

Mr. CURTIS. I think a great deal of them are. I do not know that it is 99 percent, but some of them were. According to the Parliamentary some bore on House matters.

At least that is the basis for his ruling, and I have always felt that this was a proper thing, when a bill came over from the Senate with nongermane material or material that a House legislative committee had never had an opportunity to zero in on, that proper procedure did indicate that it should come into the Rules Committee for the Rules Committee to determine whether this material was of such a nature that it should be referred back to the legislative committee for study.

In this instance, of course, the Rules Committee is the legislative committee to look into this.

I would hope, though, that the Rules Committee would tend to limit themselves to the area of these kinds of amendments rather than to reduplicate the work that we tried to do and hopefully we did do over a period of 2 years. Because, if the Rules Committee attempted to do that, I am afraid we would never have seen the Monroney-Madden-Curtis bill this year.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the procedure over there in the Senate, although it was on the floor for 3 weeks, about, was interrupted constantly, and the major part of the amendments adopted over there were from one Senator, who had about 50 amendments, and I do not think there were more than one or two of his amendments adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. Now, if I could discuss some of the substance of this issue as I see it, and why, at least I as a member of this committee felt that you needed a separate and permanent committee.

First, I have jotted down five areas that bear on this question of ethics. One is elections themselves. Here, very clearly, the House Administration Committee has a lot of expertise and has been in this area for some time, but notably they have never really developed a code of ethics in respect to elections.

I think they could as far as elections are concerned, the ethics part of elections could be handled by the House Administration Committee.

But it then moves into the area of financing of elections, and this gets somewhat out of the normal jurisdiction of the House Administration Committee. It moves on over into a second item that we have to establish a code of ethics on; namely, ethics in relation to lobbyists, and how Congressmen relate themselves to them. This involves this question of how do lobbyist groups—and this is a proper thing in my judgment—how do they contribute campaign funds in a proper way, and what would be improper.

This is one of the areas where we need the ethics spelled out, because a lot of us know there is a gray area here. We would like to conform to what is a considered judgment of the correct ethics, but no one really knows what these ethics should be.

So when we get into this lobbying relationship, I think we move out of the area of the House Administration's expertise in the past. They have had little dealing with this aspect.

Note what we have in the Monroney-Madden-Curtis bill respecting tightening up procedures as far as the lobbyists themselves are concerned. To my regret, we did not zero in on the question of relationships of Congressmen to procedures of lobbyists, particularly in this financing thing, but in our studies and discussions we certainly did