

I think that a committee of this House ought to examine that question and make a recommendation to us.

These are some of the questions which could be resolved by a committee suggested by the pending resolutions, and it is because of the scope of this work and because the committee would also sit as a "grievance committee," that I believe that it would be better for the Congress to set up a permanent standing committee.

I introduced a resolution for a select committee. However, I agree now with the chairman; I think it ought to be a permanent committee of the House.

I suggest this for the reasons I have outlined, and not because the House Administration Committee would not do a good job, because I know it would. But House Administration now has charge of House accounts, all of the election laws, including the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and campaign contributions. By the way, that is where that problem belongs. Campaign contribution questions under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act do not belong in this committee.

The House Administration Committee has enough problems, so I don't advocate as a first choice that it should be given additional jurisdiction and responsibility.

In fact, I want to emphasize the importance, as I see it, of showing and demonstrating to the American people that we are willing to act strongly and affirmatively. You are going to have to amend the rules regardless of what you do. So, from the standpoint of mechanics, it doesn't make any difference. In order to give it to the House Administration you are going to have to amend the rules.

I have no quarrel with the House Administration Committee or any other committee for that matter. I think any committee given the responsibility is going to try to do an outstanding job for Congress and the American people. I do believe, however, and I agree with Mr. Dorn, who preceded me, that because of the extenuating circumstances under which we find ourselves facing this issue in this Congress; because the jurisdiction which this committee would have is large enough to keep that committee busy without adding it to the already large jurisdiction which the House Administration Committee has, I would submit that the best course of action would be to amend the rules and set up a permanent Standing Committee on Ethics and Conduct.

One final statement. I do think that the resolution ought to be amended as the principal sponsor has already indicated he would agree to have it amended. We ought to knock out of the resolution any reference to a code of ethics adopted in a previous Congress which is not specific.

I think that we ought to start out basically on the fundamental law as it exists in the statutes. The committee would then, in the exercise of its judgment, with proper hearings begin to formulate precise standards or rules, either by modifying or adding to the conflict-of-interest statutes or setting up other specific House rules for the purpose. Those recommendations would come to the House, the House would vote on them. Then, and only then, everybody would be bound by the precise code, standard, or ethic.

I think it would be a fundamental mistake to go back and try to incorporate now a broad, general statement of ethics, as good as they are, and try to put on this committee or any committee the responsibil-