

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE  
ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on July 29 and 31, and August 1 and 2.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND  
FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been told by some that this is one of the most important bills that will come before this session of Congress. I am, of course, referring to the bill before us this afternoon to spend \$1,300,000 in connection with the transition of one President to private life and the indoctrination of a new President.

Does not the gentleman want to be here to take care of the Presidents, present and future? It is a very important bill, or at least so I am told.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT  
OF 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy at all on this rule and I reserve the balance of my time insofar as the rule is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

"REAL MADE IN HOUSE ON COTTON, ARKAS AID"

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert a newspaper article at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was rather shocked this morning to read an article in the newspaper to the effect that a deal was being made in the House on the cotton and the area redevelopment bills. It is quite a lengthy article, but I am going to read the first two paragraphs:

A North-South political trade finally moved the long-stalled cotton bill out of the House Rules Committee yesterday.

The committee voted to let the cotton bill go to the House floor after Southern Democrats—

And I am one of them—

Agreed to support depressed areas legislation that they helped to defeat last month.

I just wonder what we are coming to around here. Primarily I want to absolve the Rules Committee from any participation in any such outrageous trade if it took place.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I read the article to which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has made reference. The article, if it purports to cover anything that the leadership has said or done, is entirely false. No such deal has been made and certainly the leadership has been no party to any such deal.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am delighted to hear that. What I wanted to say is that the Rules Committee is certainly no party to any such deal. So far as the Rules Committee is concerned this bill was reported in the regular way. If there was any such trading going on here the Rules Committee did not know anything about it. Certainly it was never mentioned or considered in any way, shape or form by the Committee on Rules. And I can assure you that I know the members of that committee so well that I do not believe the rule could have gotten out under any such kind of conditions if they had known about it.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to get the statement from the majority leader, I am glad to know that he is not a party to this arrangement. As a matter of fact, I had heard about it before the Rules Committee acted and I could not believe it. I was assured on authority that I thought was ample that there was no relationship between the two bills. But I did notice in this article a very strange sort of quick; that is, that the cotton bill will not be called up until after the area redevelopment bill is first acted upon. That is a very unusual thing because I do not know whether the area redevelopment bill will ever come up. The area redevelopment bill is still in committee. I am sure everybody here remembers that the area redevelopment bill was here once this year and was defeated on a rollcall vote by this House. It is very unusual that we should have voted on a bill once in this House and defeated it on a rollcall vote, after due deliberation and debate, and then have it come back here again in the same session, almost within the same month, and that we would be asked to pass upon it again.

This is a quid pro quo deal. Trading one bill for another.

Just how is it going to be arranged that the quid must come before the quo? How is it going to be arranged that the cotton bill shall not be voted upon until after the quid pro quo votes have been delivered on the area redevelopment bill? Maybe somebody can inform me about that. You know, it so happens that the Rules Committee has a little something to do about when these bills come to the floor. I want to assure you that if there is any such deal going on or has gone on, I am going to use what little finagling and delaying, and so forth, that I can bring to pass on this situation to see that that does not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I resent this article.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I resent this article because it puts every Member of the House on the spot. Some Members may want to change their vote one way or the other, on account of changed conditions or changed provisions of the bill. But he will be subject to criticism, he will be subject to chastise, any Member that changes his vote. It has placed every Member of this House—and some Members may have good reason to change their votes—I do not know what they might be; it seems to me to have thrashed this thing out once—because every Member is under suspicion now on until this matter is disposed of, and I hope it will be disposed of quickly.

They say that the southern boys are this, the southern Members. Yes, boys, we southern boys are pretty good old horse traders. I was raised to be a pretty good horse trader myself. When I take a horse trade I want to get equal value. Here this accuses our southern boys of being so soft-headed that we are going to trade off a thing that we are not for, in the appropriation of the taxpayer's money and our taxpayers' money, of \$450 million, and what are we going to get in return? They are going to trade us an old, broken-down, windbroken, and spavined horse for \$250 million in a cotton deal. Is that what we are going to do around here if we are going to make a trade?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I always yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I am certain the gentleman is one of the best horse traders in the country. I think he is trying to make a trade now. I think he is trying to use an article which has no foundation so far as I know to make it impossible for Members for good reason to vote for either of these bills.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I appreciate the compliment of my good friend. I know one coming from him is more valuable than one coming from most everybody else. I admit I am a pretty good horse trader. I admit I am opposed to the area redevelopment bill. I further admit I am going to do anything I can

to help defeat it. If that is horse trading, then I am a horse trader.

I am going to say one other thing. There was another newspaper article that I saw this morning which was published yesterday morning in a newspaper from another State. It mentioned the name of one of my colleagues in this House to whom I am very much devoted, but it told a story that ought to be corrected.

Gentlemen, I hope that this House has not dropped down to the point where we sit around here trading off our taxpayers' money just to pass a bill.

The Speaker, the article to which I referred earlier is as follows:

Next Man in House on Cotton, Texas Aid (By Julius DuBois)

A North-South political trade finally broke the long-stalled cotton bill out of the House Rules Committee yesterday.

The committee voted to let the cotton bill go to the House floor after southern Democrats agreed to support depressed areas programs that they helped to defeat last year.

When Democrats and Republicans who had been opposed to the cotton bill have in turn agreed to support it in exchange for southern backing of the depressed areas program.

It is this morning probably will push the cotton bill through the House, but it is not clear whether the House will pass the cotton legislation.

It is not clear whether the House will be able to pass the depressed areas program. Democratic leaders ask for a vote on the cotton legislation.

The cotton bill was defeated by a vote of 203 to 231. A bill that would have provided \$100 million in additional funds for the Federal Government Administration.

It was 2 years ago as one of the first bills introduced by the Kennedy administration. It had been badly defeated in the House.

The bill was defeated in the House. It had been badly defeated in the House. The charges were made by the supporters of the bill.

It was approved by a vote of 65 to 30 on July 20. Since then the White House and Democratic House leaders have been trying to find a way to resurrect the bill in the House.

The cotton bill seemed to be the best vehicle because the 20 Southern Democrats who supported the depressed areas program when it was enacted in 1961 and then opposed it in June included several influential members who desperately want a cotton bill.

Among them are Chairman HAROLD D. COCKLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, of the House Agriculture Committee, and Representative THOMAS G. AMBURNETT, Democrat, of Mississippi, a senior committee member.

Next Monday the House Banking Committee is scheduled to take up the depressed areas program again. The committee is expected to approve a slightly modified version of the legislation as it was passed by the Senate.

The cotton bill, which has been the subject of controversy for more than 6 months, would make it possible for domestic textile mills to buy American cotton at the same price it is marketed abroad.

AN 8 1/2-CENT SUBSIDY

Now U.S. cotton sells for 24 1/2 cents a pound in foreign markets and for 32 1/2 cents in the United States because of an 8 1/2-cent subsidy paid to exporters. Without the subsidy American cotton could not compete with lower price cotton produced in other countries.

The proposed legislation would subsidize domestic as well as foreign sales of cotton.

The legislation has run into opposition from Congressmen who question the wisdom of piling another subsidy on top of the subsidies already paid cotton farmers through the 32 1/2-cent-a-pound Government price guarantee.

Also complicating the outlook for the legislation is a proposal in it allowing cotton farmers to increase their production if they are willing to market the additional cotton at the lower world market prices.

This proposal, which was put into the bill at the insistence of efficient Western producers, would provide for greater cotton production when there already is a large surplus of American cotton.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to speak out of order, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, crisis is piling upon crisis, one of our more astute political writers, the versatile and brilliant William S. White, suggested the other day. While we are in the midst of a second racial revolution, not unlike the 1860's, we are faced with a grave economic problem involving the railroads and a threatened nationwide strike, which would create chaos throughout the country.

With these two major problems hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles, we should not forget another great issue, which involves not only our generation, but our children's and their children's. I speak of the threatened degradation of the ethical and moral responsibilities which have been the guiding principles for our Nation since its beginning.

There are apparent and obvious examples of this possible deterioration of community responsibility standards.

First, I refer to an announcement by the Federal Bureau of Investigation last week, reporting that crime in general, ranging from thefts to murder, was up 6 percent in 1962 over 1961. Every category of major crime, with the exception of murder, showed a substantial increase. The FBI report said that crime had increased four times faster than population in the past 5 years. A portion of the report—based on surveys from local police departments, that should disturb every decent and law-abiding adult in the Nation—was concerned with the increase in crime among those only 18 years of age.

In this category, arrests were up a staggering 9 percent. In fact, more than half the arrests made in communities of over 2,500 for burglaries, thefts, and auto thefts were of persons under 18.

Second, for a period of years the Supreme Court has handed down decisions which are spelling the destruction

of our ethical and moral standards in the United States. The Supreme Court has created ambiguities when they did not exist and its decisions have had in many cases little justification as enunciation of existing law. The Court has not looked at the legislative intent of our basic laws, for example, in its interpretation of the 14th amendment and integration of schools. The Court has made it easier to be a Communist without apprehension; and habitual criminals escape laws which Congress has enacted, because of decisions distorting our Bills of Rights.

The recent prayer and Bible decisions by the Supreme Court should have been decided on the legal principle, de minimis non curat lex, that is, that the law does not cure small or trifling matters. The complaint of the parties involved, it seems to me, was insignificant. There seemed to be no substantial injury to those who brought suit in both the prayer and Bible cases.

However, I am certain the general public suffers from these decisions. The major responsibilities for moral and ethical teaching now are placed on the home and the church. There now is substantial training in social behavior taught in the home. But, in our modern society, in many cases, both parents work, and there are split families, which leaves a definite vacuum in moral training. This is something we must be cognizant of today and in the future. Woodrow Wilson said it with clarity: "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is vitally necessary to provide legislation for Federal assistance for the establishment of proper ethical and social behavior standards. I have introduced today a bill which sets forth these ideas. This bill should not be objectionable to the atheist or the agnostic. As a practical matter, I believe lectures could be prepared and taught at appropriate levels in our schools. In connection with this, texts could be written with the objective of crime prevention. Take, for example, the field of stealing and its various ramifications. The statutes designed to prevent theft rest on basic moral and ethical standards, and instruction in these statutes and the principles underlying them would have very substantial influences for improved social behavior.

We cannot escape the fact that what we believe in is directly tied to what we do in life. Rousseau described the role those of us in Congress should aspire to: "Those who treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other." Louis W. Cabot of the Cabot Corp., in Boston, said recently, "to maintain public confidence, business must pursue higher standards of ethical conduct more vigorously than ever."

Whatever we do, whatever our children grow up to be, should be based on proper lessons of moral and ethical behavior.

This bill I have introduced provides Federal assistance in a field which needs our urgent attention today. Some of the present crisis is the responsibility of the national level of government; and any

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15

solutions that may be found will definitely benefit the Nation as a whole, as well as the States and their subdivisions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, last week when a great Georgian, a distinguished American, reached the milestone of passing the record for continuous service in this House established by any other previous Member, his own colleagues from Georgia were unavoidably absent attending a conference in Georgia called by the Governor of Georgia dealing with matters affecting all of us, at which, after discussion with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and others, it was decided that our presence in Georgia was required. Since we were not here to join in the splendid and deserved tributes to the near incredible record established by our dear friend, CARL VINSON, I wonder if the House would indulge me one moment, the opportunity to say publicly something not about the record of Mr. VINSON but about the man, CARL VINSON, as I have come to know him in the 11 years that it has been my privilege to serve here.

When I came to the Congress in 1953, I had never met Mr. VINSON. I must confess that as I prepared to go to his office to meet him I experienced a sort of nervous elation similar to the way I felt when my father carried me to meet another great Georgian, Ty Cobb, when I was a very young boy. But despite that nervousness and apprehension on meeting a man who already, at that time 10 years ago, had established a record for greatness in America—all nervousness disappeared instantly when, as I entered his office, he arose and greeted me with a warmth and a welcome usually reserved for only warm, personal and intimate friends. From that moment to this day, I have found CARL VINSON'S friendship not only delightful and valuable, but I have learned through this association with him that he has many magnificent qualities not given to all people in public life and one of those qualities is this. I believe he as much as any man alive has the courage to do things which he thinks are best for democracy regardless of what it may mean in the light of a present political situation. I am glad I have had the privilege of knowing him these 10 years. I confess I have developed a near parental affection for the friendship he has allowed me to enjoy with him.

I congratulate the people of Georgia for providing our colleague, CARL VINSON, the opportunity to serve his Nation and the world for half a century during a period of unparalleled progress in world history. I join them, as I know all of you join us, in hoping that the years in the future will be marked by the continued success and service of this great Georgian and distinguished American. I am happy to have this opportunity to ex-

press publicly my admiration for his record and my esteem and affection for the man.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK].

(Mr. TUCK asked and was given permission to speak out of the regular order.)

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the impending strike against the public. I believe in collective bargaining.

I recognize the fact that the right to strike is the principle weapon of labor unions. The worker should not be deprived of his most valuable weapon, but I do not now and never have regarded the right to strike as absolute. There should and must be some limitations if we are to preserve public safety and promote our national defense.

No man, no set of men have a right to weld themselves together in such fashion as to bring suffering upon the innocent public. It has come down to us through hundreds of years of civilization that public safety is the paramount function of law. No man has a right to strike against the public security.

These nationwide strikes in essential public utilities such as the threatened railroad strike, are contrary to the public interest and ought not to be tolerated. Persons employed in public utility companies are quasi-public officials. They should recognize at the inception of, in an emergency, their employment that the responsibility to stay at their post of duty until suitable relief can be obtained is a compelling one. Their employment to a large extent may be likened to the employment of city fire and police departments, for a strike such as these railroad unions are about to inaugurate on a nationwide scale could be even more disastrous than the strike of the police or fire department in a single city.

Professional doctors and nurses in both our public and private health services recognize these responsibilities. Irrespective of whatever working conditions may arise at their hospitals or places of employment, we have never heard of them uniting to strike. If doctors and nurses formed a union amongst themselves and went on strike, ignoring the suffering and dying patients in hospitals, as well as those outside, we know that the wrath of the public would speedily correct such a situation.

We recognize in this country that every man has the right to self-defense. But however strong the provocation, we also recognize that no man has the right to hurl a missile at his antagonist if that missile endangers the safety of an innocent bystander. In such a situation as the proposed railroad strike, the United States of America may lie prostrate and be powerless to defend itself against its enemies, foreign and domestic. Likewise, our economy may be upset to such an extent as to accuse men, women, and children to suffer.

The unbridled right to strike is the shibboleth of the labor unions. It is a false and spurious doctrine to claim that such a right cannot be restrained. We must repudiate such preachments. We

must prevent these power-drunk union tyrants and modern-day Samsons, blinded with their fury and wrath, from pulling down the two pillars of the temple, thus destroying the people and themselves alike.

The problems of the country and of the world today arise largely because we have too many men in high public office whose concern for the public good is subordinated to their desire for reelection to public office, and thus for political purposes they cater to this or that organized group.

The "Profiles in Courage" about which we have read so much should be proliferated and projected down to meet the present-day problems, such as the menacing railroad situation that confronts us today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, following precedent, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York and ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON LEGISLATION TO PERMIT PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC PLACES

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware that every Member of the House knows that I have placed a petition at the desk to bring before the House a constitutional amendment that would permit prayer in all public schools and in all public places. That petition has been at the desk now for the past 2 weeks. The signatures are moving up gradually.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the not too far distant future we will secure enough signatures to bring that matter before the House. However, I know because of questions that have been asked of me that there are 47 Members who have introduced resolutions providing for a constitutional amendment such as mine and that the wording of these constitutional amendments is in many different forms.

Mr. Speaker, I announced last week that I was going to ask for a meeting of the 47 Members and sit down and discuss the method of writing one particular amendment that could be agreed upon by these 47 Members so that an amendment can then come before the House under an open rule as provided in my discharge petition, which will meet the approval of these 47 Members, and substitute it for House Joint Resolution 9.

After the meeting of these Members, six Members were appointed and asked to serve on the committee, with legislative counsel.

This is a bipartisan committee made up of the following Democrats and Republicans: Mr. BARKING of Nevada, a Democrat, Mr. LATTA of Ohio, a Republican, Mr. KORNGAY of North Carolina, a Democrat, Mr. CRAMER of Florida, a Republican, Mr. FUGUA of Florida, a Democrat, and myself from New York, a Republican.

I hope that, given a couple of weeks time, we may come up with a satisfactory amendment which we can all support.

12624

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25

May I also say to the Members of the House and those who have been reluctant to sign discharge petitions, that if we can agree, I would ask every Member, to please, at the very earliest possible moment, sign this petition so that this matter may come before the House.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for his efforts on behalf of the bill he has introduced and in which many of us are deeply interested.

I would like to inform the Members of the House that this is one of the most important matters which we ought to be considering this year. It is of great importance to this country's welfare because it goes to the very root of our freedom and the very structure of our political system. We are a nation that is built upon a foundation of faith in God, we are a nation that has grown strong because of our faith in God, we are a nation that has liberties beyond those enjoyed by other countries because of our faith in God and because we believe God has created us in His image and has endowed us with these rights.

We must not be weakened in proportion to the discouragement of that faith if we do not allow that faith to be strengthened.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I am heartened by the fact that the other body has indicated it is going to take like steps in this matter before the other body can get it on its way.

It is not a matter of signing a discharge petition or signing a discharge petition on a piece of legislation that has come before the House at any time. A constitutional amendment must be passed by the Congress, then forwarded to the 38 States and ratified by three-fourths of the States. This takes time. We have little time to spare.

I think the other day that other cases are pending in the courts. I have here a copy of an article dated June 26 announcing that the American Civil Liberties Union was taking up a case in the California courts now to eliminate "under God" from the pledge of allegiance to the flag. This was put in there by an act of Congress in 1954.

Above the Speaker's rostrum appears "In God We Trust," put there by our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [JOHN MCCORMACK]. This is another case that will come before the courts, to take this off our coins and currency and other places.

I include as part of my remarks the following article previously referred to:

[From the New York Times]

**FACTS ABOUT AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES SUIT**  
LOS ANGELES, June 20.—The American Civil Liberties Union filed suit in superior court (June 19) to eliminate "under God" from the pledge of allegiance to the flag, as recited in the Los Angeles school system.

The suit asserted that the phrase, added to the pledge by Congress in 1954, violated the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion.

The action was prepared by the ACLU regional office on behalf of a history teacher in the Los Angeles schools (George Washington High School).

The Los Angeles Board of Education was named as defendant.

The teacher said:

"It's a matter of conscience with me. I think the phrase is out of place there. I am not an atheist and I am not an agnostic."

The teacher said he had permitted his classes to recite the pledge while he stepped out into the hall. This, he said, might subject him to dismissal and he sponsored the suit to protect his rights.

Mr. Speaker, I say we should act now to amend the Constitution so that we do not permit Almighty God to be taken out of our American society that made this country great.

Under the regimes in Russia and under Hitler in Germany it was stated: "Give me the youth of the nation, let me control them, and I will control the nation."

They did just that. They got the youth of those countries to eliminate God from their minds and the Communists continue to do that, so that they create a godless society. We should not permit that in this country.

Sign the petition, bring it before the House, let it be debated, and let it go before the people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that I shall support any proper resolution of the type the gentleman has in mind that will provide for the submission of a constitutional amendment to the various States for ratification so we may have a Constitution that cannot be misinterpreted by any court as to our belief in Almighty God.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his support.

Mr. Speaker, last year, and again this year, the Governors' conference supported prayer in public schools and I have no doubt that should we submit this constitutional amendment to the various State legislatures, it will be approved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the House will bear with me I would like to speak for just a moment or two on the bill, and the rule which makes in order the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4638.

The adoption of this resolution and rule would provide that H.R. 4638 would be subject to 1 hour of general debate under an open rule which would permit the offering and consideration of any and all amendments and, of course, would permit the House to work its will on this very important legislation.

The bill itself is designed for the purpose of promoting the orderly transfer of Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of the President and the inauguration of a new President. It also applies to the office

of the Vice President. Another provision of the bill, by the way, would authorize the preparation, transfer, and employment of needed help and assistants for a period of some 6 months after a President went out of office, in order to rearrange his records and papers, and transport them wherever he might desire them to be placed, or to turn them over to the proper agency of the Government for preservation and future use.

The enactment of this type of legislation has been requested by a bipartisan commission of very distinguished Americans named by the President, by the Bureau of the Budget, by both the Democratic and Republican National Committees, and endorsed and recommended, as I understand it, by the President and every living ex-President. While the request for the enactment of this legislation, based on the recommendation of this bipartisan commission, was submitted to President Kennedy, he is the only man in America who cannot possibly benefit from it. That is because this money, or this appropriation, that is to be authorized to meet the expenses of a proper transition from one administration to another applies only when a new administration comes into office, that is, when a new President takes over from a sitting President. Should President Kennedy be re-elected—and I have my personal views on that which I will not express here—but should President Kennedy be re-elected and this bill be law, he would not benefit and would not receive any aid or any benefit under the provisions of this act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will come to you in a moment because I like to discuss this legislation with the very learned gentleman from Iowa, but I will discuss it on my time and on my best. I might add.

This bill does provide for \$1,300,000, as a top-level amount that can be spent for the transition from one administration to another and also for preparing, shipping, and delivering certain records during a 6-month period after a President and Vice President go out of office; that is, to take care of their various effects such as records, and so forth and so on.

This \$1,300,000 contained in the bill is a limitation on the total amount that can be expended. You will note the amount is a committee amendment. The Bureau of the Budget and others suggested the amount be \$1,500,000. It was upon my motion that the amount was reduced to \$1,300,000. I had the idea, by the way, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, that perhaps we could get by with \$1,200,000, but thoughtful as I am always of his welfare and of his position here on the floor of the House, I agreed to the \$1,300,000 so as to permit the gentleman from Iowa to follow his usual procedure of putting in an amendment to reduce the amount by \$100,000 so he may maintain the great record he has made in this House for always voting for economy and for

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1963

saving tax money. I personally would be glad to accept that amendment if the gentleman will offer it at the proper time.

I know there will be some discussion of this bill and as far as I am concerned you can amend it in any way you please, because I am not a candidate for President, and I will not benefit from it. No President will talk to me about any job he may have to offer, or anything of that sort. But I do know from experience, as a member of the Republican National Committee and as one who has been close to several Republican administrations back in the dear dead days when we had Republicans in the White House, that when you elect a new President there are a great many expenses involved in changing over from one administration to another.

I remember how we went around, usually at the end of a presidential campaign, with tincup in hand, whether it was the Republican or the Democratic National Committee that waded the winning, a victorious campaign, the committee generally was broke when the election was over. As most of the Members know, who are practical in politics, that is the case. I do remember something about the difficulty that the Republican National Committees had in the past in getting enough money together to help meet the expenses of a President-elect, so that he might organize his new administration in time to take over. The same is also true as far as the Democratic Party is concerned, because both political party committees—that is, the Democratic and Republican National Committees—have made that very clear in discussions with some of us.

This bill does provide—and I want to discuss this because somebody will bring it up—this bill does provide that the General Services Administration shall furnish the help and the equipment and the finances, up to this fixed amount, as may be needed for this transition period, after the General Services Administrator determines in his own judgment, as the director of this fund, that there has been a President elected. Of course, that does not mean that he has to wait until the electoral college meets, or until we canvass the votes here just a few days before the inaugural; but instead, as the bill is written, when it becomes apparent; and he may not act until it becomes apparent; that a President has been elected.

Well, in 1960 we had one of the closest presidential elections in all history and yet it became apparent soon after the election that Mr. Kennedy had been elected. I was not too happy about it, I might add, that he had defeated Mr. Nixon for President. But Mr. Nixon admitted it, conceded it, the Republican leadership admitted it and conceded it, and there was no reason why the transition period should not have started, as it would have if this bill had been in effect. And, as a matter of fact, it did start then soon after the election, just as soon as it became apparent that Mr. Kennedy had been elected.

So I think this is a particularly safe section. I do not believe, regardless who might be in charge at the General Services Administration, that any man would dare to say that somebody else was elected President other than the man who all the American people knew had been elected. There would be a necktie party here in Washington. You know it and I know it, if any man occupying that post were to attempt any funny business in connection with that. And anybody who tries to argue anything about this particular section of the bill will be doing nothing but dragging a red herring across the trail to mislead you in order to get you to complain about this bill.

I am told there are other sections of this bill that one or two Members have complained about. On page 7 there is a provision that not more than 20 percent of the total expenditures under this act for any President-elect or Vice-President-elect may be made upon the basis of a certificate by the Administrator or the assistant designated by him pursuant to this section, and that such expenditures are confidential, and that they accord with the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section.

Somebody may say, "What are you trying to do? Hide what you spend? What are you going to do? Shade a little bit? cheat a little bit?"

Do you mean to tell me a President-elect, a man who has been elected President of the United States, is going to cheat on this expense account. I do not believe it. I do not care who he may be. Of course, I hope he is a Republican, but whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, when this change comes between administrations I do not believe that the man the American people elect as President would try to cheat.

Why is this confidential setup provided? I will tell you why, from a practical, political angle. If you stop and think for a minute you will all agree with me. It is because the President, and those who counsel with him, will want to talk to a great many people in organizing his administration. He may want to send for a man. Well, I can imagine they can go a lot further and do a lot worse, if we elect a Republican President, that they may want to send for my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, and have him come to Washington and discuss with him whether or not he would accept a position as Secretary of State, or as Secretary of the Treasury. The President-elect might say, "I want to pay your expenses as provided under this bill," because I know that you—the gentleman from Iowa—are an honest man. I do not know what your financial situation may be. It may be helpful to you to have your expenses paid. But would the President of the United States, or would the gentleman from Iowa, either one, want it carried in the newspapers that he had received \$318 in carfare to come to Washington to talk about the job that was offered to him or that he had turned down? What would be the embarrassment to him, and to the President-elect?

The President might go even further

than that. He might if he was a smart Republican that had been elected, send for me first and say, "Brown, tell me, what do you think about this man from Iowa? Do you think he would make a good Secretary of the Treasury, or should I name him Secretary of State to take care of our foreign affairs? What is your judgment?"

He might not be satisfied with having my judgment alone, so he might send for others. He might ask other Members of Congress to come see him about this matter.

Of course, that is why this paragraph is there. You do not want to advertise to the world that you have asked any man to come in for consultation. Why, bless your heart, the President-elect might even send for some Democrat like the floor leader of this House and say, "You are on the opposite side but you are a good American, and you want this administration to be successful. What do you think about this man? Should I name him to my Cabinet?"

You may be surprised as to some of the investigations that are made by President-elect—and I happen to know about some of them—or by those they designate, going into the past records of men they are considering, and women, too, for appointment to public positions. Perhaps if they had done a little better checking over in Great Britain before they had made certain appointments there might be a different situation in that country today.

That is all this amendment does. If somebody is going to cry out, "You cannot trust the President-elect," why, that is all it does. It gives the President-elect, or whomever he designates, the ability and the authority, and the opportunity, to use this money without telling everybody in the world to whom he has talked, or whom he has sent out to investigate somebody, or to find out what conditions are.

I think this is one of the wisest provisions in the bill, yet a few criticize it. I think they ought to compliment the committee for having it in the bill. This is in my opinion a bill that is long overdue. It has been supported by all living ex-Presidents and the present President. It has been recommended by a distinguished bipartisan commission set up to study this question.

It has been recommended by both political party committees. Its adoption is urged by the Bureau of the Budget and by every agency of the Government that I know of. I do not know why, except just for the fun of it, perhaps, that anyone should be taking pot shots at this bill. It should be enacted unanimously and I hope it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 15½ minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.



12626

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REPORT OF 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, 1963.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 25, 1963.

**FEDERAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963**

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4638, with Mr. Cannon in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Clerk recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

(Mr. ROSENTHAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I suggested to the Member who is managing this bill on the floor, the gentleman from Florida, that sometimes when you are ahead you ought to quit, and after the very articulate presentation by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], I think we might do well if we had a vote right now. But being a former trial lawyer sometimes we always cross-examine a little too far and I am wondering if I might not be doing that now. But there is just one point the gentleman did not mention which I think I might add which is really, so far as I am concerned, a motivating force for the consideration of this bill.

Surely it is important that we have an orderly transition of government. I

think everyone agrees with that. I think everyone agrees that the President-elect should have the facilities and the staff made available so that he can participate in the orderly transition of government. But I think there is an overriding and equally important consideration that should be stated on the floor of the House. When President Eisenhower came in during the interim period I think the Republican National Committee spent something in excess of \$200,000 for staff help and office equipment during the transitional period. Mr. Chairman, during 1960, the Democratic National Committee is reported to have spent about \$360,000 for the transitional period. However, it was testified to before the subcommittee on which I have the honor and distinction of serving, and which subcommittee reported this bill to the floor of the House, that the total cost to individuals concerned came closer to \$700,000 or \$800,000 for the transitional period.

Mr. Chairman, the question raises itself: Who provides the money other than the national committees for these expenses during this period?

The answer is that private individuals and private groups and others who are legally permitted to make these expenditures have put up the money. It seems to me that the day is coming when government is going to have to underwrite some of these costs, because the question answers itself: If someone is going to come forward and help pay what we now recognize is a cost of government, which is actually what it is, during the transitional period, that person may feel inclined to think that he is entitled to special consideration from the government.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should enunciate a policy here and now that people should not be permitted to expect special consideration because what they did was to help pay the cost of government.

Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable difference between someone participating in campaign expenses, because a person of their party seeks high public office and a person who helps pay a quasi-governmental expense. We have come to recognize the fact, that the orderly transition of government is a public function and, actually, the public should pay the cost.

Mr. Chairman, we should here and now say by the passing of this bill—which really in the first legal document in this field—that from now on the government will assume its responsibility and shall pay the cost for the orderly transition of government. If we do this, Mr. Chairman, we can prevent any special group or any special interests from anxiously coming forward to help pay government expense.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this is the most significant reason, and I think a singular and important reason why this bill should be enacted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. ANDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that were it not for the fact that we are enjoying the luxury this afternoon of a somewhat leisurely legislative pace, as we have indeed for some weeks past, I too would hesitate to engage in any further discussion of this particular measure. But I think since we do have the time we might as well use a little of it to answer any questions which might still reside in the minds of those who possibly wonder whether or not we are in fact by the passage of this bill instituting just another new Government program which has, in fact, little foundation, and for which there is little necessity.

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been pointed out already that the genesis for this particular legislation goes back to the report of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, and that that was a bipartisan group. As I recall it, among the members were former Members of this body and also one present Member of Congress. This particular Commission in May of last year submitted a number of different resolutions or recommendations on this general subject of campaign costs and how they ought to be financed.

Mr. Chairman, recommendation No. 8 is specifically addressed to this question of financing the transition between administrations. I shall quote at this point from the language of recommendation No. 8:

We endorse proposals to institutionalize the transition from one administration to another when the party in power changes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was emphasized at the hearings that were held on this bill that since the amendment to the Constitution was enacted that accelerated the date for the inauguration of a President to January 20, we have had two new administrations come into power.

Both of the Presidents involved, President Kennedy and President Eisenhower, enjoyed the cooperation of the man who had held the office prior to them. However, this transition is important enough, and this was pointed out by the presiding speaker, the gentleman from New York, that it should be formalized; it should be institutionalized into law. I think, therefore, there is valid reason for us to consider this kind of a bill, this kind of a statute, to provide, as this bill very simply does, that the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall make available services and certain facilities in the way of staff and personnel to the incoming President and to the incoming Vice President.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. As I understand this bill, it would provide over a million dollars to help get a President into office. I am wondering if there is any way the money might be used to get a President out of office.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can assure the gentleman that much as we might want to be able to answer that question in the affirmative, the answer is "No." This is

1968

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1247

simply a bill that provides for expenses of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect under certain circumstances.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I am wondering, if it is going to cost the taxpayers a million three to change Presidents, it might not be a deterrent to them to change Presidents if it is going to cost that amount of money.

Mr. ANDERSON. It might be an added inducement for those who think that this authorization of \$1.3 million is too much. I am tempted to say, that considering the shape the country is in and the shape it is going to be in by November 1964, that this is a modest sum indeed to turn the country around and install a new administration.

Mr. SNYDER. I would hate to vote for this legislation and then hear the President announce a slogan: "Vote for me and save a million three."

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman has submitted a suggestion, but, in my opinion, infinitely more than \$1.3 million will be saved by utilizing the provisions of this bill.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Is it not a fact that there is already legislation on the books providing the outgoing President expenses for a period of 6 months?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. Section 4 of this bill would also provide certain services to be provided by the GSA to the outgoing President and Vice President. The law at the present time makes no provision for a Vice President. It was felt this was warranted.

I want to answer one possible question before concluding these remarks. One concern that the committee had during the hearings was that this bill should not be used as an excuse for any county chairman or any officeholder to come down to Washington for a brief vacation and have his travel expenses paid pursuant to the provisions of this bill.

I want to call attention to page 4 of the report where this question is discussed and where we specifically say:

It is the committee's intention that the funds made available to the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect shall not be used to pay the transportation and other costs of officeholders and others who visit them on their own initiative.

When we provide for the payment of travel expenses, we mean for people here in Washington at the request of the President and who are on official business, for consultation or for some other legitimate purposes. I think this should allay the fears of any person who might have some doubt about this particular feature.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. In my opinion, it is long overdue and is much needed. When the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Government Operations, I took the liberty of sending a copy of this legislation to former Attorney General Herbert Brownell. He wrote me back as follows:

I was interested in reading the copy of H.R. 4638, "Presidential Transition Act of 1963," which you sent me with your letter of April 22. I was down in South America which accounts for my delay in answering.

I read the bill with some care and think that it is well drawn and should be enacted. My experience during the months immediately following the election of 1952 convinced me that a law of this type would be in the public interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. I certainly thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me merely add again that this bill was reported unanimously out of the subcommittee and reported unanimously out of the full Committee on Government Operations. It is a bipartisan measure and I think it deserves the fullest measure of support of every Member of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation which seeks to improve the transfer of Executive power in the instance of a change of administration in our Federal Government.

Under the bill, certain services and facilities are provided to the President-elect and Vice President-elect from the time of their election until their inauguration, and provides that these services and facilities shall be paid for from public funds.

This is the most important part of the bill because it does recognize that in these days of big government, the expenses of preparation for office by an administration are so great that the country cannot reasonably expect that they will any longer be borne by individuals or even by a party organization. They are an integral part of the presidential administration and should be borne by the public.

It is the public assumption of this burden which this legislation authorizes and I shall vote for this bill because I believe that its purpose is proper.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER].

[Mr. STAEBLER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I had several questions to ask my friend from

Ohio [Mr. Brown]. He declined to yield. He apparently became so imbued with extolling my virtues as an advocate of economy and my virtues as a prospective appointee of some president—I do not know which one—that perhaps he lost sight of the fact that he had agreed to yield to me so that I might ask him a few questions. Now he is conspicuous by his absence. It appears I will have to direct the questions I have to someone else.

First of all I think I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the question of who this bill is designed to help in the immediate future.

Mr. FASCELL. I do not know the gentleman's name but it would be whoever is President-elect in the next changeover administration, if any.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think there will be a change in the next election?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield so I may respond, if I could look into my glass or somebody else's glass and name the gentleman, in answer to that question, I think I should resign.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is preparing for a transition period and evidently, considering all the haste in order to get this bill through, there is going to be a change in 1964. Would that be possible, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. FASCELL. Anything is possible, I assume. But I would say that there is hardly any rush on this matter. I think out of an abundance of caution, however, and good judgment and good business, we may look ahead to the time when there might be a change of administration; although, frankly, I do not think it will be the next time.

Mr. GROSS. Then let me put the question this way; I do not seem to be able to get a very responsive answer from the gentleman as to the future that this bill is designed to take care of. If there is no change in 1964 then there is no immediate need for this bill, is there?

Mr. FASCELL. The bill is inoperative if the present administration succeeds itself, by the terms of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think it would be the part of wisdom to wait for another 2 or 3 years, anyway, and see what transpires before authorizing an appropriation of \$1,300,000?

Mr. FASCELL. No, sir; the gentleman does not, because that is what we have been doing up until now. And while the situation is as it is, it is a good time to prepare for the future. That is the reason the bill is being brought up at this time, not in an election year and not when there is any particular political heat with respect to any change in administration.

Mr. GROSS. But if the line of succession should follow as some people think it may, this legislation would not be necessary for a period of perhaps 3 years; is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. On the other hand, it could be effective immediately.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman means in 1964. I am glad to get the suggestion that there is a strong possibility it may become effective in 1964.

12628

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25

Mr. FASCELL. I do not know that I said there was a strong possibility. I said that it could become effective immediately, but that it was well for the bill to be brought up not in an election year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio said that this legislation would not affect the present President. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. FASCELL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then what about the provision in the bill that gives him an office staff for 6 months after he leaves office?

Mr. FASCELL. He would be an outgoing President then.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but he would benefit, then, under the bill, would he not?

Mr. FASCELL. We have already taken care of that by a prior congressional act. All we do with this bill is extend the services available.

Mr. GROSS. Why is that provision in the bill if it is already taken care of?

Mr. FASCELL. I think the gentleman who preceded the gentleman from Iowa answered that question; also because of the Vice President's not being included in the original law, as I recall it. I am trying to give the citation of the Public Law about which the gentleman is talking.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman see on the political horizon some man who will be a candidate for President or Vice President who has to worry about where his next hamburger sandwich is coming from?

Mr. FASCELL. I should hope we have not reached the point in this country where only very rich people would aspire to hold legislative or executive office.

Mr. GROSS. This is not exactly a question of aspiration. The question is, Does the gentleman see any front runner on the political scene that has to be worried about the matter of taking care of himself in the interim from November until the next January 20?

Mr. FASCELL. I am not ready to announce, but my 7-year-old son aspires to the office and I would like to think that some day the costs of the transition would be paid by the Government, as they ought to be, and he would not be required to go around and see his friends and cronies in order to take care of those costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask about this business of the General Service Administrator designating the President and the Vice President. Does the gentleman think this is a good precedent to set, that the General Services Administrator pick the President and Vice President after an election?

Mr. FASCELL. Of course, the law does not give the Administrator that authority. He does not pick them. He does, in carrying out the administrative functions under this act, make selection of the apparent winner. But this is not a question, I might add to the gentleman

from Iowa, because in Public Law 87-829, from which the language in the pending legislation was taken, we have used that language in providing for the protection of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect in the event of harm or injury, and so forth. The Secret Service and the Secretary of the Treasury have had absolutely no difficulty in determining who the President-elect or the Vice-President-elect might be, so far as carrying out the administrative duties under that law is concerned. Therefore, I do not see why the General Services Administrator should have any difficulty under the pending legislation.

Mr. GROSS. We apparently have a situation growing up in certain States of the Union whereby there may be independent electors. Does not the gentleman think that those designated as President and Vice President by the present Administrator of General Services would be given psychological and other advantages by designating them as President and Vice President?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not think so, because if they were unable at the time to determine the successful candidates, this act would not be operative. Therefore, in a close contest, the Administrator simply would not make the decision.

Mr. GROSS. But that provision of the law makes no exception, does it? It says that the Administrator shall do thus and so.

Mr. FASCELL. Only if he can determine the apparent successful candidate.

Mr. GROSS. It says he shall make the determination, does it not? Let me read from the bill:

The terms "President-elect" and "Vice-President-elect" as used in this act shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained by the Administrator.

There is not much question about that language; is there?

Mr. FASCELL. There is nothing in the act that requires the Administrator to make a decision which in his own judgment he could not make. If he could not determine the apparent successful candidate, he would not authorize the expenditure of funds to anyone; and he should not.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it could be whoever he thought was the apparent winner; is not that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. It could be—yes.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course, that is all the authority he needs—whoever he thinks is the apparent winner—that is all—without waiting for the college of electors to meet and cast the official ballots as provided for in the Constitution.

Mr. FASCELL. I would suggest to the gentleman this kind of discretion has been placed in many public officials. The Secretary of the Treasury under the previous law is one of those who has been given specific authority with the exact language we are talking about in the pending legislation. He has not had any problem in protecting the life of the Vice President and President-elect. I do not see any great big problem in the Administrator of the General Services Administration being unduly involved in

the matter of determining who is the apparent winner in order to perform the ministerial functions under this act. In the whole history of the country, we have had only three close elections and I do not think there is any great problem. The gentleman previously pointed out in the last election we had one that was as close as we would want to have an election and nobody had any trouble in deciding who was the apparent winner.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question which intrigues me in connection with the political aspects of this thing. The last sentence of the report on page 12 reads:

Enactment of these proposals—

Says President John F. Kennedy—will go a long way to improve the political climate.

What political climate is being improved by this legislation?

Mr. FASCELL. I think that has already been referred to by speakers who have preceded me. I think the political climate can be very, very much improved by not having the President-elect or the Vice-President-elect of these United States calling on his friends and others who might be interested to pay the cost of him assuming office in this, the greatest country in the world. It just does not seem proper and necessary to have them going around begging for money to pay for the cost of what ought to be legitimate costs of Government, and that is what I think he means by improving the political climate.

Mr. GROSS. I say again, I do not see anyone on the horizon of presidential candidates who needs this legislation and \$1,300,000 it would dig out of the taxpayers. I know of not a single potential presidential candidate in 1964 who is going to worry about where his next sandwich is coming from. I do not think any of them will have to go around town with a tin cup in hand to get the money to sustain himself in the interim between the day of election and the inauguration. I do see some taxpayers who are getting tired of being fleeced for purposes of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

[Mr. JOELSON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. I wish the gentleman in charge of handling the bill at this time would give to the members of the committee a little explanation of when under the terms of this bill a person becomes the President or Vice-President-elect.



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

126

I notice that these funds can be used immediately after the general election in November. But how would this situation work, for instance, if the President or, at least, before the determination of the votes in the electoral college, suppose that some person was, say, three or four votes shy? How would this Administrator determine who was in a position to expend these funds?

The reason I ask this is because in my humble opinion a person does not become the President or President-elect until after the Congress has had an opportunity to examine the ballots cast in the electoral college. Only at that point when that determination has been made by the House of Representatives does a man become the President-elect.

Mr. FASCELL. I would say to my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], that the gentleman is absolutely right in a technical sense with respect to the determination of the election of the President and the Vice President.

The pending legislation does not seek to do anything about it or change it in any way, and we are not directly concerned with the question of election, nomination, or the inauguration, for that matter. But we do provide under this pending legislation, as we have provided in previous congressional actions, the right of the Administrator to determine that funds shall be spent for certain services, supplies, and other things for the benefit of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect.

The language in this bill defines those terms for the purposes of this act.

On page 6, paragraph (c), is the following language:

(c) The terms "President-elect" and "Vice-President-elect" as used in this Act shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained by the Administrator following the general elections held to determine the election of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2.

This act and the Administrator could in no way, in any way, affect the election of the successful candidate. The only decision the Administrator can make is who is the successful candidate—apparent successful candidate—for the purposes of this particular act in order to make the services provided by this act available to them. And, if there is any doubt in his mind and if he cannot or does not designate the apparently successful candidate, then the act is inoperative. He cannot do anything. There will be no services provided and no money expended.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. Certainly.

Mr. HALEY. Do I understand the law to be that an elector in the electoral college—that actually there is no way to force him to vote for the man or even the party of which he has held himself out to the people as being in favor of?

The only time that you can thoroughly determine that is when the tabulation of the electoral college is made by the House of Representatives. So when this ad-

ministrator determines who seemingly is the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, he has no assurance that the people elected to the electoral college will vote in accordance with the public stand which they took. That is the thing which worries me. I want my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], to understand that I am not opposing this legislation. But this language does disturb me.

Mr. FASCELL. I can appreciate my distinguished colleague's feelings on it, and all I can say is I agree with him about the possibilities that he has outlined with respect to the electoral college. I think it is an archaic system, and I will tell the gentleman right now that I will join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] in any reasonable modification by either representational proportion or by direct public vote, to eliminate the possibility that the gentleman very properly has described.

The present electoral system is a problem and I think we ought to meet its modification head on in this Congress and I hope we will. All I can say to the gentleman is that his analysis is absolutely correct. However, in a previous law we have used the same kind of authority, the same kind of language and we have had no problem. In the whole history of the United States there have only been three close such situations. It is an unlikely proposition, but if it were to happen, if the administrator had any question in his mind, he simply would not make any designation in order to make the services available as provided by the act. If as an intelligent human being and he has a doubt, he would not act until a decision has been made in the electoral college or in the Congress.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I am in favor of the principle of this bill, but there is one thing that puzzles me. In 1952 it cost \$250,000, in 1960 it cost \$360,000. Yet this bill authorizes \$1.3 million. It seems to me that around \$600,000 or \$650,000 ought to be absolutely stricken from the bill.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman has raised an interesting question, but the figures to which he refers, the small figures of several hundred thousand dollars, were the expenses taken care of by the national committees.

Mr. KUNKEL. The figures were \$250,000 and \$360,000.

Mr. FASCELL. The two figures to which the gentleman refers are the expenses which were testified to and discussed on the floor here as having been paid by the respective political national committees. They did not include all the other expenses which were not paid by those committees. They did not include the personal costs and the other expenses. The best estimate we could get from the Bureau of the Budget was about the amount of the authorization figure that we have in this bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4638 has been reported unanimously to the House by the Committee on Government Operations. It was introduced by me to carry out a recommendation made to the Congress by President Kennedy on May 29, 1962, submitted along with certain other proposals dealing with the financing of Presidential election campaigns. These proposals, including that contained in this bill, resulted from a study and report prepared by the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. The Commission was made up of distinguished members of both parties—see list on page 9 of committee report.

In essence, the purpose of this bill is to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power when there is a change of administration in our Federal Government by providing certain services and facilities such as office space, compensation for staff personnel and experts, travel expenses, telephone, telegraph, postage and printing to Presidents-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect during the period of time from their election to their inauguration. These services and facilities are to be paid from public funds. It also authorizes that services and facilities for outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents be provided for 6 months after the expiration of their terms of office in order that they may wind up their affairs.

It was estimated by the Commission that during the transition period between the election of President Eisenhower and his inauguration expenses generated by his preparations to take office resulted in more than \$200,000 and were borne by a special Republican committee. In a similar period prior to President Kennedy's inauguration costs generated by his preparations to take office totaled at least \$360,000 which were borne by the Democratic National Committee. These were not by any means the total costs during these two periods because many expenses were paid out of the pockets of the Presidents-elect and their associates. The President's Commission and the Committee on Government Operations agree that these expenses are a legitimate part of the operation of our Federal Government and should be appropriated for like other Government expenses.

I need not remind my colleagues of the House of the complexity of our governmental processes and the immense knowledge that must be quickly acquired by a new President and his close associates on their accession to power and the tremendously important decisions that must be made. It is true that in the past the transfer of office from one administration to the other has been accomplished without serious difficulty. But this need not always be so and it is the better part of wisdom for us to provide for this transfer for all time to come in an orderly and systematic manner.

The bill also provides for an orderly exit of Presidents and Vice Presidents and makes provisions—at the expense of the Government—for them to wind up their affairs. Heretofore, this has been done on a rather haphazard basis with some expense to the individuals involved.

12630

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25

Certainly, the dignity of the offices held, along with the vast accumulation of personal papers and effects, require this additional service. You recall, of course, that several years ago the Congress enacted legislation giving a permanent salary, staff, and office space to former Presidents—act of August 25, 1958. This will not be affected by our bill, except that the services and facilities provided under existing legislation would be postponed for 6 months under the operation of H.R. 4638.

The committee added to the bill a limitation on expenditures of \$1,300,000 for all of the purposes of the bill in any one fiscal year. This seems a reasonable figure considering both incoming and outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents and was based on the best estimates available to us. Of course, the specific funds to be appropriated in any year must be fully justified before the Appropriations Committee.

During our hearings, a question was raised about the possible construction of the language of the bill to enable travel expenses to be paid to visit the President-elect and Vice-President-elect by those who may be seeking a job or an office on their own initiative. To make certain that these expenses would not be paid the committee report on the bill contains the following statement:

It is the committee's intention that the only funds available to the President-elect and Vice-President-elect shall not be used to pay the transportation costs of office-seekers and other persons who visit them on their own initiative.

Such of course, would not prevent the President-elect from inviting persons to Washington for interview or consultation and covering their transportation costs.

This bill does provide for a modest increase in Government expenses that heretofore have been paid out of the pockets of private individuals or from the treasuries of political parties. I believe we have reached a point today, however, where we can easily recognize that the potential good to be achieved together with the potential dangers that would be avoided certainly outweigh this additional expense.

H.R. 4638 has been approved and endorsed by the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee. I understand that the President's Commission consulted our three former Presidents and they have likewise endorsed the general proposal contained in the bill.

I hope that the House will overwhelmingly vote to enact this legislation.

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Presidential Transition Act of 1968."

## PURPOSE OF THIS ACT

SEC. 2. The Congress declares it to be the purpose of this Act to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. The national interest requires that such transitions in the office of President be accomplished so as to assure continuity in the faithful execution of the laws and in the conduct of the affairs of the Federal Government, both domestic and foreign. Any disruption occasioned by the transfer of the executive power could produce results detrimental to the safety and well-being of the United States and its people. Accordingly, it is the intent of the Congress that appropriate actions be authorized and taken to avoid or minimize any disruption. In addition to the specific provisions contained in this Act directed toward that purpose, it is the intent of the Congress that all officers of the Government so conduct the affairs of the Government for which they exercise responsibility and authority as (1) to be mindful of problems occasioned by transitions in the office of President, (2) to take appropriate lawful steps to avoid or minimize disruptions that might be occasioned by the transfer of the executive power, and (3) otherwise to promote orderly transitions in the office of President.

SEC. 3. (a) The Administrator of General Services, referred to hereafter in this Act as "the Administrator," is authorized to provide, upon request, to each President-elect and each Vice-President-elect, for use in connection with his preparations for the assumption of official duties as President or Vice President necessary services and facilities, including—

(1) Suitable office space appropriately equipped with furniture, furnishings, office machines and equipment, and office supplies, as determined by the Administrator, after consultation with the President-elect, the Vice-President-elect, or their designees provided for in subsection (e) of this section, at such place or places within the United States as the President-elect or Vice-President-elect shall designate;

(2) Payment of the compensation of members of office staffs designated by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect at rates determined by them not to exceed the rate provided by the Classification Act of 1946, as amended, for grade GS-18: *Provided*, That any employee of any agency of any branch of the Government may be detailed to such staffs on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis with the consent of the head of the agency; and while so detailed such employee shall be responsible only to the President-elect or Vice-President-elect for the performance of his duties: *Provided further*, That any employee so detailed shall continue to receive the compensation provided pursuant to law for his regular employment, and shall retain the rights and privileges of such employment without interruption. Notwithstanding any other law, persons receiving compensation as members of office staffs under this subsection, other than those detailed from agencies, shall not be held or considered to be employees of the Federal Government;

(3) Payment of expenses for the procurement of services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof for the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, as authorized for the head of any department by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals;

(4) Payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances for members of office staffs or other assistants, including experts or consultants, designated by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, as authorized for persons employed intermittently or for persons serving without compensation by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act

of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2), as may be appropriate;

(5) Communications services found necessary by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect;

(6) Payment of expenses for necessary printing and binding, notwithstanding any provision of law codified in title 44, United States Code, or any regulation promulgated thereunder;

(7) Reimbursement to the postal revenues in amounts equivalent to the postage that would otherwise be payable on mail matter referred to in subsection (d) of this section.

(b) The Administrator shall expend such funds for the provision of services and facilities under this Act in connection with any obligations incurred by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect before the day following the date of the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2, or after the inauguration of the President-elect as President and the inauguration of the Vice-President-elect as Vice President.

(c) The terms "President-elect" and "Vice-President-elect" as used in this Act shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained by the Administrator following the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2.

(d) Each President-elect shall be entitled to conveyance within the United States and its territories and possessions free of postage of all mail matter sent by him in connection with his preparations for the assumption of official duties as President, and such matter shall be transmitted as priority mail as provided in title 39, United States Code, section 4102. Each Vice-President-elect shall be entitled to conveyance within the United States and its territories and possessions free of postage of all mail matter sent by him under his written autograph signature in connection with his preparations for the assumption of official duties as Vice President.

(e) Each President-elect and Vice-President-elect may designate to the Administrator an assistant authorized to make on his behalf such designations or findings of necessity as may be required in connection with the services and facilities to be provided under this Act. Not more than 20 per centum of the total expenditures under this Act for any President-elect or Vice-President-elect may be made upon the basis of a certificate by him or the assistant designated by him pursuant to this section that such expenditures are confidential and that they accord with the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section.

(f) In the case where the President-elect is the incumbent President or in the case where the Vice-President-elect is the incumbent Vice President, there shall be no expenditures of funds for the provision of services and facilities to such incumbent under this Act, and any funds appropriated for such purposes shall be returned to the general funds of the Treasury.

SERVICES AND FACILITIES AUTHORIZED TO BE PROVIDED TO FORMER PRESIDENTS AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENTS

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to provide, upon request, to each former President and each former Vice President, for a period not to exceed six months from the date of the expiration of his term of office as President or Vice President, for use in connection with winding up the affairs of his office, necessary services and facilities of the same general character as authorized by this Act to be provided to Presidents-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect and as authorized by the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838;

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1963

3 U.S.C. 102, note), and such services and facilities shall be in addition to those authorized by the latter Act.

## AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such funds as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act. The President shall include in the budget transmitted to the Congress, for each fiscal year in which his regular term of office will expire, a proposed appropriation for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment:  
The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 5, after "Government" insert "except for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 17, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive, and insert the following:

"(4) Payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances, including rental of Government or hired motor vehicles, found necessary by the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, as authorized for persons employed intermittently or for persons serving without compensation by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 75b-5), as may be appropriate."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few more questions. Can the gentleman from Florida tell me, if he will, please, how many \$100-a-day consultants it is expected will be employed to take care of the incoming President and Vice President in 1964?

Mr. FASCELL. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa whatever the President can substantiate in his budget request and whatever he can get out of the Committee on Appropriations and whatever may be necessary or required within the limitation of the authorization under this act.

Mr. GROSS. It is wide open insofar as this bill is concerned and insofar as the committee is concerned, that is, the Committee on Government Operations?

Mr. FASCELL. No, I would not say it is wide open at all. We do have a limit on the authorization and we do follow the normal appropriation procedure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell me how many Cadillacs will be hired or leased to take care of the incoming President and Vice President?

Mr. FASCELL. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa I would hope we would not need any more.

Mr. GROSS. Any more?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Those we provide today are all in use?

Mr. FASCELL. That is what I mean. Mr. GROSS. Then it will take some additional limosines, will it not?

Mr. FASCELL. Maybe we can get by with Fords.

Mr. GROSS. With regard to this business of the 20 percent that can be spent from the \$1,300,000 without accounting to anyone, or am I correct in saying that this can be spent without any accounting whatever?

Mr. FASCELL. It has to be on a Presidential certificate, yes.

Mr. GROSS. But it is of an unaccountable nature, that is, they make no accounting to anyone for it?

Mr. FASCELL. That is true. It is a provision we have had since time immemorial in appropriation acts with respect to Presidential requests.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Now, this 20 percent, none of that will go to the outgoing President in 1964, will it?

Mr. FASCELL. No.

Mr. GROSS. The 20 percent will be spent by both the President and the Vice President?

Mr. FASCELL. It will be spent, not more than 20 percent of the total expenditures, for the President-elect and Vice-President-elect.

Mr. GROSS. Is that 20 percent each, or 20 percent for both?

Mr. FASCELL. It is the total applying to both.

Mr. GROSS. The total of 20 percent applies to both. Then each can spend 10 percent on his own accounting, if he so wishes?

Mr. FASCELL. Whatever arrangements are made, within the limitation. We have felt that a limitation was necessary and that is the reason why we wrote it into the act. However, I might say to the gentleman in the appropriation process, if it is felt that some other accounting procedure or limitation is necessary, that can be done.

Mr. GROSS. In addition to the automobiles, does the gentleman think there will be any helicopters or jet 707's provided for the incoming President and Vice President in 1964?

Mr. FASCELL. Not by this act, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, I assume that if the incumbent President will extend the hospitality of his own conveniences, as he probably will, it would be helpful to the President-elect.

Mr. GROSS. I notice the gentleman was speaking of the incumbent President. Perhaps I do not read enough, or something, but I notice in the report it states that in 1952 President Truman sent some kind of a message to President Eisenhower. I was not aware that Truman and Eisenhower were exchanging messages shortly after the election in 1952, but apparently according to your report they did exchange at least one message. So the gentleman thinks the most amicable relations would exist and all facilities in 1964 that the President can properly give to the incoming new President will be available to him?

Mr. FASCELL. I would certainly hope so, and I would hate to think otherwise. I think the gentleman will agree. Let me say I do not agree with the gentleman when he says he does not read

enough because, having had the privilege and pleasure of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with him, I would say that probably the gentleman from Iowa is one of the best read Members of Congress, and probably reads too much.

Mr. GROSS. I would have to reciprocate and say that I am afraid the gentleman from Florida read some of the amendments I have had to offer too well. I am talking about some of the amendments to cut pretty deeply into the foreign giveaway program. I am afraid the gentleman from Florida read some of those amendments too well.

Mr. FASCELL. I must say I have been taught something now that the gentleman from Iowa has been on the committee. I have been very careful and cautious not only to listen to what he says, but to read everything he offers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 18, strike out lines 10, 11, 12 and 13 and insert:

"(6) Payment of expenses for necessary printing and binding, notwithstanding the Act of January 12, 1906, and the Act of March 1, 1918, as amended (44 U.S.C. 111)";

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:  
The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 28, strike out "free of postage" and insert after "matter," "including airmail."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:  
The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 28, strike out "free of postage" and in line 28 insert immediately after "matter," "including airmail."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:  
The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 3 insert a period after "Vice-Presidents-elect", strike out all that follows down through and including the period on line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Any person appointed or detailed to serve a former President or former Vice President under authority of this section shall be appointed or detailed in accordance with, and shall be subject to, all of the provisions of section 3 of this Act applicable to persons appointed or detailed under authority of that section. The provisions of the Act of August 25, 1949 (72 Stat. 838; 5 U.S.C. 102, note), other than subsections (a) and (e) shall not become effective with respect to a former President until six months after the expiration of his term of office as President."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

12632

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 25

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 20, immediately before the period insert "but not to exceed \$1,500,000 for any one fiscal year".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 8, strike out lines 17 through 26, including the figure "\$1,500,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment I have offered will take pretty good care of this bill. It simply takes out the money. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] suggested that I would probably offer an amendment getting \$100,000 or some such amount from the \$1,500,000. I just want him to know that I do believe in economy and so I shall do a little bit better than he suggested. I hope he will join me in this attempt to economize, and I trust the House will adopt the amendment and take proper care of this piece of legislation referring to ants up \$1,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, no valid contention has been made here today that any President or this Government has suffered by the absence of this legislation. It provides ill-advised procedures and increased spending.

If there is no record vote on final passage let the Record show that I am unopposed to it.

Mr. HICKFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Of course, the amendment would nullify the compromise bill by removing the authorization for the funds to implement the bill. I believe I am correct in saying that the Committee on Government Operations had hearings on this bill and there was no expressed opposition to the intent of the bill. I can understand if the gentleman feels it necessary, as is his habit, to offer an amendment to reduce expenditures. But I can hardly reconcile the good legislative process with striking out the implementing section, section 5, which would furnish the authorization for the funds to implement this bill.

The action of the committee was taken after discussion with a number of witnesses who appeared before us including the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Staats. It has the approval of the agencies involved—the Bureau of the Budget. It seeks to do a thing which I think is the laudable and honorable thing to do. When a President's term has ended and a new President is coming in there are a great number of responsibilities which the incoming President has to assume in order that we may have a smooth transition of Government from one administration to the next. Heretofore this money has come from many unofficial sources. I am not saying that anything improper has resulted as the result of this informal arrangement, but it is the public business to have an orderly transition of

administrations regardless of whether it may be a Democratic or a Republican President that is coming into office. Any suspicion of a conflict of interest in the donation of funds to affect this orderly transition should be removed.

If it costs hundreds of thousands of dollars, and some testimony seems to indicate more than a million dollars, for the incoming President to properly prepare his staff to interview those people that he wishes to appoint to Cabinet positions, to take care of all the necessary transportation, communication facilities and services that are necessary to effectuate this smooth transition, why should we not face up to this as the orderly and honorable cost of the process of Government and supply this money?

I can bring up a case within my own personal knowledge, and I do not care to name any names nor to indicate the particular President's group that is involved, but I know that there were services rendered by a certain gentleman who was on the staff of an incoming former President. Later on this gentleman tried to subtract a 4-percent override on a defense contract of a California contractor. When this contractor came to me and asked me what to do, I said:

You should make a statement under oath to the proper congressional committee in regard to this matter.

This gentleman did make a statement to the proper congressional committee and there was an investigation, by a committee other than the Committee on Government Operations, and the man who had been on the staff of that former incoming President was completely discredited. I do not know whether he wanted to extract the 4-percent override on that defense contract because he was on the staff of that incoming President and had made certain contributions of services or money or not. I could not state that. But I do say that we should remove the opportunity for people to come in and expend money for the purposes of a transition of Government and thereby obtain a position of advantage and favor in the eyes of some people which might contribute to their personal financial welfare thereafter.

So I say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa should be voted down. We should face up to our responsibilities as legislators, recognizing the fact that there are expenses involved in the transition from one administration to another, and face those responsibilities and provide for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GLAIMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a

new President, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Unqualifiedly and unreservedly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4638, to the House Committee on Government Operations with the following instructions: "On page 8, strike out all of lines 17 through 26."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 29, nays 343, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—29

Abele	Johansen	Stephens
Andrews	Knob	Tusen
Beermann	Landon	Ull
Colmer	O'Konski	Whitten
Cunningham	Pulliam	Williams
Grant	Pool	Wilson, Ind.
Gross	Quillen	Winstead
Hall	Rich	Wylder
Henderson	Rivers, S.C.	Younger
Huddleston	Siler	

NAYES—343

Abbott	Bell	Broyhill, W.C.
Adair	Bennett, Fla.	Broyhill, Va.
Addabbo	Bennett, Mich.	Bruce
Albert	Berry	Burke
Alger	Betts	Burkhalter
Anderson	Boland	Burison
Ashbrook	Bolton	Burton
Ashmore	Frances P.	Byrnes, Pa.
Aspinall	Bolton,	Byrnes, Wis.
Auchincloss	Oliver P.	Cahill
Ayres	Bonner	Cameron
Baker	Brademas	Cannon
Baldwin	Bray	Casey
Barrett	Brock	Chamberlain
Barr	Brownwell	Chief
Bass	Brooks	Chenoweth
Bates	Broomfield	Clancy
Battin	Brotzman	Clark
Becker	Brown, Calif.	Clausen,
Beckworth	Brown, Ohio	Don E.

