

to this committee that I think one of the unfortunate situations that has developed because of a problem of lack of proper control over foreign travel is that we are not doing enough legitimate investigation of programs that we are funding overseas. I have great respect for the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I say to you gentlemen the money we are spending in foreign aid and the Alliance for Progress is primarily in fields of education and poverty and agriculture and other areas whose jurisdiction and expertise falls in other committees in this Congress, where members of those committees can go and be helpful in assessing the effectiveness of our aid program and making suggestions for improvement. I think that this Congress should reach the point where we make this kind of travel available to all our Members under circumstances of full disclosure and requiring a report, a full report in detail, of money expended and recommendations made and itinerary, perhaps.

I think this is perfectly feasible. In any event, I think the fact that a Congressman today travels overseas on legitimate purposes at considerable political hazard is another indication of the problem we have in not having standards of conduct and not having clear rules of the road by which we can all proceed with confidence and knowing that we will not be subject to unjustified criticism. I urge upon the committee the adoption of the resolution before you to create a Select Committee on Standards of Conduct. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Goodell. If I may, just briefly, I should like to say you have done your usual excellent job in testifying before this committee.

Mr. GOODELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. You favor the select committee over the proposal of the matter being taken up and handled by the Committee on House Administration. What about the permanence of this committee, Mr. Goodell? I do not think I heard you comment on that. Do you not feel that whatever is done, whatever comes out of this committee, should be upon the basis of some permanency? I repeat what I have stated here before, that we have no assurance whatever that the 91st Congress is going to be composed of any more ethical or more honorable men than the 90th Congress; therefore, whatever is done should be done upon a permanent basis. I am not quarreling with the gentleman's conclusions or his recommendations. I certainly agree that this thing should be and must be bipartisan, if it is possible to make it so, human nature being what it is. What about the permanency of it? I would like to hear the gentleman's reaction to that.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, believing as I do in the idea of an ethics committee, I certainly would believe in making it permanent. If this committee in its wisdom determines that it will set up a standing committee comparable to the proposal for a select committee, I think this would be very appropriate. Obviously, no committee is really permanent in that each Congress must reenact the rules and set up its committees all over again. I would only make one reservation with reference to making the committee permanent. If we make it permanent, I would hope it would be with the understanding that that does not mean that it is fixed and unchangeable. I think we should learn by experience and if changes in the jurisdiction or the