

We were not asking him to reveal his sources of information, but to have the individual who had firsthand knowledge—who purportedly advised him of the violation or misconduct of Members in handling certain funds and conflicts of interest.

One Member, and I do not think he is here now, who was accused of buying some property near here and selling it back to the Government when we were clearing this area near the Capitol. You remember some of that.

The point, again, I am making is that aside from the authorization that a committee may have, whether it is House Administration or a select committee or Rules Committee, or whatever it is, as to how that is applied, how it is conducted judiciously, is a highly important thing in this whole business, it seems to me.

It is not just a matter of who has the responsibility, and so forth. It is how it is done.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Anderson, do you have any questions?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I was attending another meeting. I did not hear the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bolling?

Mr. BOLLING. You were here the other day when I outlined a proposal that I think might be an answer. Do you want me to repeat it?

Mr. BURLESON. I think I was here part of the time.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to get your reaction to this proposal, which in effect is to change the name of House Administration to the Committee on Professional Standards. That makes pretty clear what we are talking about.

We are talking about professional standards, not personal standards, and then to expand the jurisdiction of the committee so that at least initially there would be no question of the jurisdiction of the committee to do what in my resolution I propose the committee do.

Obviously, while I talk about the full committee—I mean the full committee, but it could operate through a subcommittee. The main thing is to remember that “The Committee on Professional Standards and House Administration shall, within ninety days of the date of adoption of this resolution, recommend to the House such additional laws, rules, regulations, including necessary procedures for enforcement as it deems necessary to insure proper standards of professional conduct for members, officers and employees of the House.”

As I have said before, I am the person who first made the motion to move the Bennett resolution out last August. I have been thinking of this, and have become extraordinarily concerned about what I consider the looseness of the language of the resolutions I have seen, including the Bennett resolution.

There is no use belaboring the fact, but the Bennett resolution would get us involved in some things that are pious hopes, that resolution we voted for in 1958, which is now binding, I guess, on everybody.

But the thing that really disturbed me is that none of these resolutions specify, No. 1, the timing for at least initial action and, No. 2, they do not specify outlining clearly the procedures to enforce.

The reason I take this approach is that, for example, we have laws on the statute books today which are so patently unenforceable that nobody ever thinks of trying to enforce them.