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Senator BENTON. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

First, let me make a quick comment on one point brought out by
Senator O'Mahoney - the relationship between the rise of socialism in
England and the British cartel. This relationship is very little under-
stood in this country. I have come to the same conclusion as has Senator
O'Mahoney, on this subject, out of my own long interest in the British
economy.

That is just a footnote to his interesting testimony.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you and your committee on undertaking
these hearings. Indeed, I think the quotation I have just given from
William the Silent* applies to this group here today and to your pro-
tected hearings. In my judgment, you are dealing here with one of the
most important subjects in the entire world. It is not too much to say
that much of the future of the world may depend on how well we can make
our Congress function.

I think a man must work here in Washington for some time, possibly
even serve in the Senate itself, in order to discover how terribly im-
portant one single Senator is. I remember when I left the State Department
to go back to Connecticut I told my friends that I would never again take
an administrative job in Washington unless I felt I owned a piece of one
Senator. To an administrative officer, one Senator who knows him and is
friendly to him, and has an interest in what he is trying to do, can make
all the difference between his success and his failure in his administra-
tive and executive operations.

If he has one Senator who is prepared to get up and defend him, and
stand up for him, other Members of the Senate are far more cautious, are
far slower to go after him or to attack him, are far more careful to get
the facts and to avoid possible injustice.

The reasons one Senator is of such great importance are not generally
understood by the American people or the business community. One reason
is that most of our great pieces of legislation are formulated and put
through the Senate by perhaps three, four, five, six, or seven Senators.
This makes a small group or even a single Senator potentially decisive on
crucial pieces of legislation. I like, therefore, to think that a small
group of this kind here today, such as your committee, if it wants to move
in and do a job on the organizing of the Congress, perhaps can get it done,
and not the Congress as a whole.

Now, I wish, Mr. Chairman, listening to Senator Mcohdy's comment just
now about the Banking and Currency Committee, on whose hearings I have
been spending most of my time this last month, and from membership on
which I so regretfully resigned from your own committee. I wish our great
business and trade associations saw this problem here in Congress in per-
spective. I wish they would interest themselves in it and would take some
real leadership on these acute problems, instead of concentrating their
efforts, as most of them do, on interests and testimony wholly within the
narrow sphere of what they conceive to be their immediate and selfish
business interests.

I congratulate Mr. Robert Heller of Cleveland, who is almost unique
among businessmen in the leadership he has tried to take in his studies
and efforts in this area, and I commend him to you as a possible witness
before you finish your hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator BENTON. Mr. Chairman, there were three reasons why I felt
qualified to come to testify today, perhaps better qualified than my
short service of 18 months in the Senate would indicate.

* "It is not necessary to hope in order to undertake or to succeed
in order to persevere."
First, as I am sure some of you know, I have had three previous jobs here in Washington; thus I have had the chance to observe the Congress from several vantage points.

Secondly, I have had experience in organizing, leading, and developing several businesses. Further, I spent 9 years as a part-time officer at one of our great universities. In business and education many problems are similar to those we face here. Further, the fact that I have only been here 18 months in the Senate, as I was telling Senator Monroney only yesterday, perhaps gives me even a sharper and more pointed focus on some of the questions that I want to discuss with you today than some of my seniors who have been here so long that they are not equally conscious of the extent of the problems, particularly for a newcomer.

I remember one of the young newspapermen who used to cover me last year, in my first year of the Senate - he commented on the many anecdotes and stories and fresh observations that I had for him during my first 6 months. When the time came when I did not have so many for him any more, he told me that I was getting laden. Thus, I think that with great experience in the Senate it is natural that Senators tend to forget the acuteness of some of these problems, or even to lose perspective on them.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will be accused in my State of self seeking, because of the many suggestions that I am going to make to you today. This fact perhaps puts me in a better position to advocate some of these proposed reforms than would be true of some other members of the Congress. It is the fear of this charge of self-seeking that has kept the Congress from legislating many of these reforms years ago.

Now, Mr. Chairman, compared to the high-level discussion just presented to you by Senator O'Mahoney, I am afraid that many of my ideas are going to seem to be low-level, indeed. However, it is my judgment that at the lower levels are these questions of efficiency determined. I happen to think that at some of these humblest levels rest many of the most important recommendations by your committee which, with your leadership, I hope can be put through the Congress.

I have often thought, Mr. Chairman, that the United States Senate, as a group, can only be called specialists in self-abuse. I have never seen a group of men who flagellate themselves under worse circumstances than our 96 Senators. Indeed, in view of the way we abuse ourselves and fail to take care of ourselves, it is amazing to me how successfully we operate and how well we do.

About the only perquisite that we give ourselves is a free haircut, and even there I suppose most of the Senators tip the barber about as much as it would cost them to go and buy the haircut. But if we didn't have that barbershop in the Capitol, how would we ever find time to get our hair cut at all?

I do not believe that ever in history was there such an important group doing such important work that treated itself so badly, when it has within its power to treat itself reasonably and to secure for itself the kinds of things that are indicated and required for greater efficiency.

I came to the Senate floor a month or two back after being up all night in an airplane, I had had hardly any sleep, and I was very tired. I discovered that there was not a place in the Capitol to take a nap, which I wanted to do in the afternoon while waiting for a vote.

That is the first time I personally have happened to have been willing to confess that I needed a nap since I have been in the Senate. But when I came into the Senate somebody checked up that I was 49 years old, and discovered that 75 of the men in the Senate were older than I, perhaps many Senators need naps more than I do, and I see some of them trying to occasionally get them on those ill-suited couches in the Senate cloakroom. This seems to me a very simple and humble illustration of how we fail to take care of ourselves and how we abuse ourselves.
Let me give you another. We in Congress have a doctor. I discovered that he is legislated into office for life. We must keep him for life, regardless of his competence or efficiency. He doesn't even have to try to be efficient. He doesn't even have to claim that he is any good. He doesn't have to take care of us, if he doesn't want to, because somebody at some past time put through a bill, and our doctor is the Senate's doctor for keeps.

I submit that no other group of men would inflict needless and potentially harmful discrimination against themselves.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came into the Senate my quarters were so crowded, my girls and staff people were so jammed together, that I went to a nearby hotel and rented a room at $200 a month. I had never had people around me, for whom I felt responsible, subjected to such working conditions, and I did not want them to have to put up with it.

I finally got a room down in the basement, only because I had friends on the Hill prior to coming into the Senate. This room was a privilege normally a new Senator would not get. The room is badly ventilated.

Mr. Chairman, I am ashamed, personally, against my background in the three businesses of which I am the owner, I am ashamed and humiliated at the kind of treatment that my people are given by me as a United States Senator. It is to me tragic that the United States Congress has not had the political courage to stand up and secure adequate quarters and demand adequate care of our people.

My staff is underpaid; it is overworked; it is only half the needed size, Mr. Chairman.

I cannot speak for other States and other Senators, but my State happens to have 2,000,000 population, and thus I am graded in the lowest group in the provisions of staff for a Senator. Yet my State is highly industrialized, and it is close by, and it is replete with educational institutions. It is acutely conscious of the great problems and issues with which the Federal Government is faced. The work-load in my office at a very minimum level is at least double what the staff I am provided with by Senate regulations can efficiently handle.

Now, fortunately I happen to have private resources. If I am willing to use them; I can go out and spend them to remedy that situation. I do spend them to remedy it. But there are a large number in the Senate who are not in that happy and fortunate position.

Our immediate and daily concern in my office is the problem of getting the heavy mail answered. We only attempt to answer part of it. We only attempt to answer that part within 3 or 4 days. We don't begin to hit this target.

We constantly get complaints that we are not adequately taking care of my mail, even though I employ, I think, at present, five or six special people on my own payroll to try to keep up with our work load.

Our failure to care adequately for our mail is not fair to the people who have elected me. Further, in my office we get these special inundations of mail, as all Senators do on special issues or questions, such as the recent MacArthur question. Such inundations can throw the whole office into relative chaos for a week or more. Every girl in my office had to drop everything for 2 or 3 days and do nothing but try to take care of the heavy mail growing out of General MacArthur's record.

Now, this question is terribly important so far as I am concerned. The mail I receive is sincere mail, and it comes from people who are worried, people who are upset, people who are distressed, people who are sitting at home at night worrying about their boys.

I had a letter yesterday from a neighbor of mine in Southport about her boy who was on the way to Korea after only 3 weeks in the Army. It is just wholly unjust, in my judgment, to the American people that we do not set ourselves up to take care of this enormously accelerating mail that has descended upon the Members of the Senate, at least from States like Connecticut. The mail is only one part of the greatly increased work.
Wow, as to services which should be made available, Mr. Chairman, there is a great opportunity to do much more in the form of general services for all of us as a group. A new Senator is particularly, conscious of this need and it is terribly difficult - perhaps Senators Monroney and Underwood who come here from the House with long background have not shared this experience - but certainly for me and for Senator Lehman, when we came in together last year - we had a difficult time finding out what was happening, and where we were, and what was expected of us, and when we tried to guide each other, we felt very much like the blind leading the blind.

It is of course a very great responsibility to advise a United States Senator. I am not necessarily speaking, however, in terms of advice.

As all of you on this committee know, we Senators don’t begin to get the advice individually that one would think from reading the papers. I have had only one telephone call from the White House about a legislative matter since I have been in the Senate.

As you know, we don’t get calls from the majority leader, or at least, I have never had one. We only infrequently have caucuses. Now the uncertainty and complexity of these problems, plus the great responsibility involved in giving advice to a Senator, keeps each of us from getting much advice individually.

So operating in an area, particularly the new man, where he is not getting much advice or leadership, it becomes in my judgment infinitely more important to provide certain types of services which he can go and ask and get information upon which he has a better chance to base an informed judgment.

At this point, I am not going to try to be more specific this morning, Mr. Chairman, except to pose the problem to you and your committee.

However, I might give one tiny illustration of a service that should be available for all of us, of a different kind and a humbler kind, about which I was talking to Senator Hayden about only yesterday. This service is facilities through our radio room to make motion-picture films for use in our television stations back in our States.

I have a television station back home that offers me time for a weekly report to the people of Connecticut, and I would like to make this report, but I am unable to get action to use the funds that our radio office has accumulated out of their radio work to purchase the needed equipment.

I agree my illustration is at a very low level, but I submit it to symbolize the problem on needed services.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that we try to set up pay and salary levels in the Congress to rival our business organizations. We cannot do that, we should not do it, and we don’t have to do it.

However, I do think that we should perhaps treat ourselves somewhat comparably to presidents of our leading private universities, or at least half as well as the leading universities treat their presidents. Let’s say that we take as a standard for a United States Senator half the standard which the members of the board of trustees of the University of Chicago set up for the chancellor of the University of Chicago. Perhaps that would not be an unfair yardstick.

I think that Senate salaries ought to be a minimum of $25,000 a year. Before I came into the Senate I worked with my predecessor, Senator Baldwin, and also with Senator Flanders, in trying to put through their bill to increase executives’ salaries. I sent hundreds of telegrams and I hoped that when that bill went through it would help form a backdrop against which Congress would have the political courage to raise its own salaries.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that many of my suggestions are not suitable at this time of crisis, when all of us must pull in our belts, and that it wouldn’t be suitable to double congressional salaries, for example, at a time we are setting up a Wage Stabilization Board, raising taxes, and asking all the American people to sacrifice. However, I think it is important for your committee to keep in mind the long-range objectives,
from the standpoint of how we want to set up the operations of Congress, and treat our Congressmen, while you are considering measures immediately applicable. If you know where we want to get over a period of years, this should have a bearing on decisions you reach for the immediate future.

Retirement allowances should be stepped up. On this problem of salaries and retirement allowances, I would like to refer to a friend of mine because he is no longer in the Senate, and because it was Senator La Follette who worked so brilliantly with the then Congressman Monroney in putting through the La Follette-Monroney Act. Senator La Follette was the first Senator whom I knew at all intimately, and he visited my home many times during his long term in the Senate, and I used to go up from Chicago to Madison to spend New Year's Eve with him. I still vividly recall the terrible gnawing worry of Senator and Mrs. La Follette over their financial problems caused by the terribly low salary scale and the lack of retirement provisions. The worry startled and upset me then, and I know today that it is still at the root of many of the most important worries that concern a very high percentage of Senators.

One of our colleagues, when he left for his campaign last fall, said to me, "Of one thing I am sure, I am not going to come back with a $9,000 deficit again. The last time it took me 4 years to pay it off and I am not going to have it again, even if it costs me my Senate seat. I can't again carry that burden of debt for 4 years."

Mr. Chairman, it is shocking to have men doing the most important work in the world carrying these kinds of burdens at such a level. Some Senators, after working nights all week, then get on sleepers over the week end to go half way across the country to make speeches in order to earn a $200 or a $250 fee to pay their rent and balance their household budget.

I don't at all agree with those who criticize the Congress for establishing a $2,500-expense allowance. The truth is, it is not big enough. Every business executive charges against his business moneys that he spends in the development of his business. By doing this, he does not pay a tax on these particular moneys. Every Congressman must spend more than $2,500 a year on expenses incident to his job.

The fact that we are allowed one trip back and forth to our States every year on Government expense, when the people of my State at least want me back there every Saturday and Sunday to tell them what is going on down here, seems to me to be patently absurd. I must average going back and forth from Connecticut 35 or 40 times a year at least. I surely would average this or better during the course of a calendar year if we stay in session for a full year as now seems possible.

There is an interesting article that was published not long ago, Mr. Chairman --

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, if I may interrupt you, just before you leave that subject, there are many of us who would like to go home to our States more often when Congress is in session on occasions where we might address large groups of our constituents in response to invitations that we receive to do so, but we cannot afford it. We cannot pay that expense.

Senator BENTON. I know that.

The CHAIRMAN. So some of us have found it necessary to adopt a policy of not accepting speaking engagements at home while Congress is in session. If you accept one, you take on some obligation to accept others.

Senator BENTON. You give me a new reason as to why perhaps Congress does not legislate more round-trip tickets. It had not occurred to me that there might be Members of the Senate who might be glad to have only one round trip a year, because it gives them a more valid excuse for telling their constituents that they cannot get home. Your comment helps to show how complicated and difficult it is to get some of these changes made. But from the standpoint of the public interest, the lack of a railroad or airplane ticket is not a valid reason for not being able to go home. Somebody must take the leadership, in my judgment, to make it possible for Congressmen who cannot afford tickets to go back and forth to their States.
Senator MOODY. Senator Benton, as one who has been doing considerable traveling back and forth, I would like to point out that it would be a rather unusual constituent who might accept an excuse like that, that you cannot afford it.

The CHAIRMAN. Off the record

(Discussion off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. Back on the record.

Senator BENTON. For the record, I say that it seems to me absurd for an Assistant Secretary of State to be able to get the secretaries and stenographers he needs to handle his mail, and for me not to be able to get them as a United States Senator. This same point applies right down the line to other differences that exist between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, in an article by Robert Heller in the New York Times for May 20 there are two or three interesting paragraphs dealing with retirement that perhaps you would let me give the stenographer to put in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done.

(The paragraphs referred to above are as follows:)

Finally, Congressmen's salaries should be raised and adequate pensions provided. Many Members of Congress, who know that when they complete their terms they will have less money than when they began, would rather swim the Potomac than introduce measures to correct the situation; that is simply because the Members of Congress are in the anomalous positions of being the only means by which their compensation can be increased. Part of this problem can be avoided.

If Congress would ask the Supreme Court to review its compensation the court would be within its constitutional authority in agreeing to do so. Its prestige and its independence of Congress are great enough to assure the objectivity of its review and public acceptance. In the event the Supreme Court would not take on the job, Congress should call on a carefully selected independent commission to analyze and evaluate the congressional job and determine the commensurate pay. This would be a logical basis on which to peg congressional salaries and pensions at the right level.

The objection will be made that with a general salary freeze in effect this is no time for Congress to consider defrosting its own compensation. This is not a valid argument. Congressional salaries and pensions should have been evaluated and raised long before the current wage freeze. The objective of raising congressional salaries and pensions would be to pay what the job is worth and insure that able men would not be deterred from seeking congressional office because compensation is so far below comparable levels in private business.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Senator BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I think that if Members of Congress were privileged to retire at full salary after a certain number of years of service, or at a given age, as are the Supreme Court Justices, they would perhaps voluntarily leave the Senate when they should retire, and that would be a good thing for them and for the Senate.

Congress passed a bill applying to Supreme Court Justices at the age of 70. I commend that approach to this committee as an important step forward.

My frank opinion is that any Senator - at any age - who has served for 12 years, or two terms in this body, should be entitled to the maximum. If Senators knew that they were assured that kind of treatment, I believe it
would give them greater courage in facing up to some of the so-called tough votes, those votes upon which we Senators often think our victory or defeat depend.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think if such a provision were made for us that we would not be under the political pressure, that we would be more free and would feel more free to vote our deep convictions, rather than to think, "Well, if I vote this or that way, I am going to incur the displeasure, maybe, of this group or that group?"

Senator BENTON. I firmly believe that, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to give you two illustrations out of last year's session. These deal with the President's vetoes. They were what are called tough votes. They help show how much of the waste and the high cost of our Government is attributable to the Congress, and is much more attributable to the Congress than is generally supposed, and much less to the administration.

These two illustrations deal with the President's veto of the Spanish-American War veterans' bill, by which these veterans were to get free medical service for the rest of their lives, regardless of the cause of their illness.

Now, there were only three Members of the Senate who supported the President on that veto. That was a tough vote. It was tough because if you supported the veto you risked arousing the veterans against you back in your State. In close States, like Connecticut, where I won by 1,102 votes, that 1 vote, out of 200 votes during 1950, could cost a man his seat.

Senator Byrd, with his great leadership in the field of economy, did not vote to sustain the President's veto. Senator Robertson, his colleague, was one of the three, and I was another one, and Senator Ellender was the third. We were the only three who stood up on this particular issue. Three out of ninety-six.

Perhaps even a better illustration is that of the postal clerks. I hope I am betraying no confidence when I say that my State chairman was very much distressed when I voted to uphold the President's veto on their bill which gave seniority rights to the veterans who had become postal clerks after the war - rights we did not award veterans in other Federal departments. I agree the postal clerks are underpaid. Their pay should be raised and at once. But I agreed with the President this wasn't the way to do it.

Senators Taft, Millikin, and most others running for office did not vote to sustain the President's veto of this bill. That bill would have ultimately cost, according to Senator Humphrey's statement, $452 million. It would have cost many times that, applied to all Federal employees.

I believe that half the Senators who supported the President on this veto were southern Senators - who prevented that $452 million from being spent - were southern Senators who, to us northerners, seem reasonably secure and safe in their seats, and in this case it was perhaps due to their sense of security that the President's veto was upheld.

Now, on vote after vote we Senators have these pressures of the kind that Senator O'Mahoney and Senator Moody were discussing, represented by the business groups even more dramatically than by an underpaid and undernourished group like the postal clerks, and I had the privilege of being a member of your committee last year, we Senators felt them on issue after issue on the Hoover reorganization proposals - as the vested interests would come in and make their pressures felt.

These pressures and these tough votes give a great sense of insecurity to men running for office. If the men do not have independent financial resources and their reelection is important to them financially, it is surely not to be wondered at if these pressures are felt even more strongly.

The postal clerk issue alone, in the judgment of some of my associates in Connecticut, could have involved two, three, or four thousand votes, and
yet I went in by only 1,102 votes. You can see why my State chairman was
distressed that I upheld the President on that issue. I cite this as an
argument for a liberal retirement and pension plan for Congressmen. I
think such a plan would cost the taxpayers pennies, in contrast to the
millions or billions that would be saved if the Members of the United
States Congress were better able to withstand the pressures of the busi-
ness groups and others who are advocating policies which make for ex-
travagance and inefficiency in the Federal Government. Such pressures
can come from the bankers, Mr. Chairman, as they did last year on our
Reorganization Plan No. 1 to reform the Treasury Department. Practically
all groups in the economy are organized along the lines Senator O'Mahoney
described at the beginning of his testimony. There are at least 3,000
trade organizations representing various business groups.

Now, if I could take just another 4 or 5 minutes --

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead, Senator.

Senator BENTON. I would like to make a few quick comments on some
of these topics which your agenda shows are going to come before you.

The CHAIRMAN. I would be glad if you would. I might say this, that
since the Senate is not in session today and we have two or three other
witnesses scheduled for today, that I intend to resume the hearings after
lunch.

Senator BENTON. I am almost through with my suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right. We were going to wait until you
had finished, but I might make that announcement now, that I intend to re-
sume the hearings this afternoon in order to accommodate those who were
scheduled to testify today.

Senator BENTON. I shall pick those topics from your agenda on your
proposed hearings where I may have some observations of special interest.
On most of these topics you will have more qualified witnesses than I, and
men with more experience. On your first point, the committee structure and
operation of the Congress, I would like to suggest that it be either a rule
of the Senate or of both parties that no first-term Senator shall be per-
mitted to go on two major committees before each first-term Senator is
given one major committee. Here on this committee we have men of the talent
and experience of Senator Monroney coming in with long years out of the
House, who has not been assigned to a so-called major committee. Let me
take my own case. When I came in in December of 1949 I was not able to go
on a major committee. I wasn't put on one after I was elected in November
of 1950. Mr. Chairman, you know what is called a major committee. I per-
sonally think the Committee on Expenditures Is a major committee, but it
is not listed in our organizational structure as such a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say originally it had no marks of major importance
at all, or jurisdiction, when I first came to the Senate, and was assigned
to this committee. That was before the Reorganization Act. During the 4
years I was here before the reorganization bill was passed, this committee
met but twice.

Senator BENTON. Well, only meeting twice a year, there was a good
reason that any Senator could be on it, no matter what other committee he
was on. It was not major.

The CHAIRMAN. That was before the Reorganization Act, and before our
jurisdiction was broadened.

Senator BENTON. Yes. But I was in the Senate 18 months before I was
put on the Banking and Currency Committee.

I am not betraying any confidences on the Banking and Currency hearings
of the past months when I say that Senator Moody and I were the most regular
in attendance of the Democrats, whereas our four senior members have been so
busy with so many other assignments that they have been their relatively
little, though the Defense Production Act under review, of course, is one of
the most important pieces of legislation before the Congress.
Senator MOODY. If I may interrupt you just a moment, as an illustration the clerk of the committee just came up to me and said quietly that Senator O'Mahoney was now testifying before the Banking and Currency Committee and they wanted me to go down there. That shows the problem of being in two places at one time. I am going to ask to be excused, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Before I go, I would like to say to the Senator that while I do not agree with everything that you have said, I think that your statement this morning reflects the great courage which is typical of the Senator from Connecticut.

Senator BENJON. Perhaps it is easier to have courage when one feels that he has a position of security either in or out of the Senate. I think that feeling is one we should try to develop for all members of the United States Senate. The cost to the American taxpayer would be infinitesimal compared to the reward.

Senator UNDERWOOD. Are you intending to make any mention of the difficulties that we are having in having two committees meet at one time?

Senator BENJON. I was not going to mention that. That is a very good point.

Senator UNDERWOOD. Since Senator Moody brought it up, I think that is one of the things that concerns me more about the work than anything I have seen. I just wondered if you had any suggestions as to that.

Senator BENJON. I know sometimes it is unavoidable, Senator Underwood, and I did not expect to elaborate on this question specifically, but manifestly a new Senator who is not yet spread thin is in a better position to attend committee meetings than some of the older Senators who are spread so thin that it is often impossible to get to meetings. Senator Moody and I have illustrated this during the past month in our attendance at the Banking and Currency Committee hearings.

Senator UNDERWOOD. I was wondering if there would be some way of not meeting at exactly the same time. Now, this committee has been meeting at the same time as the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which has been having hearings on postal mail rates and pay raises. I imagine there are many other committees that are meeting at the same time.

Senator BENJON. If we had better central services of the kind I advocate, they could contribute at least to minimizing such conflicts. There is not enough thought being given to questions such as this.

The CHAIRMAN. On that point, Senator, I would like to have you comment on the suggestion of Senator Ferguson, which I am sure is something we have all thought about, and that is to alternate Senate sessions and committee sessions. In other words, have the Senate meet one day, meet earlier and try to do as much work in that one day as it would normally do in two now, and give one completely free for committee meetings.

Senator BENJON. I like that kind of idea very much, Mr. Chairman. I have not explored all the implications of this one. Offhand, it sounds very good.

The article of Robert Heller's to which I have previously referred starts off:

If Henry Clay or Daniel Webster could walk into the United States Senate today, they would find startling changes, but one thing would be familiar - the way Congress operates.

That is an interesting line to illustrate that we must examine new procedure in line with these tremendous expanding responsibilities on ourselves as individuals.

My suggestion that no first-term Senator get two major committees before each first-term Senator gets one is my compromise with the seniority system. That system is very widely criticized throughout the country, but my observations in the Senate have led me to conclude that there is not any
reasonably good alternative for it. I yield to it albeit reluctantly because I have not yet been able to think of an alternative system that promises to work better. But I don't believe the seniority system should be rigorously applied to the extent that it is to first-term Senators. Merely because one Senator comes 1 year earlier or 2 years earlier, I don't believe he should get two important major committee assignments at the expense of a still newer Senator who may have unusual qualifications in his own right. If I were a member of your committee I would examine the seniority system as to how to relax it somewhat, particularly as it is applied to new Senators, and adjust it in a common-sense way to our problems and our opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I have already commented on the second point on your agenda, the staffing of the Congress. I have told you I think the staffing should be greatly stepped up.

As to your third point, the workload of the Congress, Mr. Chairman, I must say that it does seem absurd to a man coming out of business, who is accustomed to delegating responsibility and to organizing his work to rid himself of the least important work, it does seem ridiculous to view the spectacle of these private bills going through the Congress and taking the time they do, when a lot of them, in my judgment, ought to be delegated with appropriate powers to the administrative departments. Equally ridiculous, of course, is this problem of running the city of Washington through congressional committees.

In Congress we treat these residents of Washington as though they were some kind of queer fish who need special supervision and who need special feeding. It seems to me insulting to the residents of the city. I am told that we have 5,000 congressional man-hours consumed each year in the consideration of Washington, D. C., business.

If there is one easy, quick thing to make for congressional efficiency, it is this home-rule bill.

Mr. Chairman, skipping to page 2 of your agenda, on the registration of lobbyists, I think that the law ought to be tightened up a great deal on lobbyists. For example, lobbyists ought to be required, to the maximum extent possible, to disclose what campaign contributions they make personally, or their organizations make, or the men whom they represent are making.

The single most difficult problem I have run into since being in the Senate is the question of campaign contributions - of raising money to finance my campaign. I am going to testify at some length before Senator Douglas' committee on this problem when his committee begins hearings on the subject of ethics and morals in politics.

It is my observation that how money is raised for political campaigns lies at the root of some of the corrupting or inethical or immoral practices which develop within our system of government.

I expect to elaborate on this more fully in a subsequent statement which, with your permission, I would like to send to your committee at that time and make a part of the record of your own hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to receive it at that time.

Senator BENTON. These lobbyists operate under umbrellas that are very leaky, Mr. Chairman, and the problem is, how do you fix these leaks and tighten up on the lobbyists' operation? Or at least, to the point so that we will know what is going on, so that their operations will be out in the open so that we can see then. They are not out in the open right now.

As a current illustration, I refer you to my efforts on television, last week I put in a bill with Senators Bricker, Saltonstall, and Hunt, dealing with the Federal Communications Commission and proposing setting up a so-called citizens' advisory board to help provide an annual review of standards for radio and television.

This town is full of lawyers and others representing the commercial interests in radio and television. The great commercial interests employ
perhaps half the big law firms of the country, or maybe more, for all I know. The consequent pressures on the commercial side are tremendous. The pressures on the side of the public, in the public interest, to keep television from going the way of radio broadcasting, right down the road of complete commercialization, are hardly discernible. This illustration may help show why I would like to have us in Congress know better, and in better focus and perspective, who these lobbyists are and what they are doing, and perhaps greatly broaden the definition of what constitutes a lobbyist. If you are an ex-chairman of one of our Federal bodies here in Washington and you start collecting big fees from American industry, it seems to me you can be persuaded to be influential in your effect not only on the Congress but on the administrative bodies that the Congress has set up.

My last subject, Mr. Chairman, is your item of public relations of Congress. Now, this question is made doubly acute by the Communist propaganda. The Communist propaganda, as an essential part of its dogma and doctrine, contains the aim of destroying the confidence of our people and all peoples throughout the world in democratic processes and in the operations of our Congress.

Yes, our Congress is a major target and butt of Communist propaganda in every country of the world, including the United States.

The American Communist Party has achieved major success in infiltrating into the media of communications in this country. Some of our great magazines have had problems, as I know, from their owners and editors, through Communist infiltration on their staffs. We know this infiltration has happened in Hollywood, and we see its results in some of the Broadway plays.

A major aim of this infiltration and of this propaganda of the Communist Party is to destroy public confidence in the operations of Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not suggest that I know what to do about this. I don't claim I know how to handle the public relations of Congress. This is a very delicate and difficult subject. Assuredly, we don't want to hire a lot of publicity men to publicize Congress, and this would be unsuitable and not in the American tradition.

How to handle television and radio in conjunction with the operations of Congress I have not figured out. But I do know that a company of which I am a partial owner, the Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc., in conjunction with the University of Chicago, has been employed by the Federal Reserve Board to make a picture showing the operations of the Board, and this film is going to be shown in schools throughout the country.

The Atomic Energy Commission has also employed that company to make a motion picture that will be shown in schools throughout this country.

I wish that Congress had a good motion picture, an educational picture, made under the direction of one of our great universities and laid out by distinguished political scientists - a picture that would show how Congress operates, a picture that could be shown throughout the schools of this country.

I cite this merely as an example to show what I think is appropriate, as against what I feel is inappropriate, wholly inappropriate are public relations in the orthodox tradition of Broadway and Hollywood publicity men.

I suggest - and this is the only concrete approach I have thought of - that the subject of the public relations of Congress be turned over to the Joint Library Committee, of which I am now a member, although I only attended one meeting, but it seems to me this is the kind of committee - and the Library of Congress the kind of institution - which could most suitably devote itself to a study of this whole problem of the so-called public relations of the United States Congress, at an educational level rather than at a publicity level. I give your committee this idea for whatever value or interest it may have to you.
Mr. Chairman, I have presented to your committee this morning a miscellaneous assortment of ideas which, at least, have the value of being concrete and specific. You have been very courteous as always, I would not have appeared before you if I had not thought that this subject on which you are embarking today is one of the most important subjects, not only for this Congress, but for every Congress, and if I had not had a long background of interest in it.

The CHAIRMAN. As Senator Moody said, while we may not agree with you completely on every point that you have discussed, still you have given us a number of ideas here that certainly merit consideration. Some of them are within the common knowledge of all of us to justify the position that you have taken. As chairman of the committee, and I know all the members of the committee, personally appreciate your coming in here in this frank way, dealing with problems that may be small compared to some of the greater ones, but several small ones make a big one and I am very grateful to you for your presentation, Senator.

Senator BETTON. Mr. Chairman, you encouraged me when I was a member of your committee and I was grateful to you then. I am again grateful to you for your encouragement this morning.

Senator MOWEONEY. I would like to repeat what the chairman said. We do appreciate your ideas.

Senator BETTON. Thank you. I appreciate your comment the more because you are an expert in this field.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

The committee will stand in recess until 2:15. I hope the members will agree with me that we should try to keep up with our schedule if we can.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 2:15 p.m. this same day.)