Mr. President;

I rise in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Let me acknowledge at the outset that this is a controversial question. The fact that it is controversial is in some respects reassuring to me. Mr. Strauss has a record of long public service in high office. Were there to be no objection to his confirmation, I might be influenced to believe that during this long period of service the nominee was, in essence, a do-nothing. I am proud that such is not the case.

Although the nominee's record of service is long in period of time, his record of accomplishments in behalf of our country is much longer. He has served in the administrations of the last three Presidents--Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower. As a member, and subsequently as Chairman, of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Strauss participated at the highest level in dealing with the most volatile and controversial issue of modern times. The scientific advance in the field of atomic energy, with its original application in the field of weaponry, was so rapid that the fact of its existence preceded a full public awareness and consciousness of its potentialities and far-reaching effects on every phase of our lives. The controversy in this field has not been lessened by the suspicion in the public's mind stemming from the secretiveness necessarily accompanying the scientific advances because of its military applications.

It was in this novel field that Mr. Strauss applied his long and valuable experience as an administrator and his clear and logical judgment in the public interest. In response to his official duties, and consistent with his honest judgment, Mr. Strauss took a firm and resolute stand on such widely controversial issues as testing of the hydrogen bomb, shipping of radio-active isotopes to foreign nations, the dangers posed by radio-active fallout, the adequacy of our nuclear detection system, the extent to which private industry should participate in peaceful uses of atomic energy, and--certainly not the least controversial--the questions on security clearances for employees in the atomic energy field.
The judgments which he made on these questions stand as a magnificent tribute to the competency and ability, as well as the unflinching patriotism, of the nominee.

It was indeed inevitable that there would be a serious conflict in judgment between any public servant in this field who took a firm stand and others in the same and allied fields. The differences in judgment arose, and indeed were foredoomed, not only from divergent prognoses as to contemplated courses of action in the atomic energy field, but from basic differences in philosophy. Place any man of deep convictions—and I doubt that anyone will question that Mr. Strauss is a man of deep convictions—in the same circumstances, and controversy will result.

Contrary to what appears to be the impression in some quarters—the Washington Post, for example—the fact that a man is controversial does not disqualify him from public service. If such were the case, few, if any, men with the requisite experience would be eligible to serve; and the cabinet of every President would necessarily be staffed with mediocrity, rather than quality and ability. Let us dispel once and for all that the Senate shall establish a new criterion for confirmation based on whether a man is controversial.

As stated in the supplemental views of the Committee report on this nomination, I believe that differences in philosophy should be minimized in the Senate's consideration of a confirmation of an appointment to a cabinet post. The President is presumably aware of the philosophy of any man he appoints to a cabinet post, and it is inconceivable that the President would appoint a man to a cabinet post if the nominee adhered to a philosophy substantially contrary to that of the President, or his administration, in the area in which the nominee is to function. The President and his party are accountable to the people at the polls for their philosophy as it is embodied in policy and actions. At the same time, let us hope that the Senate will always have members who are not in accord with the philosophy of the President, for unanimity to this extent would be quite indicative of an abysmal lack of freedom of thought among the people themselves.

The transcript of the hearings on this nomination is voluminous. It contains a variety of objections to the nominee's confirmation.
Others have also raised reasons for objections both on the Senate floor and in statements in the press, but they are not substantially different from the reasons given in the hearings.

I attended as many of these hearings as my schedule would permit, and I have studied the transcript extensively. It is my firm conclusion that every objection to the confirmation of this nomination is founded, basically, on a difference in judgment or philosophy, whether the objectors are, or are not, conscious that such is the case.

It is unquestionable that our objectivity is weakened by our emotions. It is an equally human characteristic that our emotions are aroused by the advocacy of philosophies to which we feel deeply opposed.

The hearings on this nomination were prone to arouse emotions, as is obvious to anyone who observed them and even to one who reads the transcript. Although I approached the hearings without any strong feelings about the nominee—in fact, I had never met the man before his appointment—I found myself having to resist emotions of antagonism, inspired by the advocacy of views and philosophies to which I am violently opposed. For instance, when two of the witnesses from the ranks of scientists continued to defend Dr. Oppenheimer, to talk of our "national guilt" for having developed the hydrogen bomb—although they themselves worked vigorously for development of the atom bomb—and raised their wail of woe that our security laws were too rigidly enforced, it was only by the most determined exercise in will power that I viewed the testimony of these witnesses as merely the expression of impractical idealists, rather than parrots of the Daily Worker.

Similarly, I can understand that those who disagree basically with the nominee's philosophy can unintentionally approach his testimony and record with a desire to find conflicts of statements, conflicts of interests and unseemly conduct. With the presence of this desire, it is not too difficult to understand how their interpretation of the record and testimony is reached.

An objective consideration of the evidence will not bear out the charges that have been hurled at the nominee. Take, for example, the charge of non-cooperation with Congress. There can
be no doubt that the Senator from New Mexico /conscientiously
believes/that Mr. Strauss, as Chairman of the AEC, failed to keep
Congress informed and failed to cooperate with it. In considering
this question, however, we cannot overlook the fact that all the
others who had the same official relationship/as Chairmen of the
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with the nominee, take a contrary
view/to the Senator from New Mexico. The other Chairmen were
Senator McMahon, Senator Hickenlooper, Congressman Cole and
Congressman Durham, whose attitudes are summarized in the Committee
Report/on this nomination. Lest there be any doubt that the
divergent opinion of Senator Anderson/be attributable to
philosophical differences, rather than the nominee's action during
the particular period when Senator Anderson, as Chairman of the
Joint Committee, worked with the nominee, one need only to refer
to the individual views/of the junior Senator from Rhode Island/
on this nomination. Senator Pastore was Chairman of the Subcommittee
on Agreements for Cooperation/and a member of the Joint Committee/
during Senator Anderson's chairmanship. It is also indicative that
the attitude of these others on the nominee's cooperation/does not
stem from an agreement in philosophy. Senator Pastore has pointed
out/that the chasm that separates him and the nominee in the
political and economic categories/is "wide, and in some instances,
unbridgeable."

Another charge, which has been continuously reiterated by
opponents of confirmation, centers around the unequivocal dispute
in testimony/between the nominee and Adolph Wenzell. Mr. Wenzell
stated that he informed Admiral Strauss/that he was an employee
of the Bureau of the Budget, and the nominee stated that he knew
Mr. Wenzell only as a representative of First Boston Corporation.
This conflict of testimony is not a late occurrence, but, in fact,
was given in 1954. It was related and re-related during the hearings
on the nomination in question. Time and again it has been reiterated
that one of the two was lying. With this assertion I am satisfied
that few will argue; but it is extremely significant that no
witness would assert, as distinguished from insinuate, that the
nominee was the liar/in this instance.
The reason for the innuendo, rather than a clear-cut charge of falsehood, is evident from the facts surrounding the transaction. Mr. Wenzell was involved in a personal conflict of interest matter. Criminal prosecution was in the offing. It was, from his standpoint, a self service to establish that he had been dealing in the Dixon-Yates transaction above board and out in the open, with no intention to represent conflicting interests at the same time. His statement, in point of law, is known as a self-serving declaration, and as a practical matter, raises a suspicion, even when not contradicted. It was contradicted by a public servant with a long and devoted record of unselfish service to our country, who had no axe to grind.

The transaction in which Mr. Wenzell was involved concerned an issue of the deepest political and economic philosophy--public power versus private power. There are those who feel most strongly--yes, even emotionally--about this issue. And that emotion is ever present in any discussion of action with relation to the much discussed Dixon-Yates transaction.

The relevant fact with respect to the nominee in the Dixon-Yates transaction is that there was no conflict of interest on his part, and all the rationalization in the world cannot attribute the actions of Mr. Wenzell to the nominee. Even such a springboard of emotions as Dixon-Yates cannot bridge this gap and attribute misconduct to Mr. Strauss.

The whole play of emotions in viewing this confirmation, or any other question, was most ably and succinctly stated by the junior Senator from Rhode Island during the hearings, and I quote:

"...If you don't like a man, I suppose you can construe anything he has done as being ill advised, as being deceitful, as being cunning. It is like anything else.

"I have seen a lot of men brag about their children for having done something that they might have spanked someone else's child for having done. But just because it happens to be their child and they see him only with eyes of love, they interpret that action with a certain sense of benevolence. Yet when somebody else does it, that they don't like too much, it seems to be an evil act."

Senator Pastore has summed up this matter in a nutshell.

The nominee has taken an active part in public affairs for a period of forty years. He has, in an official capacity, testified before numerous congressional hearings. He has been widely reported in the press, and many columnists have commented on his actions.
His services, as I have pointed out, have been connected with highly controversial issues.

With such a public record for a playground, anyone who is so-minded can excerpt apparent inconsistencies and apparent illustrations of deceitfulness of the nominee, just as could be done from the record of any other public servant or person in the public eye to the extent that the nominee has been. Viewed in its entire context, however, the record and the verbal expressions of the nominee disclose no disqualification.

In assuming this approach, I am not unaware that at least one witness before the Committee based his objections solely on the political philosophy of the nominee. The question of political philosophy has not historically been a criterion for confirmation, except to the extent that it might affect loyalty to our form of government. I do not believe that the Senate is ready to adopt a new criterion, and I know that I am not.

Only recently it was argued persuasively to this body that the historic criteria used by the Senate on questions of confirmation of appointments were four in number, and consisted of good character and mental soundness, freedom from conflict of interest, loyalty to our system of government and competency to perform the job for which the appointment was made.

Viewed objectively from these criteria, the nominee should be confirmed by the Senate.

On the question of character, there is an abundance of evidence. An overwhelming majority of the reputable press has supported him editorially. People who have known the nominee for a lifetime of public service have come forward with unsolicited testimonials to his unimpeachable character. These testimonials include statements by members of our own body from both sides of the aisle. As examples, I shall read, first, a letter from our esteemed former colleague, Senator Alexander Smith of New Jersey, and I quote:

"Dear Strom:

I am writing this personal note to those present members of the Senate who were colleagues of mine during these past years.

I am distressed over the charges that have been made in the current debate on the confirmation of Admiral Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce which appear to reflect on his character and on his integrity. We must bear in mind that he has been nominated by President
Eisenhower/to be a member of the President's Cabinet.

"I have known Lewis Strauss since World War I/when we served together in the United States Food Administra­
tion/under former President Hoover. I have been privileged
to be associated with him/in all President Hoover's post­
war relief and educational activities. We are both
members of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation.

"I have followed with great interest and admiration/
his brilliant business career/and his outstanding military
service in World War II. I know of no one who has main­
tained during his entire life/higher standards of integrity
and dedicated selfless public service/than Admiral Lewis
Strauss.

"Let me add that Lewis has had no part in my sending this
letter/nor does he know I have done so.

"With warm personal regards, I remain
Always cordially yours,

H. Alexander Smith"

From our side of the aisle, we draw on the recommendation of
the able senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. Byrd, who wrote the
following letter to the Chairman of the Commerce Committee:

"Hon. Warren G. Magnuson
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Warren:

"Thank you for your letter with respect to the
hearing on the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be
Secretary of Commerce.

"I have known Admiral Strauss for a long time. I
think he is a man of very great ability/and is eminently
qualified for this position. He has a great breadth of
experience/and is splendidly equipped in every way.

"I trust your committee will report his nomination/
as promptly as possible.

"With best wishes, I am
Faithfully yours,

Harry F. Byrd"

These are only examples of the testimony/to the good character
of the nominee.

Opponents to the confirmation of this nominee/point repeatedly
to the legalistic answers of Mr. Strauss. I mention the inclination
of the nominee/to give legalistic answers to congressional committees,
not as it affects his character, for it has no bearing on that
matter, and reflects to no extent on his forthrightness, in my
opinion. On the contrary, it does reflect on the question of
mental soundness, for it shows that the abundance of experience
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that the nominee has had in testifying before congressional committees has not gone unheeded. Legalistic answers are often a necessity if one is to survive congressional grilling.

There is no question, actually, as to the mental soundness of the nominee. Even those witnesses who opposed his confirmation most vigorously admitted that the nominee was a man of acute mental perception. There was even a hint that his mental ability was somewhat too good for the likes of his antagonists.

There is no conflict of interest disqualification. There have been charges, in this regard, substantiated by innuendo only. There has been an effort to find conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates matter which I have previously mentioned, and on Wenzell's part there may well have been; but there is no evidence of conflict of interest insofar as the nominee is concerned.

There is printed in the transcript of the hearings, at page 1100, a "Staff study of interlocking relationships of Kuhn-Loeb and Rockefeller interests in the uranium field." I can only suppose that this study was prepared in connection with the testimony of Mr. Garonzik, who testified in executive session, but whose testimony is included in the hearings. No relationship by the nominee with either Kuhn-Loeb or the Rockefellers was shown during the periods of the nominee's government service, nor was any current connection shown. The witness, Garonzik, in substance, testified that in his opinion, the nominee and Kuhn-Loeb think alike. This sort of testimony is involved and is voluminous, and best typified as "... full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Although no evidence has been forthcoming that the nominee would have a conflict of interest, were he to be appointed to any job in the Government, it is still important to remember that the nomination is for Secretary of Commerce, and not to some post in the atomic energy field, to which the meaningless testimony on this point was apparently directed.

The nominee is loyal to our form of government. He is intensely patriotic. Every iota of testimony and evidence points unequivocally to this conclusion. As a matter of fact, some of the witnesses objected to his preoccupation with security. If indeed he be one of the few preoccupied with security, he should be commended rather
than condemned. It is interesting to note that these witnesses attempted to sustain this particular point by directing attention to remarks from a speech of the nominee at Columbus, Ohio, in November, 1953. The remarks of Mr. Strauss, which the witness suggested as showing his over-security consciousness, are as follows:

"There are some who think that in the past we have erred on the side of excessive security. There are others who think we have revealed too much information. Many years of association with the problem have shown me that when the error is on the side of too much security, that can be rectified; but if the error has been in the other direction, there is nothing appropriate but handwringing and vain regrets."

I can only summarize the evidence on the question of loyalty by quoting another patriotic Virginian's apt remark, "If this be treason, make the most of it."

As to the fourth of the criteria to which I have referred, it is my opinion that the country is indeed fortunate that a man of the nominee's ability will still consent to undertake this public service. His experience as an administrator extends back for several decades. He has rendered outstanding service in each of the positions of government in which he has served. It would be difficult, if, indeed, not impossible, to find in another man the combination of knowledge of commerce, administrative ability and experience, and familiarity with governmental practices and procedures, to the degree that this combination is present in the nominee.

If, then, we put aside differences in political and economic philosophies, which exist most broadly among the members of this body on almost any given question, and concern ourselves with pertinent qualifications of the nominee, the evidence is overwhelming in favor of confirmation.

I feel I would be remiss if I concluded without at least mentioning what I consider to be a factor for consideration in voting on this nomination, although it is not within the usual criteria for the Senate's tests on confirmations. It arises from unusual circumstances of this nomination, and indeed from the unusual times in which we live.

As I have pointed out earlier, and as we are all aware, the nominee has been in positions of prominence in the administration.
of our security programs. He has been unflinchingly diligent in enforcing security laws. In the process, the nominee has unquestionably been a thorn in the flesh of subversive elements. For some time, he has even been a target for such brickbats as were at their disposal.

I do not mean to imply that the Communists are in any way directly responsible for the opposition to this nomination in the Senate. Unquestionably, the opposition in the Senate and the opposition of the Communists to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss are for completely dissimilar reasons.

Nevertheless, and this is my point—if the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Strauss as Secretary of Commerce is defeated, the Communists will undoubtedly, albeit falsely, claim credit for having purged another strong advocate of security from the Government. Although the claim may be without any substance or truth, there is a distinct possibility that the claim will have a deterring, although unconscious, effect on persons who might administer our security program in the future.

As fanciful as it may seem at first glance, it is a possibility which deserves the mature and objective consideration of every member of this body. I do not suggest for a moment that it is a controlling factor, but it is certainly more vital by far, than some of the considerations which have been suggested.

In conclusion, I admonish each member of this body to read the entire transcript of the hearings on this nomination. They are voluminous, but only in the full context can the issues be clearly put in proper perspective. In this transcript is everything except the demeanor of the witnesses, and in some instances even that is apparent in the transcript.

I am convinced beyond any shadow of a doubt, from the evidence before the Senate, that the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce should be confirmed.