

Mr. CONTE. Are trusts governed at all by the laws of Illinois?

Mr. RAY. In some instances, some are.

Mr. CONTE. Of course, they are.

Mr. RAY. Not all of them, and not this one. This is a private trust.

Mr. CONTE. We can remove that veil and ascertain whether or not you are violating the laws of the Federal Government.

Mr. RAY. Is this a judicial body? Are you going to hold that?

Mr. CONTE. Quasi-judicial.

Mr. RAY. *Watkins v. U.S.*, 351-178 where Chief Justice Warren, in delivering the opinion of the Court, stated in the second paragraph:

We start with several basic premises on which there is general agreement, the power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad. It encompasses inquiries concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes. It includes surveys of defects in our social, economic or political system for the purpose of enabling Congress to remedy them. It comprehends probes into departments of the Federal Government to expose corruption, inefficiency or waste, but broad as is this power of inquiry, it is not unlimited. There is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of Congress. This was freely conceded by the Solicitor General in his argument of the case of *Watkins*. Nor is the Congress a law enforcement or trial agency. These are functions of the Executive and Judicial Departments of Government. No inquiry is an end in itself. It must be related to and in furtherance of a legitimate task of Congress. Investigations conducted solely for the personal aggrandizement of the investigators or to punish in quotation marks those investigated are indefensible. It is unquestionably the duty of all citizens to cooperate with the Congress in its efforts to obtain the facts needed for intelligent legislative action. It is their unremitting obligation to respond to subpoenas, to respect the dignity of the Congress and its committees, and to testify fully with respect to matters within the province of proper investigation.

Mr. PATMAN. Read that last sentence over, if you do not mind.

Mr. RAY. "It is their unremitting obligation to respond to subpoenas, to respect the dignity of the Congress and its committees, and to testify fully with respect to matters within the province of proper investigation."

Mr. PATMAN. Testify fully, that is the point.

Mr. RAY. "This of course assumes that the constitutional rights of witnesses will be respected by the Congress as they are in a court of justice. The Bill of Rights is applicable to investigations"—

Mr. CONTE. May I interrupt you there?

Are you claiming any constitutional rights here?

Mr. RAY. Yes, sir, under the first amendment, if I may continue.

Mr. CONTE. Why didn't you do that yesterday? You claimed it under a trust agreement then. That is what you claimed it under yesterday, and you and I had quite a discussion on this.

Mr. RAY. Now we are going to have the question. May I just finish this?

Mr. CONTE. If you want to plead the Constitution, I respect your right to do so.

Mr. RAY. May I finish?

Mr. CONTE. Do you want to plead the Constitution?

Mr. RAY. No, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. You said just now the first amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Of course you do not want to.

Mr. RAY. We have two cases here. We have Mr.—

Mr. PATMAN. Which is correct; you are pleading the first amendment or you are not?