since may have had an adverse effect upon the Central Intelligence Agency; nor do I recall them having raised any question with us about any of those proceedings.

Mr. WATSON. Thank you, sir.

Now can you think of any Internal Security Act proceeding that has seriously damaged the security or the intelligence operations of the Department of State?

Perhaps Mr. Liebling can better answer that question. Can you think of any proceeding under that act which has seriously damaged your security or intelligence operations?

Mr. LIEBLING. I would have to answer off the cuff on that, Mr. Congressman. I am not aware of any. I wasn't in this position. I am acquainted with the position that the Defense Department gave on the bill in 1950, and our concern was specifically confined to section 5 at that time, where we objected to a public divulgence of the sensitive facilities which would then become a means of targeting intelligence information for a foreign government and indicate and disclose certain vulnerabilities, and this is what we confined ourselves to at the time, and I personally am not aware of any as far as your question is concerned.

Mr. WATSON. And of course oftentimes we are apprehensive about things, but they never materialize. And, so far as you are concerned, nothing, so far as any proceeding under this act, has seriously damaged your security or intelligence operations?

Mr. LIEBLING. My experience has indicated no knowledge of any.

Mr. WATSON. You don't know of any. All right, sir.

Mr. YEAGLEY, can you think of any Internal Security Act provision or proceeding which has done serious damage to both the intelligence and the security operations of what was formerly known as G-2—I don't know what they call it now—or the Army's intelligence unit? I am sure that they would have conferred with you about that if there had been such a serious problem arise.

Mr. YEAGLEY. I don't recall any proceeding that was brought before the Board which would have conceivably had an adverse effect upon the operations of G-2. I suppose they could have had the same concern for the publishing of the list of defense facilities that Mr. Liebling referred to.

I believe that provision was amended in 1962, however, for that very purpose, because they thought it was a problem, in order to do away with the requirement of publishing this list.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir. Rather than ask these individually, we will make them collectively because I verily believe that the answer will be the same.

What about the Office of Naval Intelligence, what about the Office of Special Investigations, OSI, of the Air Force's Security and Counter-intelligence Unit, and the Air Force Office of Intelligence? Can you think of any provision or proceeding of the Internal Security Act which has done serious damage to their operations?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I believe the answer would be the same, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. WATSON. Thank you, sir.