

Jurisdictional questions are important when there is a conflict. I hope this will not provoke anything but sometimes I am a little apprehensive that we are getting to the point where we are also getting maybe a little partisanship in this thing. I make that observation for this reason: I just want to go on the record again in spite of the fact that there may be some differences of opinion, that if the effort of this committee is to be successful, it has got to be of a permanent nature and it has always got to be on a bipartisan basis.

In this field there is no room for partisanship. There are good eggs and there are bad eggs in both parties. I agree with the gentleman that the good eggs for outnumber the bad ones.

Thank you, Mr. Burleson. Are there any questions of Mr. Burleson?

Mr. SMITH. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Delaney?

Mr. DELANEY. Like yourself, I find it is very difficult to dot every "I" and cross every "T." I have employees here who have relatives on their payroll, and the relatives do a good job. In some cases a Member marries a secretary and she continues to work.

I have in mind another Member who has a daughter who works for the committee. She works there day in and day out and not only does a good job, but has a knowledge of everything that happens in the district because she happened to be brought up in the district.

That would work a hardship on the other side, and if you are going to be absolutely rigid, you might bar everybody within a certain degree of relationship. I think that would be unfair in many instances.

A great number of the Members of Congress are attorneys. If they have a conflict of interest it would be difficult. With a sizable estate you have got to deal with Internal Revenue. Appearing before an agency, is that a conflict of interest? And if you want to carry it to the ultimate, a man from a farm area is certainly affected by legislation dealing with farmers and subsidies, which would bar him on voting under those circumstances, and you could carry this on until almost everyone is included.

People connected with power: Would a person be a tool of the utilities if he voted for a power yardstick, or against it, one way or the other? It is a difficult thing, and I do not know how we can deal with this because there is no such thing as exact justice.

You have to rely a little bit upon the judgment of the Member. The more we delve into this the more it becomes apparent that this is not a good time. When we are publicly and emotionally upset at the moment, and maybe depressed, and I know very often you can do in haste what you later regret.

It is a difficult proposition. We all agree something should be done, but just how, and who will do the job? I am sure this committee has no desire to take on ethics as part of their duties, as was suggested here today.

We have differences with every committee of the House. We have had a conflict here in one of the committees, Banking and Currency, where they are coming to us for relief. There are complaints on nearly every standing committee of the House at one time or another. We have organized, and have a standing committee, because someone happens to be chairman of that committee and cannot control the com-