

partners in a number of the best-known law firms of the country, men without special interest in administrative law, but with vast experience in the basic principles which govern legal procedure. Many—indeed I would say most—of the nationally known authorities in the academic world of administrative law participated. Three outstanding authorities on the science of Government took part as members. Two participants were from State regulatory agencies. In all, 29 general members, that is, outside from the Council, were from outside services. Attendance at the Conference, all of which was public, was almost unbelievably full.

In short, the recommendation which went to the President as the best means to be adopted for the future was not the product of a small committee, theorizing behind closed doors or working with limited knowledge or material. This recommendation was the considered product of an assemblage of the real workmen in the field of administrative procedure, formulated after 18 months of laboratory experimentation.

The recommendation for the future was described on detail in a long report debated and adopted at a plenary session of the Conference. It was epitomized in a single introductory sentence which read:

We recommend the establishment of means by which agencies in the Federal Government may cooperatively, continuously and critically examine their administrative processes and related organizational problems.

I emphasize the precise statement in that sentence because that is the sum and substance of the plan which is in the bill before you.

There are other plans designed by other people—plans for a one-man director, for a one-man office, for a private commission, for a small governmental committee, for 50-50 government-nongovernment commission, for a congressional committee. None of these are this plan. This plan is specific and plain. It is that the agencies be supplied with a means, a machinery, by which they can cooperatively, continuously, and critically examine their own procedures.

The White House translated the recommendation of the Conference, with a few variations, into a draft of a bill, which is now S. 1664, before you for consideration.

I have in my prepared statement a description of the bill and the Conference which would be created, but I believe that is clear enough on the fact of the bill, and where it isn't clear, it has been clarified by the chairman of this committee; I will omit that portion of my statement.

In most fields and in most instances S. 1664 coincides with the recommendation of the Conference to the President. In three respects, however, it varies from that recommendation. I mention those respects without extended discussion, content to leave the matter to the judgment of the committee. At the same time I express the hope that you will agree with the Conference. These variant provisions of S. 1664 are:

1. The limitations on the jurisdiction of the Conference. It seems to us that the jurisdiction of the Conference could well be as broad as the Administrative Procedure Act.

2. The requirement that the heads of the agencies and the departments comprise the membership of the Conference. While this provision has some advantages prestigewise, it seems to us that the