

Dodd's '65 Income \$50,650, Off Since, His Lawyers Say

By Raymond J. Crowley

Associated Press

Attorneys for Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.) listed his 1965 net income yesterday as \$50,650 and said it dropped sharply in 1966 as a result of attacks by columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson.

Anderson said Dodd was refusing to answer questions about what the columnists contend are large additional amounts of income. They charge he devoted large sums in campaign contributions to his own personal use, without paying income taxes on them.

John F. Sennett, Dodd's attorney, accused the other side of trying to create "a Roman holiday." While not conceding that Dodd converted funds to his own use, he contends that it is not at issue in a \$2 million libel suit Dodd has brought against Pearson and Anderson.

Dodd appeared yesterday at a deposition proceeding, part of the preliminaries before the suit goes to trial. The session was behind closed doors, but newsmen obtained versions of what took place.

Sennett introduced a financial statement he had prepared from Dodd's records. This showed 1965 receipts as follows:

Net income from the government—\$29,500.

From 19 speaking engagements—\$11,000.

For broadcast recordings

for the American Security Council, anti-Communist organization—\$6000.

From six law clients Dodd represented on non-Federal matters—\$10,360.

After the subtraction of business expenses of some \$8000, the net receipts were \$50,650, the statement said.

Concerning his law practice, Dodd said: "No one has approached me on any legal business this year." And he said he cannot remember receiving any requests to make speeches since the Pearson and Anderson column accusing him of misconduct in office began to appear.

Anderson told newsmen there was a dispute in the closed session when it was asked whether Dodd, in 1965, received \$8000 given on behalf of a. n. spanel, founder of the International Latex Corp.

Sennett contends such questions are outside the scope of the libel suit. He has said that complaint in the suit to clear the libel suit.

These include his charge that the columnists conspired with some of his former employees to steal papers from his office and that they falsely alleged he acted as "errand boy" for public relations man Julius Klein in return for expensive gifts.