

not been possible to take into account and fully reflect in the draft all the divergencies of view.

There are some fundamental points, however, that we feel are highly important from our point of view in any legislation on this subject. I have tried to point those out in my statement—the official character of it; the primary emphasis upon it being a device whereby the agencies themselves can improve their procedures; the strong role the chairman would have to play in this picture. These are some of the fundamental points, it seems to me, with respect to any discussion on this subject.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Staats, the only thing I wanted to get clear in my mind is whether the Bureau of the Budget has considered the suggestions made by Judge Prettyman and Professor Gellhorn and people from civic organizations like the American Bar Association and rejected them or not so that we know what the Bureau's position is on these various matters.

Mr. STAATS. I do not want to be too definitive on this point, because I think you still have some testimony to be presented here, and we have never attempted to really formally come into agreement with all of the interests here.

We have had discussions. We think we have a meeting of the minds on most of the points, but I think that they should be free to state what differences they have.

But to the extent that we are aware of specific changes—I am trying to give you as definitive an answer as I can—I think we have considered all of the viewpoints, and we feel that this represents a better approach.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, then, let me just read one or two sentences from Judge Prettyman's testimony which is typical of my concern with it. He says:

At the same time, I express the hope that you will agree with the Conference—of which he was speaking—

with respect to varying provisions of the bill.

Now, do I understand the Bureau of the Budget does not favor the variance that Judge Prettyman sets out?

Mr. STAATS. Does not—

Mr. KENNEDY. The variance as Judge Prettyman describes it.

Mr. STAATS. I am not sure what the specifics are here. You are talking about—

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, he listed three of them in his testimony; for example, the limitations on the jurisdiction of the Conference; two, the requirements that heads of the agencies and departments comprise the membership of the Conference; and, three, that alternatives or substitutes be permitted.

Now, those are suggestions which have already been made, and I am not clear whether the—

Mr. STAATS. Yes. Well, I will be happy to comment on each of these points because we have discussed them.

First, I would like to take up the matter of the membership. I believe he indicated a question with respect to the requirement that the heads of the agencies and departments comprise the membership of the Conference.