

Mr. FASCELL. But I am of the opinion that the House Administration has enough to do already.

Mr. SISK. I would raise a question about that. Here again this is not to be critical of anybody. I am not a member of the committee and I believe the gentleman is not a member of that committee.

Mr. FASCELL. No, I am not.

Mr. SISK. I know very little really about the committee. It has been my understanding it has been considered, as we class committees, one of the so-called minor rather than major committees. Jurisdictional areas should be considered in setting up a so-called code of ethics, and in consideration of conflicts of interest, in consideration of so-called corrupt practices and how we might be affected by them. All this lends itself toward at least consideration of reorganizing and upgrading an already existing committee rather than further proliferation of activities and jurisdiction in the House, because we tend, it seems to me, to be going back after losing ground over the Reorganization Act.

Now, the Reorganization Act came about to consolidate and eliminate what at that time was some 80 committees. We brought it down at that time, I think, to 17 committees, 16 standing committees. Now already we are back up to 20.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Sisk, I know your point and I recognize its validity as far as the Reorganization Act is concerned.

I think that here you have to face the issue straight out. Is this an important enough subject, new enough, vital enough, and broad enough to require the establishing of a new standing committee or—

Mr. SISK. It would deal, you agree, with House administration, because basically that is the subject we are talking about?

Mr. FASCELL. No; I disagree altogether. I don't think the subject has anything to do with House administration as far as keeping of accounts is concerned.

Mr. SISK. As I said, I can understand the reason for difference of opinion and I value the gentleman's judgment in the matter. It does seem to me, though, to some rather basic extent the program which the gentleman has outlined has at least a potential conflict of jurisdiction. It would deal to a large extent with things falling in the administration of the House.

Mr. FASCELL. The truth of the matter is, it depends on what kinds of jurisdiction you gentlemen give any committee before it will do anything.

Mr. SISK. Thank you; that's all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will have to go into executive session. Mr. Pepper?

Mr. PEPPER. I just wanted to compliment my distinguished colleague on his splendid statement.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. I appreciate your time and attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, March 7, 1967.)

(The following was submitted for the record:)