

ULLMAN, PETITIONER, VERSUS
U. S. A.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, because I know very few Members of the House have had the opportunity to read the full text of a very important recent decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Ullman, petitioner, against U. S. A., which is commonly known as the recent decision on the Immunity Act of 1954, I am, pursuant to consent previously granted, placing most of the text of the decision in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for your guidance.

Secondly, I wish to call your attention to the fact that I am placing in the RECORD today what I believe is a very significant and important letter from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to me in answer to certain questions I asked him because I wanted his opinion to me as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It was in answer to my letter to him of March 29 asking him to give me his letter reply thereto, a copy of which letter to him is hereinafter set forth. He has done so in his letter to me of April 2, and I feel it is so clearly a helpful explanation by this distinguished American of the respective functioning of the FBI and the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am a member; and other similar congressional committees, that I am pleased to have you and every one of my distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body promptly know of his analysis, appraisal, and opinion.

One reason I wrote Mr. Hoover and asked him to give me his considered opinion is because of the frequent inquiries I receive asking why the FBI could not also do the work being done by the House Un-American Activities Committee and by the corresponding committee in the United States Senate. Also almost universally the letters I receive about the FBI compliment Mr. Hoover on the work of the FBI, of which he is the distinguished Director. So I therefore assume that this clearcut statement by Mr. Hoover showing the place and importance of these congressional committees will be accepted in full faith and credit by any who have open minds on this subject and really seek the true and correct answers.

MARCH 29, 1956.

Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Department of Justice, Wash-
ington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I read in the Washington Evening Star for Tuesday, March 20, on page A-3, a quotation by you as to some of your testimony before the House Appropriations Committee. If you have more of the text of your prepared statement available so that I might have a copy of whatever you are able to send me, I will appreciate it very much.

Being a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, your statement, as printed, was naturally very interesting and informative and whatever additional you have along those lines will be welcome received by me. And if you do communicate with me in the premises I will especially thank you to answer the following inquiry by me: to wit, To what extent do you believe it is valuable and necessary to our national defense and national security against subversive activities of persons or groups in our Nation for such a committee as the House Un-American Activities Committee, or the corresponding Senate committee, to operate vigilantly from day to day.

One reason I ask this is that not infrequently I receive expression of opinion of people questioning the need of both the FBI and the congressional committees herein named. Many of these persons clearly state that they do not see the need of either of these committees functioning because, they claim that the FBI can, could, and should do all the work that is necessary. In your answer, therefore, if you can make it clear as to what you believe to be the function of such congressional committees and why you believe them to be necessary, if you do, I will appreciate it.

I trust you will anticipate from my question to you and the extent of my inquiry that it will be also appreciated if you will make a statement of the value of such committees in the House and Senate, and wherein they do necessary work which the FBI cannot and should not be expected to do.

I write you this letter because I want to be able to show your answer, and if convenient and you have no objection, to insert it in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also release it back to at least these people who write me as above indicated and criticize the existence of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the corresponding Senate Committee.

For your cooperation in this, which I hope may come forward as promptly as convenient, and with personal regards, I have the honor to be

Cordially,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1956.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of March 29, 1956, has been received and I do appreciate your interest in my recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. Unfortunately, I do not have copies available for distribution, but you may like to make inquiry with the office of the committee for the text.

The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to the work over the years of congressional investigating committees. These committees, day after day, secure information vitally needed in the consideration of new legislation. They are indeed indispensable parts of the American legislative process.

Congressional investigating committees, moreover, time after time have brought to the attention of the Nation conditions of fraud, dishonesty, and subversion. This function of awakening public opinion is of the greatest importance in our democratic life—a service not within the province of regularly constituted investigative agencies. Congressional investigating committees, by the very nature of the broad powers vested in them, are enabled to search out the facts and make them available to the citizenry.

We in the FBI have the highest appreciation for the contributions rendered by congressional investigating committees dealing with un-American activities. Each in its own way is serving the American people. The FBI is strictly a fact-gathering agency. It does not express opinions or make recommendations on the information it secures. That is the function of other officials of the Government. As the investigative arm of the Department of Justice, the FBI is charged with the duty of investigating violations of the laws of the United States, collecting evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest, and performing other duties imposed by law. Its function is not exposure or securing information for legislative purposes. That is the function of the congressional investigating committees.

I feel that both the FBI and congressional investigating committees, in the field of internal security, have important roles to play. We are working for the same goal—protecting our great Nation from enemies who seek to destroy us. Our work is not contradictory, but mutually helpful. That is as it should be.

It was a pleasure to set forth my opinions on this topic and you may feel free to insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

ROY COWAN ET AL.—VETO MES-
SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO.
370)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 6421, "For the relief of Roy Cowan and others."

The bill directs the payment of sums aggregating \$276,568 to 28 individuals in settlement of claims for damage based on the flooding of privately owned lands. The flooding is alleged to have resulted from activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior in the establishment and management of the Lake Alice National Wildlife Refuge in North Dakota.

In my judgment this is a case in which there has been an unfortunate failure in communications between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. A subcommittee of the House conducted a hearing on the ground and made a personal inspection of the area and the construction works involved. Although Department of the Interior engineers testified at the hearing, the views of the Department were not presented at the hearing and the report of the Department on the bill apparently was not received in time for consideration before floor action was taken by the House of Representatives. As a result, the record before me is one of unresolved disagreements of fact and law. Nevertheless, the materials presented by the Department of the Interior convince me that a satisfactory and adequate basis has not been established for appraising the merits and the equity of the claims.

Under the circumstances I believe that I have no choice but to return the bill

without my approval, but with my recommendation that the case be handled either by the referral process frequently used in difficult claims cases or, if warranted, by the enactment of a jurisdictional bill which will preserve the rights and proper defenses of the litigants.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1956.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and, without objection the bill and the message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

FEASIBILITY OF MAINTAINING A PERMANENT DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 371)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 of April 21, 1955, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report entitled: "A Study of the Feasibility of Maintaining a Permanent Domestic Tin-Smelting Industry in the United States."

The study was made for me by the Office of Defense Mobilization with the assistance of a special interagency group comprised of representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, and Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the United States Tariff Commission.

I concur with the conclusions of the study, and I am also in accord with the recommendation contained in the attached memorandum from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 29, 1956.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1956.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OPERATION OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT OF 1953—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (Public Law 239, 83d Cong.), I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report of the Operation of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1956.

AMENDING THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8107) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 5, insert:

"Sec. 2. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after section 263 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 264. Notwithstanding any other provision of law any person called or ordered to perform a period of active duty for training in excess of 30 days under authority of subsections 233 (d) or 262 (c) of this act, shall during such period be deemed to have been called or ordered into active naval or military service by the Federal Government for extended naval or military service in excess of 30 days for the purpose of determining eligibility for any benefit prescribed under Public Law 108, 81st Congress (63 Stat. 201)."

After line 5, insert:

"Sec. 3. This act shall be effective from August 9, 1955: *Provided*, That no additional basic pay shall be paid to any member by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the first day of the calendar month in which this act is approved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I know what the bill purports to do, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana if he will kindly explain the substance not only of what the bill proposes to do but the Senate amendments added by the Senate.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this measure simply equalizes the pay received by all the reservists under the new Reserve Forces Act of 1954. It seems that the National Guard man called on active duty for 6 months' training received greater pay

than the reservist for the armed services who is not a guardsman. This bill would equalize that pay so that the men all receive the same amount of money when they go on active training for 6 months. They would receive the pay of a private and after 4 months get the pay of a private first class; that is, a pfc.

The Senate added two amendments. One of the amendments was to the effect that if a man on active duty training for 6 months received some disease which was injurious and disabling to him or contributed to his death, that this man should be compensated on the basis that the regular is compensated for when he dies or is injured in the service. It also provides under section 3 that the act shall be effective from August 9, 1955. The reason is that the Comptroller asked that we so frame the act so that the repeal is dated back to August 9, 1955, except for pay purposes.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana I think this is good legislation. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, N. C.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8634) to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services shall convey to the Charlotte Park and Recreation Commission, an instrumentality of the city of Charlotte, N. C., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the tract of land described in section 2 of this act upon the payment by such commission of an amount equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of such tract as determined by the Administrator, less \$10,000, the latter sum representing the amount contributed by the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce toward the purchase price paid for such tract and contiguous land by the United States.

SEC. 2. The tract of land referred to in the first section of this act is described as follows:

A parcel of land located two and one-quarter miles east of the center of Charlotte County of Mecklenburg, State of North Carolina, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a stake at the southeasterly intersection of Central Avenue and West-over Street, and running thence with the southerly line of Central Avenue south 82 degrees 36 feet east 1,200.00 feet to a stake in the southerly line of Central Avenue; thence south 7 degrees 34 feet 30 inches west 1,445 feet, more or less to a stake in the northerly line of McClintock Avenue; thence with the northerly line of McClintock Avenue in a westerly direction 1,325 feet, more