

We do have legislation in the conflict-of-interest field that was developed, I believe, in 1961, where we cannot represent any client before an administrative agency of the Government, anything except the court.

But at the same time there are border cases, like whether a Member of the House who is a lawyer, for example, should handle a case, an application for a bank charter or a savings and loan charter.

There are a number of cases that are borderline cases that may not be covered literally by the language of the act.

What about the case that is going on in the other body now about the alleged misuse of campaign contributions? It is only elections, as I understand it, that your committee has authority to regulate or observe whether a misuse of campaign funds occurs. I realize it might properly be a subject for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to investigate, but if a thing of this kind comes to be well known, or perhaps notoriously known, it is a subject of embarrassment, and the ethics committee in the other body is now considering that.

But there is a glaring example that would not normally come before the House Administration Committee, as I understand it, if that committee did not have additional and general authority.

And we have the Baker case over in the Senate where they discovered that an employee of the Senate was engaged in notorious operations leading to personal profit by him, the use of his power and contacts there to make money on the side.

I realize if somebody had heard about these growing activities on the part of this employee, they could have told his employer about it, and no doubt he would have done something about it. But it finally came to a committee for disclosure. I believe, that was set up especially in the Senate before the regular ethics committee was constituted.

But a case like the Baker case would not normally, as I understand it, have come before your committee because he was drawing his Senate salary. It was these outside activities that came to be notorious.

And there was a case that came before the House where there was an exclusion of a Member who was duly elected and an expulsion of this Member, the Whittemore case in 1870, where a Member was found guilty of selling appointments to one of the military academies.

I do not know whether that would come within the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs or the Armed Services Committee, but if a report like that got around, if somebody found out that a Member was selling appointments and they knew about the existence of a committee, somebody at home could write back and say, "I just found out my son did not get this appointment because this representative had sold it to a fellow who gave him \$5,000 for it."

Mr. YOUNG. How much?

Mr. PEPPER. \$3,000, whatever you want to say. "So my son did not get it." But he would know there is a committee here to which he could write. That would not normally come before your committee would it?

All of the cases that I recall for the moment, or most of the cases that I recall for the moment that have brought discredit on one of the Houses, only one of them, and that is the Powell case, actually involved the misuse of funds, which did come within the jurisdiction of your