

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fascell, you have been around here ever since these hearings started. We would be glad to hear from you this morning. Give us your words of wisdom about what this committee should do.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DANTE B. FASCELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen.

I appreciate the opportunity to add some thoughts to the discussion on this subject. I think that there are several questions which need to be answered.

One of the questions is, Can we in the Congress tell the American people that it's all right to have a double standard? Can we lay down one set of rules for the executive branch of government and practically no rules for the legislative branch of government? Can we require a Cabinet officer or some other executive officer to dispose of all of his assets in order to hold public office, but make no mention with respect to the Members of Congress?

It is an unanswered question.

A committee, a permanent committee, a standing committee of this House, ought to have the opportunity to review that question along with others and reach some kind of a sensible recommendation which could be considered by the House.

Are we going to be able to answer the question as to whether or not the present statutes on conflicts of interest need to be codified, extended, or modified in light of present-day conditions? Is it all right for me to be a member of a law firm, even though I don't draw any money from that law firm or I draw very little money from that law firm, or I practice or don't practice law? Is it all right for a physician to run his clinic? Is it proper for a Member of Congress to have other sources of income? We ought to have a committee of the House knowing what our own problems are, in light of what the American people expect, at least study the issue, analyze it, and maybe come up with a recommendation that this House would have the opportunity to vote on.

Now as to the possibility that we would be subjected to irresponsible charges, I have not been in a campaign yet that my opponent didn't throw irresponsible charges at me. All of you have had the same experience. You handle them every day. I don't see that meeting the issue head on would cause a Member of Congress any more difficulty than he now has.

I think we would be a lot better off if we could specify, as far as possible, the rules for membership and then do our best to live up to those rules. We would be, as officeholders, in a lot better position. Specific rules and standards would help resolve the doubts and the reservations that the public has, plus there would be less opportunity for each of our opponents to confuse the public in a campaign.

Can we in the Congress ignore the fact that a trend has started in the executive branch of Government with respect to the establishment of trust funds for executive officers? Is that a good practice? If it is, what's wrong with suggesting that it is a desirable practice for Members of Congress?