

mittee and the members are up for relief. Should we abolish that committee and form a select committee?

My understanding of a select committee was only when there was conflict between two committees would a select committee be made. Then that select committee could recommend legislation. They could merely come up with their findings and give them to the appropriate committee for whatever action they see fit to take.

So there are so many questions here, and no yardstick. We have got to do the best we can under the circumstances, and to me it represents a rather unusual and difficult question.

I can understand very well how your committee acted. You were tied down, had certain restrictions, and I know how people react when they read the newspapers. Every one of my people back home, when they read about the salaries a certain woman was getting outside the mainland, would say, "Why am I not on the payroll? Even my wife who answers the phone from 7:30 in the morning until 11:30 at night. For 20 years she has been doing this. I never knew such a thing existed."

Certainly most political people never knew such a thing existed. It is a difficult thing. I do not know just how best to handle it, but I am not one of those who feel that it has to be done this exact moment and done in haste, because whatever we do I hope has a degree of permanency.

We are not meeting every situation as it arises.

Mr. BURLISON. And, too, Mr. Delaney, if I may interrupt, this reorganization bill is coming over from the other body. There have been changes. I do not know how that would affect the situation, but it is bound to, to some degree, and it might be well until we know how far reaching that is, and how it applies to our operation here before we jump off into something here we are not sure about.

Then, too, if I may add, going beyond what will be the rules and the law and the mechanics which would enable an investigation to be conducted on certain charges made against a Member. I do not know how many of you remember, but a few years ago there was an article by one of Mr. Pearson's men, Jack Anderson, entitled "Congressmen Who Cheat," or something like that.

I was wrapped up in a part of one of them. It declared that we had an expedient action at one time, an elections contest case—I will not bore you with the details of that—but it was known on both sides, the leadership on the committee. I think Mr. LeCompte, of Iowa, was ranking member.

Well, to shortcut it, we were criticized. You may recall that Mr. Anderson wanted to testify before the committee, and we accepted the challenge, which we should not have done, but nevertheless he came up with a lot of papers. He was sworn, and he was asked in the beginning if he had direct knowledge, personal knowledge of the charges he was about to present, and he said, "I have proof of it."

I asked him, "Do you have personal knowledge?" and this goes beyond, I thought, and still think, certainly the relationship between the newsman and his source of information.

But the point is he admitted that what he was about to present was hearsay, and under the rule of best evidence I said, "This committee will not permit hearsay evidence," and we adjourned the session. That is all there was to it.