

major Advisory Committee on Public Charities charged with the responsibility of revamping the statutes governing public charities dating back to Colonial Days. The Committee's work has become a referring standard for State regulation of public charities in the majority of the 50 states and has been used by Foundations specializing in this field.

Professor Sargent received his pre-legal training at the University of New Hampshire and was graduated from Suffolk University in 1954, magna cum laude and president of his class.

He was admitted to practice in the New Hampshire Bar after receiving official notice of the highest mark recorded in a bar examination in that state.

He was admitted a short time later to the Massachusetts Bar. He is an active lawyer and a frequent consultant by members of the Massachusetts Bar Association.

He is a member of the American Bar Association, Massachusetts Bar Association, Mt. Vernon Lodge, A.F. and A.M. and the Alpha Delta Law Fraternity (whose most noted member is the Retired U.S. Supreme Court Justice, Tom C. Clark).

Mr. Moss. As I indicated in my remarks following the questions of the very distinguished Member from Illinois, Congressman Springer, it was because of the conclusion reached by me and by Senator Magnuson that we introduced the resolution calling for a study.

The conclusion that there were not sufficient facts upon which to base any legislation. So, of course, we are not considering as a legislative vehicle the Keeton-O'Connell plan.

I believe that we sought, as the other body did, the views of the representative of that plan on the wisdom of a study. It is in a sense in the context of the study only that we are interested in any plans or proposals because until that study is made, I do not think we would be qualified to make the kind of judgments as to whether or not there is a need for Federal legislation or the nature of that legislation which might ultimately be required.

Mr. Keith.

Mr. KEITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I concur in the sentiments which the chairman has just expressed with reference to the mission of this committee at this stage of the game.

I do think that it is helpful to get some education of the sort that you have offered because it is going to be a long and slow process whereby we become qualified to sit in judgment of the recommendations of the Commission 2 years from now more or less.

It is my understanding that no State has thus far authorized the Keeton-O'Connell approach. Is that correct?

Mr. SARGENT. That is true. As you undoubtedly know, it passed the house of representatives in Massachusetts very surprisingly and it was then sent to the senate where it was, after 3 weeks of study, and there had been no study in the house, defeated or at least there was an adverse recommendation by the ways and means committee, 9 to 1, ultimately it was defeated on the floor of the senate 28 to 10.

But I think that the problem with the Keeton-O'Connell plan is that a plan which promises to pay both the innocent and the guilty and cost less money than a system that pays just to the innocent has greater lure.

It is awful difficult to be opposed to that kind of plan.

As you undoubtedly know, in Massachusetts when the bill did pass the house of representatives, the Governor, John Volpe, said that despite the fact he had a plan of his own, the Keeton-O'Connell plan had considerable merit.