

mittee feels about him. But if they approved him, I would be glad to offer him this job, but I don't think he would want to take very much of a cut, because that's a permanent job and he has a lot of children and I just don't think he would be willing to take a deep cut to come to this committee although he is interested in the subject matter.

So I would think I could probably not offer him less than \$20,000 a year. He is a master of law from Harvard and a capable man. The committee would have to approve who is selected. They might want to take somebody else who is less experienced and less capable and pay them less money, but my own feeling is it is better to have a small staff composed of really competent people than to have a large staff composed of people who really have very little to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Bennett, I would like to go back briefly and then I am going to finish my part of this, as far as this witness is concerned anyway.

The question was discussed here between your colleague on this committee and others about what would have happened with reference to a certain other Member of this House and his alleged derelictions had your committee been in existence.

Do we not now have laws that cover all of these alleged violations?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, there are laws now dealing with things in the House Administration Committee's activities and those are the only laws that are being looked at as far as I know with regard to the Powell hearing. Of course, I am not on that committee, so I cannot speak to everything they looked at. But there certainly are vacancies in the existing laws.

If you read the report which this committee got out, about 10 pages in the report, I think, relate entirely to existing standards in this field.

The CHAIRMAN. And I read that.

Mr. BENNETT. Just by reading them, you will see they were enacted for particular circumstances and not a general look at the law at all.

A specific thing had to be cured and they wrote a law to cure that thing without looking at the broad picture at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, any law that was recommended by your committee would have to be specific, would it not?

Mr. BENNETT. It sure would and it would also have to be passed not only in our committee and passed by the House of Representatives, if it was going to be a real law, it would have to be passed the Senate, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I just come back to the basic question that bothers me about this, whether you can set up the standard code of standards or ethics that would be effective or would result in the desired results of making Members of the Congress, employees of the House, conduct themselves in an ethical manner.

Mr. BENNETT. This falls into two categories: First, the question of drawing a general statement of code of ethics, not criminal law; and, secondly, the bringing in of criminal law in this field, or specific laws which would say that certain things are prohibited and they could be taken to the courts if they were wrong.

I think it would be very difficult to draw a code of ethics which would be meaningful and helpful in the field of general House behavior, but that is not to say it cannot be done. I think it can be done