

Mr. Hebert. I just wanted to make my position clear.

Mr. Rankin. You wanted your position on the record?

Mr. Hebert. On the record. I want to say I am going to oppose it and I will do it privately and publicly. I think the time has come when we ought to do something.

Mr. Peurifoy. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement? I did not know I was going to be asked to go through all these documents. I want to say in all frankness to you gentlemen that my job is administrative. I don't think I am really qualified to pass on this. I am not a political officer. I have already taken steps, that is, while we were talking here one of my people has already called the department and we are trying to get a list of these people for you, the people to whom these telegrams were distributed. I am perfectly willing to cooperate in any way I can. I would be glad to have a man down here with Mr. Stripling or with the committee that is fully qualified to pass on these documents. It is a little out of my field.

Now, the documents shown me upstairs today I think were perfectly obvious, I mean, I could see that. It might look obvious to me and I could say it would not injure the national interest, but there might be the name of a Frenchman, a Russian or someone in there that I don't know about whom the gentlemen up there would know. I just really do not think I am qualified to pass on this. I am perfectly willing to cooperate with you.

a lot of documents and they didn't amount to anything. From the other standpoint, of course, the charge that Mr. Chambers made when he turned over the documents was that these documents were gathered for the specific purpose of turning them over to the Soviet Union. I think your analysis of the documents could be of assistance along those lines.

Mr. Peurifoy. I would like to say this, and this is purely a gratuitous comment on my part, but what I regard as most serious about this whole thing, forgetting Mr. Hiss and Mr. Chambers, is the fact that these documents were taken out of the Department in '37 or '38, and to me that means that our codes were being read by foreign nations during that whole time. That to me is what is important. I don't care about Hiss or Chambers. This is what worries me.

Mr. Nixon. I wish Mr. Peurifoy had made that statement in public.

Mr. Peurifoy. I just thought about it while we were talking of it.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Peurifoy, 135 years after the Revolutionary War closed, the British records were published showing that Benjamin Franklin's secretary was a British spy. Now you have hit the bull's eye.

Mr. Peurifoy. So far as I am concerned, these other people don't amount to a tinker's dam.

Mr. Hebert. You are absolutely right.

documents if they are not prejudicial to the national security, or to the high diplomatic purposes of the Government, but to take every conceivable step to safeguard the national security, even at this late hour, by not publishing documents which Mr. Welles or which the State Department feels would peril the national security.

Mr. PEURIFOY. I have not seen the documents.

Mr. MUNDT. No; but you understand our objective view?

Mr. Stripling will now show you the documents which he showed to Mr. Welles and ask you some questions concerning them.

Mr. PEURIFOY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I will show him the same three documents, ask that he read them all three carefully, and then we will take them up in the order in which Mr. Welles considered them.

Proceeding in order, Mr. Chairman, the first document which the witness has examined is the document dated January 13, 1938, marked "Strictly Confidential for the Secretary," section 1, and signed "Bullitt."

Do you consider, Mr. Peurifoy, that the publication in the record of this document would jeopardize the national security in any way?

Mr. PEURIFOY. I do, sir, for the same reason that Mr. Welles outlined. Section 2 of that telegram taken by itself I think would be all right, but because of the information in the first section I think that would not be in the national interest.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you. Proceed, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. The third document is dated February 15, 1938. It has previously been identified and is signed "Hull." I will ask you your opinion of that document.

Mr. MUNDT. The Chair would like to ask the photographers to be careful not to photograph the text of any of these documents.

Mr. PEURIFOY. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the third document should be made available to the public in the national interest.

Mr. MUNDT. You do not believe it should be?

Mr. PEURIFOY. No, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Stripling, have you shown Mr. Puerifoy all three of the documents?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. The Chair would like to ask Mr. Puerifoy, having heard the testimony of Mr. Welles, if you think perhaps you could help the committee identify the names of the people in the State Department to whom these documents would have been available back in 1938, whether you can supply us with that information.

Mr. PEURIFOY. I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that those distribution lists would be still in the Department. That is something I would have to check. On the original there probably is printed a distribution of where these documents went. I am not sure whether this is a copy or whether it is the actual original copy. That would show the actual distribution and I think it would be the best source to check that from. We could, however, go into it.

Mr. MUNDT. In your position in the State Department you could check and determine whether such a list was available; could you not?

Mr. PEURIFOY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. Would you be willing to do that, and if you find it, would you give us the names of the people who did receive such documents?

Mr. PEURIFOY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you very much.

Mr. Rankin, have you any questions?

Mr. RANKIN. I have a question of Mr. Stripling.

I wanted to ask Mr. Stripling how many more of these documents he has.

Mr. STRIPLING. I haven't counted them, Mr. Rankin. I would say there would probably be—well, all of these documents did not come from the State Department, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN. I know, but how many of these secret documents have you?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Wheeler says there are approximately 200 pages, which have been developed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Hébert.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Peurifoy, in your position in charge of security for the State Department, would you say that documents in the number of 200 pages removed from the Department would prima facie indicate that they had been taken for a purpose detrimental to the United States Government?

Mr. PEURIFOY. I would so.

Mr. HÉBERT. And anybody taking them could not be perchance, or by accident; it would have to be some systematic removal of these documents from the files for a purpose not in the interests of the United States Government?

Mr. PEURIFOY. I would agree with that, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Peurifoy, could you imagine anybody taking those records from the State Department who didn't do it with some ulterior and unpatriotic motive?

Mr. PEURIFOY. Well, actually, sir, under the regulations, the security regulations of the Department of State, no one is supposed to take documents like that out, even for their own use at home at night to study. They are supposed to remain in the Department.

Mr. NIXON. May I follow that, Mr. Peurifoy?

Mr. PEURIFOY. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIXON. I understand that where a document is classified, at least where it is classified to the extent of "Strictly Confidential" or "Strictly Confidential for the Secretary," that the document is not supposed to be removed from the Department to the person's home?

Mr. PEURIFOY. That is right, sir.

Mr. NIXON. And if a document of such a nature were removed to a person's home, and there copied or there digested by that person, that in itself would be a breach of the State Department's rules?

Mr. PEURIFOY. It would, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. No; no further questions.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I ask another?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Hébert.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Peurifoy, these documents were originally highly restricted and even to this date their publication would be against the