

a motion it is under investigation, so I think the committee can well protect Members in this field.

Analogous in the Senate, they did not put anything in theirs about being under oath and in writing and Members submitting it to the committee. If you remember in the last days of the last session of Congress, I am not perhaps the most belligerent Member of Congress available to carry on this kind of fight, but with the assistance of some stalwart men on both sides of the aisle, we were able to make a case, but we were under heavy attack from people who said this was an immolation committee and something to destroy Members of Congress and all kinds of protection should be set up to keep down this abuse, and, of course, there is no Member of Congress probably that has said—I will put it this way. As far as I am concerned, if I go back on this committee, I don't know whether I would or not, I have never said an adverse thing about any Member of Congress either privately or publicly and I am certainly not anxious to see anybody hurt.

All I want to do is help raise the standards of Congress analogous to the grievance committee and the bar, known by its anonymity, not publicity. It is known by its effort to prevent rather than its penalization of individuals.

So I think these provisions are entirely unnecessary and I would welcome them being stricken by the Rules Committee if it wants to do so, because I think it is a weakness I think it would be good to strike it, but if it makes some of the apprehensive Members of Congress happier, well, it is a rule which we could live with and we are not anxious to do anything but help, not to hurt.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, one other question, Mr. Bennett, in regard to protection of the Members of the Congress themselves.

The resolution reported by the Rules Committee last fall required a two-thirds vote, two-thirds of the total membership, eight of the 12 members, for a report or a censure of a Member to the House.

Now, as I read your resolution, it would require a simple majority?

Mr. BENNETT. That is true only because the House itself in working its will on this bill did this. You see, in other words, this resolution you have before you today has had only one thing done to it other than what the House did to it last fall.

The only thing done to it is to allow resolutions of censorship to be presented in proper cases for action by the House of Representatives. That was the only thing added. It was my thought and the committee's thought that the House had worked its feeling about what the House had decided.

As far as I am concerned, and I guess as far as the other members are concerned, the two-third requirement is not unusual. I said repeatedly in the hearings of this committee I hoped this committee could be a unanimous committee; I hoped that, there is no rule about that.

I hope we can do that. I served under Mr. Vinson for many years in the Armed Services Committee. That was his rule—we did not bring out things unless they came out unanimously. Of course, you cannot always do that, but you can have that as a goal, so I think two-thirds would not be a difficult thing to live with at all.