

the Conference as a whole, but it is also vitally necessary that he be able to require information of the agencies to determine to what extent, if at all, the agencies implement the recommendations of the Conference. There is, I believe, universal consensus now that one of the principal needs for a strong chairman is to insure that there is some kind of constant goad to the implementation of recommendations of the Conference.

Fourthly, although there are surface differences, there is a most substantial consensus of agreement on the vital subject of the composition of the membership of the Conference. No one disputes the fact that personnel from the agencies must be members of the Conference.

That is true, not only because one of the objectives of the Conference is to enable the agencies to undertake critical self-examination but also because many of the problems faced by agencies are common to many agencies.

The Conference can be of vital importance in affording the agencies a means for exchange of information as to methods, procedures, and operating practices without which the agencies can never know of, or hope to reach, the level of the highest denominator of activity by any agency. Also, agency representation in fair proportion will promote in the agencies a sense of confidence in, and acceptance of, the recommendations of the Conference.

Moreover, within the past few years, there has been a recognition by all who have been articulate in this field that the Conference, if it is to be successful, must have a fair membership from the practicing bar, as well as from the agencies themselves, and also must have members from the experts in the teaching profession in law schools and in universities and others, whether from within the Government or from without Government, must have these outside people, that is, outside the agencies, whose special competence, interest and ability in this field will make them invaluable participants in the Conference. There is also, I believe, without any question a consensus that the outside-of-Government representation should be in such proportion as fairly to reflect the views and interest of the citizens of the United States whose daily lives are directly and vitally affected by administrative action.

The outside-of-Government representation is, according to the consensus, intended to accomplish several things. First, no one denies that such representation will produce a greater activity by the Conference. The outside-of-Government representation will be a deterrent to lethargy.

It will prevent the agencies from converting the Conference into a mutual admiration society for the perpetuation of the status quo. The outside-of-Government people will also be expected to contribute sound ideas for the solution of problems in the field of agency procedures, which solutions will reflect the viewpoint of the public interest.

Although the agencies themselves are, necessarily, and often claim to be the sole, custodians of the public interest, the agencies have also the responsibility for the accomplishment of their own work with expedition, economy, and efficiency. Their duty to the public and their duty to their own operations is not the same duty.

No one expects the agencies to see the viewpoint of the affected citizen to the same extent as nonagency members of the Conference.