

duty imposed upon them by the act to file proceedings against the Communists before that Board.

So I am sorry I won't be here tomorrow, but I hope and I know that my colleagues on both my right and left will carry the ball.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I almost shudder to contemplate what you have said, because it would indicate the Attorney General of the United States might be deliberately attempting to sabotage the efforts of this committee and the Congress to safeguard our people from the communistic movement, which is certainly gaining ground in our country.

Anybody can respect a man who does the best he can with what he has, but when a man takes no action and then says he does not feel the court will back him up, he is the judge and the jury.

The CHAIRMAN. Well let me tell you, I remember as if it were yesterday, one member, Mr. Yates, took me to task, year before last, or last year, when we debated the SACB amendment. He said, well that is all right, that is all right, but what about the Justice Department? Will they back you up?

I read on the floor of the House a letter by the Attorney General, in which he said that, within constitutional limits, if we passed the bill he would cite these Communists. And then I was brought to task by Mr. Culver of this committee, saying that the letter was meaningless.

Maybe it was meaningless, and I was too dumb to see through it myself. I don't know. But you remember that, when I read it.

Mr. WATSON. I remember it specifically; yes.

Mr. RARICK. Well, perhaps this committee had better start investigating the Attorney General's office and see what is wrong over there. The man is bound to be an attorney. He is obligated to preserve, defend, and protect the Constitution for the people of this country.

I had heard the testimony of the previous witness, and in examining the eminent body's final decree, they went out of their way to talk about the equities of nonsensitive, so-called, employment.

This man Robel was what, a machine operator? He had been so working for years and apparently, knowingly, to the people at the head of the factory, he had been in such a position, and I would like to leave this committee with this thought.

When it comes down to protecting the lives of our boys in combat and to maintaining peace of mind and security right here in our own country, the heartland, what in a defense facility is a nonsensitive job? A janitor? Sweep-up man who goes around to the waste baskets or sweeps shavings up? This is very definitely a sensitive position.

The CHAIRMAN. I expressed this just yesterday.

Of course, I understand that the Supreme Court held void the particular provision of the Internal Security Act which we seek to correct, on the ground that it violated the freedom-of-association clause of the first amendment.

I said, well, I don't; I believe very firmly in the establishment of religion provisions and the right of worship, and I'm not trying to promote a religious doctrine here. It is a fact, however, that I happen to be a Catholic, and I think after all, now that is a pretty old institution.

I said when he was teaching catechism, on freedom of association, the priest used to tell us, tell me who your company is, and I will tell you what you are.