

was not sufficient time in the closing months of 1966 to make such recommendations and because such efforts should be made while Congress is in session so that the full membership of the House could be available for comments, recommendations, and hearings.

The only new power asked, over what the committee had in 1966, would be the power to make an investigation and recommend censure on a violation, by a Member, officer, or employee of the House, of a standard of conduct which had been established by the House by law or resolution previous to the act complained of.

The comparable Senate committee now operating has, incidentally, much broader powers than are requested here, as it is not restricted to recommending resolutions of censure, but is authorized in broad terms to recommend "disciplinary action to be taken" (sec. 2(a)(2), S. Res. 338, 88th Cong.).

It is believed that the ability to at least recommend resolutions of censure in a proper case is necessary for three reasons: First, to effectively handle any such matter that may arise; second, to help the committee in getting the attention and assistance of the whole membership of the House in drafting workable and practical rules; and third, to reassure the public that any improper conduct that may arise will be adequately and promptly looked into.

I would like to call attention to the Washington Star article of February 2, widely circulated by some Members in an effort to show that the Committee on Standards and Conduct should not be reconstituted.

A group of women reporters asked me to appear before them, and they interviewed me. I quickly sensed that they felt this committee was being set up as a "whitewash" committee. I felt that such an impression on the press would further unfairly damage the image of Congress with the public.

In reply to a question expressing disbelief that any Congressman would be willing to present to the committee any matter at all for investigation, I replied that in a case fully substantiated by competent evidence and reflecting on the Congress, it was my belief that 90 percent or all Members would be willing to do so in a serious case publicly reflecting on Congress.

The article gave the impression that 90 percent of Congress was waiting to present existing charges against other Congressmen. No other article coming from this well-attended interview gave such an impression as far as I know.

Further, in answer to a question on how narrow or broad the fields of study of new legislation might be, I replied they could cover "all matters of impropriety" covered by legislation that might be introduced and assigned to the committee for study. The article as printed implied to many readers that the committee would have power to investigate charges under legislation not yet enacted. This is clearly untrue because the proposed bill would not allow any case to be investigated unless it were based on a statute or resolution previously passed by the House; and then only under the additional safeguards set up in the proposed bill before you.

As I stated in the first hearing of the committee last year (and ap-