

I would suggest, too, that any code of ethics over a period of years needs changing, no matter how well it is conceived when it is first set up. **Experience shows in certain areas it needs to be changed.**

Second, and I was pleased to be present during some of the testimony to hear the questioning of Mr. Bolling and his statement, there is need to have the mechanism, practical mechanism, to enforce the code once it is established.

Then let me interject a third thing, which is part of this mechanism, and also calls attention to one of the great weaknesses in the present congressional structure on ethics and a whole lot of other things.

It is the fact that we do not have an independent audit of the congressional books. GAO does not audit the congressional expenditures. The GAO should audit the congressional books. They are an arm of the Congress, but nonetheless they are an independent organization by structure, inasmuch as the Comptroller General is appointed for 14 years.

This would serve the function of an independent audit. I think whatever is done that this ought to be done just as quickly as possible. Why it has not been done over the years is just inconceivable. It is the only large institution in the country, Congress, that does not have independent audit of its books.

The executive department, of course, does.

This has led, I think, to a great deal of, let us say the misunderstanding, perhaps, of how money is spent in the Congress, whether it is spent by the individual Congressman as part of his office allowances or part of the money that is allotted him, the stationery fund, or the manner in which the committees spend their money, or the manner in which counterpart funds are spent, and so on.

So I would urge that this third aspect be incorporated into this. Now, we could wait, of course, but I would not urge that we wait, for the Monroney bill, the Monroney-Madden-Curtis bill, to reach the floor. That bill has been referred, of course, to this Committee on Rules and in my judgment rightly so, if I may comment.

We had hoped that originally that bill would go directly to the floor of the House under a rule granted by the Rules Committee, but there were so many amendments put on that bill in the Senate which our committee, of course, did not consider and the House has never had an opportunity to consider, that I think very properly the Parliamentarian sent it here, to this committee.

This is not true, of course, of this specific area on ethics; here I would think it would be very wise under the circumstances for this committee to report out the bill, and I would urge the bill that would create a permanent committee—not a select committee that the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bennett, is talking about. I would hope the rule for debate would be broad enough, of course, so that amendments to this could be considered on the floor and that we move as promptly as we can on this.

I think this is exceedingly serious. The integrity of the Congress under the present climate is very much involved.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. You referred to the amendments offered on this in the Senate. I think that 99 percent of those amendments were pertaining to the Senate's procedures.