

committee. I think it might end up accomplishing the same purpose.

I would prefer and would recommend that we have a select or a permanent standing committee independent of the House Administration Committee for several reasons. One reason is that, although there are many justifications as to why the House Administration Committee has not acted in the past in terms of jurisdiction and other problems, I think sending it to the House Administration Committee would be a move that could be and probably would be misinterpreted. Second, I think the Ethics Committee or the permanent standing committee should have equal party representation which would be difficult in a subcommittee of House Administration. With reference to your suggestion that there be a time limit of 90 days for a committee to come back with specific recommendations, that has considerable merit and should be considered by this committee and by the House. I think this, however, could be done by whichever agency you refer this jurisdiction to, whether it is the House Administration Subcommittee or a select or permanent committee on ethics. I would not say, in other words, that the 90-day requirement is an argument for or against jurisdiction in either place.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to comment briefly on two points that you make. I believe that this committee, as all other committees, should be controlled by a partisan majority. I happen to believe, and this is not necessarily a popular thing to say, that the responsibility for ethical failures primarily lies with the majority party. I think it is unquestionably everybody's concern, but I believe in party responsibility to the point where I think clearly that the majority should have and take the responsibility.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BOLLING. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the gentleman agree that if you ever want to take something effectively away from the American people just make it bipartisan. Then they cannot do anything about it. If it is a partisan situation, it is a fixed responsibility.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman and I see the thing together. I agree with this. I think they can then fix responsibility.

I will repeat again I think the Democrats are responsible for the ethical problems of the House of Representatives just as the Republicans were in the 80th Congress and the 83d Congress; just as we all are, individually. There is one other point that seems to me important. I cannot find any reason to believe that the American public is going to exonerate us or not on how we title our committee. I think what we do is going to count. That is the reason for the 90 days, because I think that this will have a more effective impact in getting something done and done promptly than setting up two dozen select committees. So, frankly, I can hardly see where it makes really any difference except to encumber us with one more committee.

Mr. GOODELL. I respect the gentleman's argument. I respectfully disagree with him. I think the matter of party responsibility is a valid argument to make. I think, however, that in this area, most importantly, we should have the appearance and the reality of nonpartisanship. We talk about bipartisanship. I would distinguish it from nonpartisanship. I think this should be an unpartisan committee. As a practical matter, I think equal representation will give