

Mr. FASCELL. I suppose ever since the passage of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. O'NEILL. Since the reorganization of the House, I would presume.

Mr. FASCELL. I don't know. But the fact is, I agree with you, that this is a vital issue and it ought to be studied and something perhaps done with that. I am not too happy with the present form of reporting under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. I think maybe that ought to be reviewed and sometime I would welcome the opportunity of going before the House Administration Committee and discussing that. But I don't think that is a matter for this committee as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sisk?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague from Florida on a very excellent statement and I might say one which I would find myself basically in agreement with.

However, it seems to me that he has made a good argument for the position, of course, that I have somewhat been leaning toward and yet, as I understand his position, he would basically oppose what I was proposing.

This would be the upgrading of an already existing committee. Here again I go back to the House Administration Committee, because some of the very things that the gentleman is discussing, as I understand, that would be under the jurisdiction of this new committee and should be looked into, are now under the jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Sisk, not any of the new authority. You would have to rewrite the rule to give it to the House Administration.

Mr. SISK. I would agree that in order to give House Administration this authority we would have to amend the rules.

Now, here is the thing. I think to give this the consideration and the prestige and so on, it should have, that it should be a permanent standing committee of the House. And I believe the gentleman has about the same position.

Now, my thinking has been moving along the line of, let us say, a revamping of the existing committee which, for example, you might call the Committee on Ethics and Administration, because basically it is dealing with accounts, it is dealing with corrupt practices. There are certain areas, for example, in election procedures in which the Committee could get into, it seems to me, as a logical thing. I unfortunately missed last week's hearings because I had to be out on the west coast. I am not sure, has Mr. Burleson appeared before the committee, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. No, sir.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Sisk, we cannot quarrel because this is a matter of judgment and discretion. As I pointed out, this is my opinion based on a desire for emphasis. I am sure any committee will do the job if you give them the jurisdiction. I am not concerned about that. This is too important a matter and no committee would treat it lightly.

Mr. SISK. I agree completely, and this goes to this point.