

will be handled promptly in the field in which it will have jurisdiction. Within the past 2 years the Committee on House Administration, by virtue of its supervisory administrative functions in House accounts, has had knowledge of a number of situations involving very questionable activity; and it has failed to act promptly.

There may have been good and sound reasons for its failure to act promptly, but the records of the committee itself, the House Administration Committee, speak for what was actually left undone, and cannot be reassuring to the public without explanation.

Illustrations of the slowness of the House administration to deal with matters within their jurisdiction are replete in the hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Contracts held December 19, 20, 21, and 30, 1966. For examples: The matter of not cutting off the pay of Mrs. Y. Marjorie Flores Powell when paid in violation of law (see p. 44 of those hearings), and the matters of travel pay and per diem costs (see pp. 16, 17, 22, 113, 114, 115, 191, and 193 of those same hearings).

So despite the fact that there may have been good and sound reasons for these delays, the public could not be reassured by any action of Congress placing these new responsibilities in that same committee, without adequately documented and understood explanations of its past inaction. Moreover, clearly, any committee set up to do the broad task of raising and maintaining standards in the House should be a nonpartisan committee, with equal membership between Republicans and Democrats. The House Administration Committee is, of course, not so constituted as it should be for this purpose.

In conclusion, there is a need for the new Committee on Standards and Conduct to be established, a broadly based committee, but one devoted solely to the problems of raising and maintaining the highest possible standards in the House of Representatives. The House should come to grips with this need in an effective manner and in an important manner, and not just "sweep the problems under the carpet." We can do no less for our country.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bennett, specifically, there seems to be no provision in your resolution for a termination of the study. I assume that, if this resolution is adopted by this committee and by the House, it would operate throughout the 90th Congress. It would be authorized to do so.

Then, projecting that further, is it reasonable to assume that the distinguished gentleman has in mind that the committee, if it proves effective or desirable, should be continued in the next Congress?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, there would have to be a new authorization setting it up.

Mr. BENNETT. The resolution I am bringing to you now is the unanimous recommendations of the committee that has existed in the last session of Congress.

On further thought I, myself, and this was not brought before the committee, have come to a strong conclusion that the committee really should be a standing committee and the reasons for this are twofold:

One, by analogy to the bar association committee on grievances or