

thought of the American people, or do you think that such has resulted as a result of the passage of this act?

Mr. YEAGLEY. I haven't considered it a matter of thought-control. I would suppose that there are still people that have that view.

For example, when we brought proceedings against front organizations under this law and brought on witnesses to testify to the Communist influence in the organization to establish Communist domination and control, obviously there were so-called innocent members, sometimes a great many of them, who were not members of the Communist Party, and I think that there were people who felt that this effort was an interference with the operation of their organization.

On the other hand, if you are going to proceed against operations of the Communist Party, that is a determination to be made by the Congress and the executive branch, and it will require the production of evidence of party activities.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Yeagley, I am sure that you would agree, especially in recent months, that the Justice Department has been rather slow. In fact they have not proceeded at all against anyone, but do you mean to tell me that you have procedures in trying to harass or to control the thought of any individual or that you have tried to prosecute one or identify him as a Communist under the provisions of the SACB? Have you done that?

Mr. YEAGLEY. Not at all, Mr. Congressman. I was trying to say that I suppose there are still people who feel that it is an interference.

Mr. WATSON. There will be people against this, from time immemorial, but you are unaware of and certainly you have engaged in no activity of thought-control?

Mr. YEAGLEY. Absolutely not.

Mr. WATSON. Absolutely not. And lastly the message said that it would give the Government officials "vast powers to harass all of our citizens in the exercise of their right of free speech."

Certainly you have not engaged in any such activities as that, have you?

Mr. YEAGLEY. No, sir.

Mr. WATSON. In fact, isn't it true, Mr. Yeagley, that the Supreme Court in its 1961 decision on the Internal Security Act rejected the claim that the act in any way infringed upon first amendment rights of freedom of speech and association?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is right.

Mr. WATSON. Even the Court said that. The veto message also claimed that the act would "make it easier for subversive aliens to become naturalized as United States citizens."

Now, do you know of any subversive aliens who have obtained U.S. citizenship under the provisions of this act who would not have been able to obtain it if the act had never been in existence?

Mr. YEAGLEY. No, I don't.

Mr. WATSON. You don't.

Finally, Mr. Yeagley, the veto message said that the Internal Security Act "would not hurt the Communists, instead it would help them * * *."

"I repeat"—and again reading from the veto message—"the net results of this bill would be to help the Communists, not to hurt them."