

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sisk?

Mr. SISK. I was intrigued by your comments, Mr. Curtis, in reference to calling the committee a grievance committee, and I might say I can see some real benefit in considering that aspect of such a committee.

I want to join my good friend from California, Mr. Smith, in some of the comments he made, because I think they were very excellent. I, too, want to say that I have had some indication—I was called by some member of the press a day or so ago who wanted to know who was holding up this resolution. Nobody is holding up this resolution.

This particular member apparently did not know anything about what was going on. He seemed to think that the 110 resolutions we had here were all identical. Well, of course there are resolutions of a broad variety of approaches.

One, for example, calls for the creation of a 15-member committee in which you would have seven public members appointed by the President, and then of course there are a number of them calling for a joint committee of House and Senate, as I am sure my friend from Missouri knows.

There are others which go in the direction of having a committee that would hold hearings and develop a code of ethics and report back to the House, some within 90 days, some within 1 year, et cetera, and then go out of existence and the House would approve the recommendations.

Others are similar to the Bennett resolution, which go to the point of being the committee that would be the so-called watchdog of Congress.

So this thing is a serious matter, and I do not think that anyone is holding it up. I think we have a serious responsibility, and I particularly appreciated the comments by the gentleman from California on this.

Getting back to your comments on the grievance angle, and I simply wanted to, because the gentleman mentioned that there are only two professions that apparently have gotten by so far without them, and that is those of us in political life and the press——

Mr. CURTIS. News media.

Mr. SISK. News media, let us put it that way.

I agree with you, because that covers the whole scope. Let me ask the gentleman if he would visualize a situation in the way of a grievance committee such as may exist in the legal profession or others, where, for example, a Member of Congress was being maligned, let us say.

Unfortunately, the news media have among its members a few muck-rakers who seem to have not much else to do except to attempt to destroy some individual, apparently in some cases because of some personal dislikes.

Would the gentleman visualize that some Member of Congress might at some time find himself in a position, because of some wild accusations made against him, that he might want to come to the committee and request consideration?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made a very fine point. Taking it affirmatively, a good grievance committee, and this is true in the bar, where you have a client who for one reason or another does not like what you have done and you say, "Well, why don't you take this to a grievance committee?"