

Mr. SCOTT. May I—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator answer the question?

Mr. SCOTT. I will be glad to answer the question by beginning at the first part of it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I invite the the Senator to go right through to the end.

Mr. SCOTT. If I have missed any part of the question by the Senator from Wyoming, I am sorry. I have discussed this matter with him earlier. I think I am familiar with the point he makes. I cannot apologize for attending a meeting of the minority policy committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not ask the Senator to apologize.

Mr. SCOTT. I am only glad the minority policy committee meets; I think it is most fortunate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The majority policy committee meets, too. The Senator is now making the natural argument of the advocates of the confirmation of the nomination of Strauss, trying to turn the issue with innuendoes and suggestions of impropriety or failure to do something.

Mr. SCOTT. On the contrary—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us deal with the facts.

Mr. SCOTT. On the contrary, there is but one fact involved in my original question, and that is, Is not a man who takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States entitled, in view of that oath, to determine for himself whether he must answer questions, or whether the oath in fact inhibits or prohibits his answering the questions?

Therefore, nothing the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said with regard to what Mr. Rowland Hughes may have said has any bearing whatsoever on the attempt to make it appear that an honorable public servant said—and I commend him for it—"If in my judgment I am asked to answer a question which violates my oath of office, I will not answer it."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is making an incorrect premise. The fact is—and this was also stated before the Senator from Pennsylvania came on the floor—it was the President of the United States who ordered Admiral Strauss to cancel the contract; and even after that order to cancel, Mr. Strauss continued to proclaim that the contract was a sound one.

I suggest that the members of the minority of the Senate would be better engaged in defending the action of the President of the United States than in defending the action of a nominee who insists that he is his own judge as to what he should do in a case involving an invalid contract which was deliberately contrived to shortcircuit the constitutional legislative power of the Congress.

Mr. SCOTT. I assume the Senator from Wyoming has read the hearings. Under that assumption, the Senator doubtless will recall that the remark of the Secretary of Commerce, to the effect that the contract was a sound one, was accompanied by a statement somewhat to the effect that, in view of present costs of contracts, it would have been a better contract than that which was entered into. He used the phrase "sound one" with reference to some such language as "in light of current costs."