

Mr. President, I say to you and to my colleagues that the finger of Sherman Adams was in that case. Sherman Adams refused to appear before the congressional committee to testify. Instead, he proclaimed that he had executive privilege; and he would not consent to testify before the congressional committee.

Well, Mr. President, Sherman Adams now has departed from the scene. There were many conferences in the White House, when Sherman Adams was assistant to the President. There were conferences with Mr. Goldfine. But all that was too much for the White House to stomach.

Mr. President, I say that the action of Admiral Strauss in this case is too much for the Senate to stomach, if it wishes to defend the right of the public to know the public business.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that I do not know whether Sherman Adams was in the case or not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. His finger was there.

Mr. CARROLL. But I know the record. The record is presently in the U.S. Court of Claims, where that court is finding the facts. There is not the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone that the policy in regard to the Dixon-Yates contract was formulated in the White House. The Bureau of the Budget is an arm of the President. The policy was formulated there. And there can be no doubt in the mind of anyone who reads the record that Admiral Strauss was one of the advisers of the President.

When we reduce the matter to its simplest terms, we find that the important point is as follows: When the congressional committee called Admiral Strauss before it to testify, the committee had the power to do so; it was exercising a proper legislative function and a proper legislative power. Admiral Strauss was questioned. Mr. President, in the name of commonsense, why did he not state, "This is a part of administration policy." That is admitted now; it is in the record. Why was not that fact laid on the table, instead of hiding behind executive secrecy? Or did they not want the public to know that it might cost them a million dollars?

PRESIDENT'S ORDER TO REVEAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that it should be made clear that the executive secrecy claimed was only pretended; there was not actually any executive secrecy, because the President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower—as I shall presently show to the Senate—at a press conference held shortly after this matter "broke," said to all the members of the press who were assembled in the room in which he held the conference that there was no information about this whole problem he was not willing to reveal.

On the 18th of August 1954, the President replied to a question which was asked at his press conference. I do not know who asked the question; the record does not show; but the following report of