

Mr. DORN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SISK. That brings me, then, to the question really that I had in mind. I don't think on the basis of objectivity that there is really any difference of opinion among the Members of Congress, certainly none that I have heard discuss this subject. I think the 400 and what—434 Members we have at the moment, are almost unanimous on their objective here about the need. I think the method, the *modus operandi*, to achieve that may be where some of us differ.

Now, I have been concerned. I feel that we do need—I agree with the gentleman—I feel we do need the permanent committee. Of course this goes then to the point of my own feelings, that if we are going to consider the creation of a new standing committee, which is in essence what it amounts to, if we are going to amend the rules and make a permanent committee, then why not use an existing committee?

That is why I wonder about the charge, then, if we amended the rules to grant the type and kind of jurisdiction, the broad jurisdiction needed, let's say to the House Administration Committee because the gentleman is aware and we are all aware of what I am referring to, why is the proposal to move in that direction branded as a whitewash because this then would become a permanent committee.

I am not saying you have made any charges, but there have been some made.

Mr. DORN. I don't think for a moment it would be a whitewash. I think it would be a good alternative, but I do think it is best to hit this problem head on with a standing committee, as the people will be reassured much more than they would by the other method.

I realize there is a lot of room for debate and argument, but I do believe under these extenuating circumstances we ought to go ahead. I would urge this committee to go ahead and establish a select committee or permanent select committee to take care of this situation.

You even hear it overseas. I heard Mr. Madden the other day and I thought he made a splendid statement, Mr. Chairman, about the fantastic cost of campaigning. All of this is involved and I know you have to deal with one problem at a time, but I envision that this select committee or permanent committee could come up with recommendations about this fantastic expenditure and how we can deal with it.

I would like to say this. When I came back from the Army in 1946 after three and a half years—19 months overseas—I saved \$1,500 out of my corporal's pay, and I was able to run for Congress. Just wore out a lot of shoe leather and passed out cards. That is no longer possible, Mr. Chairman.

You have to kind of line up with somebody now, gentlemen, and maybe accept more contributions than we should. Maybe we almost subconsciously become tied up, but you couldn't make a hard campaign today in my district for less than \$50,000.

That's how situations have changed in the relatively short time I have been here. I just think it's getting to the point where you cannot run for public office unless you have a certain amount of wealth in your own possession or friends or certain pressure groups or organizations, so I just wanted to throw that out for the committee.

I could no longer run for Congress today on \$1,500. I did borrow a little that year. That total was about \$3,500 and I paid it back when I came to Congress.