

conceivable angle, studied and debated, back and forth, over the past few years.

But it is not my intention here to compare the advantages and disadvantages of the various types of agencies which have been proposed over the years, not only because I do not set myself up as an historian in this area, but more, because I sincerely believe that the form of organization proposed here—establishment of the Administrative Conference of the United States on a permanent basis—represents a synthesis of the best features of the various agencies previously considered.

Here, the high degree of autonomy of the proposed Conference, specific exclusion of the Conference from matters of substantive policy committed to agency discretion, the provision for a Chairman with an expanded role and meaningful authority, the provision for an adequate staff to assist the Conference in recommending procedural reforms, and, finally, the provision that recommended practices are to be formulated through mutual cooperation and only after agency members have been afforded an opportunity to appraise the effects of such standards on their operations—all these features of S. 1664 speak well for the proposed Conference.

And, at the same time, they serve to lessen the concern which really lay at the heart of most agency objections to previous proposals in this area—the fear, whether justified or not, that some administrator, though well-intentioned, might try to force all agencies into the same rigid mold.

But under the safeguards provided by this bill, I think such fears would be unjustified. And, in my judgment, the bill is a good one which carries a high degree of promise for bringing about much-needed reforms.

Now, in light of the fact that the previous witnesses have so ably discussed the work of the recent Administrative Conference and the background of this bill, what I should like to do, if I may, would be to direct the balance of my remarks to a somewhat different matter—that is, discuss briefly the benefits which agencies could expect to derive from participating in the Conference.

I think this aspect of the bill deserves some attention, because, human nature being what it is, there is a regrettable tendency for all of us, immediately upon seeing a new piece of legislation, to think solely in terms of new obligations and duties, viewing the plus factors of such legislation with a certain amount of skepticism.

At this point, one of my associates, Mr. Chairman, in the draft of this statement, indicated that perhaps I might express this thought by saying that some people, when they are faced with a new piece of legislation, take the so-called attitude of the fellow who says, "I'm from Missouri, show me." And I told him I thought that might be a little inappropriate in view of the identity of the chairman of this subcommittee.

However, this is a problem.

What, then, can agencies expect to derive from participating in the Conference?

To my mind, the most important, and also the most obvious, benefit will be to obtain a combined marketplace, forum, and testing laboratory for the assembling and exchange of ideas and information useful to procedural reform.