GOVERNMENT
Storage
Y 4
R 86/2
C 76/4/
966/PT. 2
1046
89Y4
R86/2
C 76/4/1966 pt. 2

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. Res. 293

ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

AUGUST 24, 1966

PART 2

Printed for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration

KANSAS STATE
DEC 17 1966
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
67-558 WASHINGTON : 1966

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina, *Chairman*

CARL HAYDEN, Arizona
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia

CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania

GORDON F. HARRISON, *Staff Director*
HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, *Chief Counsel*
JOHN P. CODER, *Professional Staff Member*

[Executive session of the Committee on Rules and Administration of Aug. 24, 1966, released to the public Aug. 26, 1966. This print, designated as Part 2, is a continuation of the Committee's hearing of Aug. 17, 1966.]

CONTENTS

Statement of—

	Page
Hon. A. S. (Mike) Monroney, a U.S. Senator from the State of Oklahoma	19
Hon. Walter S. Magnuson, a U.S. Senator from the State of Washington	20
Hon. Henry M. Jackson, a U.S. Senator from the State of Washington	22

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1966

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:25 a.m., in room 301, Old Senate Office Building, Senator B. Everett Jordan (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Jordan, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd, and Curtis.

Also present: Gordon F. Harrison, staff director; Hugh Q. Alexander, chief counsel; Walter L. Mote, professional staff member; John P. Coder, professional staff member; Marian G. Moore, assistant chief clerk, Committee on Rules and Administration.

James H. Duffy, chief counsel, Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; Roy L. Elson, administrative assistant to Senator Hayden.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a quorum present.

The committee will come to order.

This meeting was carried over from last Wednesday by request in order that more time could be used in studying S. Res. 293, the proposal to establish a special Senate Committee on the Organization of the Congress. I sent out a letter and a notice of this meeting to the chairman and ranking minority member of each standing committee.

I am glad that we have Senator Byrd here today who was not able to be here last Wednesday. Glad you are here this morning, Senator Byrd.

(At this point Senator Clark asked to be excused since his attendance was required at another meeting.)

The CHAIRMAN. Senators Monroney, Magnuson, and Jackson are also here. We are glad to have them and will be glad to hear from them.

Senator Monroney, will you lead off.

STATEMENT OF HON. A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Senator MONRONEY. You were kind enough to hear me last Wednesday. The problem we are trying to meet is to get legislation to the floor and considered by the Senate before adjournment We are up against a very tight program on all legislation that is to be considered.

We have worked 2 years with the joint committee of the House and the Senate trying to design a reorganization program that would help expedite the movement of legislation through the Congress. Our

portion is designed to expedite our work by simplifying some jurisdictions and transferring some overload in various committees of the Senate. We had felt that we had a recommendation that would be permitted to go to the floor. We understand that several distinguished chairman feel that their jurisdictions affected by the proposed realinement should be further discussed by the chairman of these committees and that the resolution we requested should be amended by this committee.

If that is the will of the Rules Committee, we accept it; but I am afraid we will lose the opportunity of getting to the floor and trying to pass the reorganization bill this year. It would seem to be necessary to have it considered before we get to the civil rights legislation which is scheduled to come in immediately after Labor Day.

As I say, the bill that we ask permission to report is an open bill. It is the result of the unanimous votes of the six Senate Members that comprise the Senate side. The House did not have any authority to pass on the Senate jurisdictional questions, each House being the judge of its own rules.

For that reason, I would like to defer any further comment until we hear from the two distinguished chairmen that are here.

The CHAIRMAN. I might add, Senators Jackson and Magnuson, that I sent each chairman and each ranking minority member a complete transcript of the last meeting in which all of Senator Monroney's testimony was included.

Senator Magnuson, we will be glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Senator MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, we have sent a letter to the committee in which we pose a number of questions relating to the proposals of the Joint Committee on Organization concerning committee jurisdiction. These recommendations pose some serious questions on the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee.

Now, we have had no chance to discuss this with the Commerce Committee members. Senate recommendation No. 2 would transfer the Bureau of Standards and Research involving environmental science to an expanded Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and the draft bill proposes the additional transfer of the jurisdiction over the Weather Bureau to that committee. These are presently, and have long been, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. We have devoted considerable study to these substantive areas, and our staff, which has developed considerable expertise, has laid the groundwork for additional future legislation. Examples of our legislative activities during this 89th Congress include the State Technical Services Act, the Standard Reference Data Act, and the committee's present consideration of a comprehensive weather modification bill.

The transfer to an expanded Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of research and development in environmental sciences, including the Environmental Sciences Services Administration, confuses overall Commerce Committee jurisdiction, but particularly the fast-developing field of oceanography and marine resources, an area in which we have just enacted a broad act. We would still retain

jurisdiction of the Coast Guard, fisheries, and the merchant marine, but these are only part of the research and development in oceanography. This is such a radical change that I would like the opportuinity to discuss this with my committee and find out what they think about it.

To rush this to the floor at this time would put us in a very difficult situation. I am afraid we would not get much done down there. Instead, we should sit down and take ample time to discuss this with the committee and with the Senator from Oklahoma, who is a member of my committee. Maybe we can work something out and get this through. These proposals are drastic changes for the Commerce Committee. I point them out in the letter, but I am not attempting at this time to establish the merits or the demerits of the particular proposals. I just want to outline the problem.

Senator MONRONEY. May I say to my distinguished chairman, oceanography would remain in the Commerce Committee, and is not transferred. These other areas would be transferred to a committee which we hoped to build up as a general science committee capable of specializing in these scientific fields as well as space. We feel your space activities will eventually diminish through the years. The scientific field will enlarge, and this would be the place for strong understanding of these scientific affairs.

Senator MAGNUSON. If you establish a Committee on Science, and transfer all environmental sciences, including the Environmental Sciences Service Administration, you are going to cover some oceanography and probably the whole field.

Then there is the Bureau of Standards, with whom our committee deals every day on consumer products. I just feel the present proposal would be confusing. This is my first thought about this, and this is what I want to work out.

Senator CURTIS. May I ask a procedural question?

As I understand it, what the Rules and Administration Committee is called upon to do is to grant legal authority to this committee to proceed to present legislation to the Senate. I do not regard what we would do here as approval of anything.

Now, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma: If we grant you this authority and the Senate approves and, so, you are authorized to report legislation, do you expect to hold hearings so that the distinguished Senators from Washington, both of whom are here, and all other Senators, can speak to the merits before it is sent to the Senate floor?

Senator MONRONEY. We did not propose to do that. We are trying to follow the same pattern as we followed 20 years ago, when the Rules Committee granted permission to report an omnibus bill. The Senate members of the Committee on Organization then reported the bill, and the committee went out of existence. This proved to be a rather satisfactory device, and we were trying to follow this same pattern at this time. Bear in mind, the last reorganization abolished half of the committees of both Houses. No committees are abolished this time, and jursidictions have been shifted to a minor degree to effect a more equally balanced workload.

Senator CURTIS. That is all I have to say. I yield the floor.

Senator CANNON. This is a point, Mr. Chairman, that I was getting at last week when I asked Senator Monroney whether he would expect to report the bill directly to the floor or have hearings, and I

indicated at that time when I asked Senator Monroney whether he had had any discussions with the chairmen of the committees to see whether they had any objections to the procedure—that they should be given the opportunity to state their views. This point Senator Curtis raises today concerns me, and I am prepared, when we get to it, to offer an amendment to the resolution to provide that the special committee shall not make a report until the chairman of each standing committee in the Senate has been given the opportunity to appear before the special committee and present his views so that the special committee would have the benefit of the feelings of all of the chairmen of the committees that have jurisdictions that may be involved in this reorganization plan.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Chairman, would the Senator yield?

Senator CANNON. Yes.

Senator BYRD. Senator Cannon, would you feel it feasible to include the ranking minority members of the committees?

Senator CANNON. Well, I certainly would have no objection to that. I would think that the chairman of each committee would probably want to hold a meeting of his committee to consider these matters and then speak for the whole committee. I have no strong feeling on that point, however.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Jackson.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY M. JACKSON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I just say that I have the highest regard for what Senator Monroney has been able to do in this area. I was in Congress 20 years ago when the Monroney-La Follette Act was passed. It was no easy task. It was a difficult one.

First, I would like to say that a lot of changes have occurred in the past 20 years. The jurisdictions of the committees have become confusing because of a tremendous increase in new programs. My committee is in the natural resources area, and when we take up a given bill, it cuts across several different committees. I think there is a clear need to go into this matter of jurisdiction. The joint committee, however, has only made slight changes in the general jurisdictions of the committees as compared with the abolishment of a whole series of committees in 1946. Then the Congress consolidated the jurisdictions of several committees in the Senate into 17 standing committees, and likewise in the House. But it would seem to me that it would only make sense that we use the committee process to go into this matter and have hearings on the specific proposal. I do not frankly, feel that you can waive the committee process and really get into these proposed changes and do a thorough job. The Senate floor would not be the appropriate place to work these changes out.

I have no desire to delay the committee, but I hope that at some time we will go in even beyond that what the joint committee attempted to do in the way of jurisdictions. I am plagued with this problem continuously in the water field, natural resources field. The work of the Agriculture Committee is involved; the work of the Public Works Committee is involved; Senator Magnuson's committee is involved.

I believe we need to find some new formula, either to have joint meetings from time to time, or some other process in which we can

properly cover the current responsibilities of the existing committees. For instance, the big thing that has occurred recently, as we are all keenly aware, is the emphasis on the changes in our environment. We need to attack the problems of water pollution and all other problems relating to water. Just to speak of one more area, the problems of our cities cut across so many different committees. You are going to have a different committee just on urban affairs. I think you have only scratched the surface, frankly.

I feel very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the bill could be divided and some primary reforms could be accomplished before we adjourn. But I say there is a lot more that should be done in order for the committee system in Congress to operate on a functional basis, so we can truly deal with problems effectively.

I do not think we have reached that point. Having made this suggestion, I want to say again that I have nothing but the warmest praise for the work of Senator Monroney this year, last year, and 20 years ago in connection with Government reorganization and with the reorganization of Congress.

Senator MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on the Interior for all he has said.

We feel that there are minor changes, we think, that were made in the bill and that it was the result of 5 months' hearings that we had in which about 199 witnesses testified, and then a whole year of careful discussion with the six Members of the Senate of the six Members of the House.

I have no desire to rush this thing, except that we go out of existence at the adjournment of this Congress, and the work of the 2 years will be dead as far as carrying out any effort to get a product out of the efforts that we were instructed to carry on.

I just feel we are up against an impossible deadline if we reopened hearings, as much as I would like to do it, if there were time in any way to achieve it. I will still try to do it, if it is the will of the committee and the will of the chairman. We will try to get a quorum. And you people are well aware of the problems we face with the members in trying to maintain a quorum for additional hearings.

Senator CURTIS. May I go off the record just a second?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(Discussion was had outside the record.)

Senator CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the amendment I intend to propose is not proposed with the thought that this would be a delaying action of any sort. I hate to hear the distinguished Senator concede that we might lose our bid for legislation this year. I, for one, would be willing to do everything I could to try to get this legislation considered, and I am sure that some of the committee chairmen who are present here would help also, even to the point of putting aside pending business for consideration after the committee chairmen have had the opportunity to be heard on the bill. There are many good proposals in here, and a lot of good work has been done by this committee, and I would not want to see it go for naught.

I do feel strongly, as I indicated to Senator Monroney a week ago when we had our meeting, that the committee chairmen should have the opportunity to express their views.

67-558—66—pt. 2——2

The CHAIRMAN. Well, as I pointed out at the last meeting, and I would like to do it again today, and as Senator Curtis pointed out a moment ago the committee is not making any recommendations of approval in this bill. I think we should get out a reorganization bill this year if it is possible to get it out. I know that if we do not move pretty fast we probably will not get it out. But I think it is still possible to get it out and give people a chance to be heard on it.

Senator CANNON. May I say to Senator Monroney, I think if you were to give a reasonable period of time for committee chairmen to appear and time for consideration of the bill in their committees and take 3 or 4 days, whatever you require, for your hearings, and then report to the floor, I think we could certainly try to get action on the things that would be presented at that time. But if you go directly to the floor with the bill now, it is obvious that we are going to be trying to do a very difficult job of legislating on the floor, because each committee chairman would have to present his views there, rather than before you; it would be much more effective to resolve as many problems as possible before you report the bill to the floor.

Senator MONRONEY. We have no desire to unduly rush this bill to try to take advantage of any situation. But I must say, if there is substantial delay in consideration of the bill, that would make impossible the passage of the bill through Congress this year. Let me emphasize there would be every right to amend the bill on the floor. We will, of course, follow whatever rules the Rules Committee lays down for us.

If we can come within the time limit and get the bill to the floor, we shall do so.

And we recognize that the committee would be surrendering, along with the Committee on Government Operations, the right to exercise jurisdiction over consideration of legislation which deals with the rules of the Senate or deals with jurisdiction or matters normally under the control of the Committee on Government Operations.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there are two parts to this problem. I have not had a chance to go through the bill in any detail myself but my staff has kept me advised. However, I would say on 95 percent of it, there could be immediate agreement, and maybe certain limited changes could be made in the committee jurisdictions in this session. I would like to see the committee carry on its work next year to help straighten out this problem that we are getting into in the Senate on legislative jurisdiction as a result of so many programs. We are really in a jungle right now, Mr. Chairman, in trying to properly legislate in many areas.

For instance, Senator Magnuson, I think, very properly raised the question on science. Should the Space and Aeronautics Committee handle all science matters? Well, every department of the Government is involved in scientific research, just to illustrate that as one example. As these programs expand we could have real chaos.

So I would like to see the bulk of what Senator Monroney has been able to accomplish during the past 2 years approved this year. Maybe we could then work out some kind of an arrangement, Mr. Chairman, to get into a thorough study of jurisdictions by continuation, at least on the Senate side, of the committee to deal with this problem.

Senator MONRONEY. I would say, in answer to my distinguished colleague, that the pattern is to keep it as an omnibus package even if you have to delay the whole package. I would rather try to as-

semble the six members of the Senate to hear any complaints and straighten them out before we introduce the bill. As you know, this is a committee print that we have here.

Senator MAGNUSON. I think we can work out our differences. I just read this, Mike. If the chairman will permit me, here on page 19, the Appropriations Committee, the Finance Committee, Foreign Relations, and Armed Services of the Senate shall be regarded as exclusive and no Senator shall serve on more than one of them.

Well, I am sure—I am just thinking out loud—I am sure that Dick Russell would want to say something about whether he is chairman of the Armed Services.

Senator MONRONEY. Present assignments would not be affected. But I think the Senator, as well as I, would agree that in the future it would be advisable to limit these very heavy committee assignments.

Senator MAGNUSON. Mike, our real problem is the environmental science research proposal which includes oceanography and weather modification. You cannot separate the two of them.

Senator MONRONEY. I think if you want us to try and have hearings, we stand ready to accept whatever you wish to do. We may lose our opportunity to report legislation this year, but, if so, we would have to carry it over until next January when we do not have much on the calendar.

Senator PELL. I would just like to insert here, and I apologize for coming in late. I heard what Senator Magnuson said, and being very interested in oceanography myself, too, I would agree with him that there should be no separation of environmental sciences and oceanography. As I read this proposed bill, they would still be under the same committee. Or would they?

Senator MONRONEY. Oceanography would be under Commerce, but weather activities would be transferred to the Space Committee, redesignated the "Science and Astronautics Committee."

Senator PELL. To my mind, that would be an error.

Senator MONRONEY. You will always have marginal areas.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate your being here, because this is a matter of great concern to all the committee chairmen. We want to hear what you have to say about the proposed procedure and try to work it out as satisfactorily as we can.

Senator JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Senator MAGNUSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Cannon.

Senator CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if it is in order, I would like to offer an amendment to the resolution at this time. Are you ready to receive that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator CANNON. On page 2, line 4, after the word "advisable", I would offer the following amendment:

Provided, That no report shall be made until the chairman of each standing committee of the Senate shall have been given the opportunity to appear before the Special Committee and present his views.

Senator PELL. In accepting that amendment, it would seem to me we should also make provision for extending the life of this committee, because the calendar being what it is and Senators' plans what they usually are prior to and after adjournment, either running for re-

election or moving around, it would seem to me you might not be able to wind the whole thing up in this Congress. But I think you would have to extend the life on line 6 of this resolution where it says "cease to exist with the expiration of such Congress." I think if we do accept that—I think it has great merit.

Senator MONRONEY. We had hoped to go out of existence. One of the things we prided ourselves in 1946 after we finished the Reorganization Act was that we folded our tents and turned over to the Committee on Government Operations responsibility for executing the law.

We are, unfortunately, up against this deadline. If the Congress thinks enough of what we have recommended generally, we would like the opportunity for the Senate to pass on it.

Certainly we do not expect unanimous approval—and never have—but many things were changed in the original Reorganization Act from the time it was reported to the time it was passed. We will do the best we can. If it is necessary to do so, we can come back in January for 1 or 2 months when there is not much legislation and try to obtain passage.

Now, I would caution against taking out the committee structure, because restructuring the jurisdiction of a committee is the biggest headache in the world. Because our committee structure was hopelessly bad last time, the whole Congress was willing to swallow the loss of jurisdiction and the loss of many, many committees to straighten out and simplify the committee structure. This time, the reorganization of committee structure has been very minor, and I am surprised that the small jurisdictional changes which have been made caused so much excitement. But we certainly do not want to cut anybody off if the chairmen feel their jurisdictions have been prejudiced.

The only way to satisfy that, as I understand the Senator, is to have them appear before this committee, and we will hear them out.

Senator CANNON. Do you have a recommendation as to when the committee should cease to exist in view of this?

Senator MONRONEY. The only thing I would like is that the committee cease to exist as rapidly as possible. I think it may be impossible to get legislation through this session if we reopen for hearings and give enough time to accommodate the chairmen who may wish to appear. Until we have these hearings, it will be impossible, Senator Cannon, I think, to know.

Senator CANNON. My question was, though: Do you have a recommendation as to when the committee should cease to exist, what language we should adopt?

Senator CURTIS. If I may be heard on that.

We provide the funds for the various committees to run through January, so if there is a hiatus there, inability to make plans for the staff will result.

Senator MONRONEY. Our problem in the extension is for the joint committee. If it is going to be extended, it will have to be extended for both the House and the Senate. There are six each.

Senator CANNON. Not in this resolution.

Senator MONRONEY. Not in this resolution. But I think it will be to carry forward, because the House does not expect to take up the bill until the Senate has enacted it or has considered it.

You would need, I think, to contemplate the fact that although this is merely the authority to report a bill, that the basic support for the recommendations and all the data and the expertise rests in the joint committee, which is comprised of the two Houses.

I think probably the thing to do is to express the recommendation that the authority contained in this resolution and in the joint committee resolution should be continued for perhaps 2 months after the next session. I do not like to ask for that, because I hope we go out of existence.

Or would you want to wait until we see how fast we can dispose of the complaints and adjustments required by the testimony of themittee chairmen?

Senator CANNON. Well, there is one point, and that is: If we approve the resolution in this form and waited to see, you might not actually finish by the time Congress adjourns and you would not have the authority then to do anything between the end of Congress and January 1; whereas, you may want to do something during that period. Therefore, I think, to protect you, that it probably should be extended maybe to January 30, 1967, and then, hopefully you could still get the bill to the floor this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Monroney, I am certain now, and I did not know any of this until late yesterday afternoon, that the objection raised by Senator Magnuson and Senator Jackson was that they just had not seen this report of yours. This was no fault of yours or anybody else's I know of, but they evidently had not, because I got Senator Jackson's letter last night and Senator Magnuson's this morning.

So, I am sure this was the sole reason they wished to be heard, and I can understand why they would.

Senator PELL. May I ask another question here?

How many of the standing committee chairmen were heard by your committee in the course of the hearings?

Senator MONRONEY. In the course of the hearings, I would say maybe a third to a half—many of them not on committee jurisdiction, although they knew this was one of the subjects of study.

We did take into consideration that there is one committee we had not heard from in the Senate, the Committee on Labor and Education, which presumably would be most concerned, we having suggested it be divided into two separate committees.

Senator PELL. I am on that committee, and it produced a very strenuous reaction in the committee.

Senator MONRONEY. I have not heard of it, but I should think they should be given a special invitation.

Senator CURTIS. I think time taken to hear these committee chairmen would save a lot of time on the Senate floor.

Senator MONRONEY. I think you are probably right, because I do not know of anything as highly controversial in this report as jurisdictions has proven to be.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is not done, Mike, it might mean defeat of the whole bill, which we would not like.

Senator MONRONEY. I think it is entirely possible, and I think it would be a very bad thing to take the bill to the floor without such consideration.

(Discussion was had off the record.)

Mr. HARRISON. May I make just one point?

As I read S. Res. 293, Senator Monroney, if you do hear the committee chairmen and they have objections to some of the changes in the jurisdictions of committees as proposed in the joint committee's report, then you would have no alternative but to delete those proposed changes from your omnibus bill. This is so because the resolution that sets up the special committee provides that it could not report out a bill or an amendment unless its provisions carry out a recommendation listed in the July 28 report of the joint committee. Therefore, you could not report out something different than what the joint committee recommended. You could however probably delete something.

Senator CANNON. But you could report to the floor what the position is on the committees.

Senator MONRONEY. I think we could get that done after the bill comes to the floor. We could offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further discussion on Senator Cannon's amendment?

Now, do you want to amend that?

Senator CANNON. I would suggest that we vote on the amendment and then that we take a separate vote on the expiration date, or we can put them together, as far as I am concerned.

Senator PELL. I would like to put them together, because I think the two go together, really.

Senator CANNON. Then, in addition to what I have offered as an amendment, I would offer that on page 1, line 6, we delete the words "with the expiration of such Congress" and insert "January 30, 1967", and if they are not finished by then that would——

Senator MONRONEY I would doubt very seriously, knowing what happens in January. Then you have the President's message and all these other things. You would never get down to a meaningful opportunity on the floor by the 30th of January.

Senator CURTIS. Of course, it would come before committee assignments were made, too.

Senator CANNON. I said January 30. I meant January 31.

Senator MONRONEY. I think the minimum you could take and hope to get it out would be at least 2 months.

Senator PELL. Why do we not just say the 1st session of the 90th Congress?

Senator MONRONEY. I would hope we could finish before that. We will do our best, but that would give us enough time.

Senator CANNON. So, it would read: "shall cease to exist with the expiration of the 1st session of the 90th Congress".

Senator CURTIS. Why do we not just let that go and see what happens?

Senator MONRONEY. I think we might be compelled to pack up our records and get our files stored and things of that kind if we have that date. We would have no authority to occupy any space or anything else.

Senator CANNON. You see, you only have money authority until January 31, anyway.

Senator CURTIS. December 31.

Mr. HARRISON. We have always limited our carryover funding resolutions for Senate committees to the end of January. If the joint committee finds that money will be needed beyond December 31, the

required authorization should be approved by both Houses of Congress.

Senator MONRONEY. No; the money comes from the Senate contingency fund.

Senator CURTIS. That runs out on December 31.

Senator PELL. Which would you like, Mike?

Senator MONRONEY. I think we would be hit with a crisis in January, knowing the schedule. You see, you have to have both Houses or it is no good.

Senator PELL. Why would not the first session be—or do you think that delays the whole thing?

Senator MONRONEY. I do not like to ask for that myself. The only hope I have, if we get this snafu that we are on with the committee smoothed out, to get it to the floor as fast as we can and to have the ample time for discussion.

Senator CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I modify my amendment, so that it reads on the first page, omitting on line 6, "with the expiration of such Congress" and insert in lieu thereof, "February 28, 1967".

Senator MONRONEY. We have got a little difficulty here, because we are talking about the Rules Committee resolution for allowing the six members of the Senate to report legislation. The real problem is the joint committee problem, because we want to pass it through both Houses, and we would have to amend the joint committee resolution to extend that time beyond the 31st of December.

Senator CANNON. Well, we cannot do that in this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not believe we can. Well, it is entirely possible that you would clean up these hearings among the few that want to be heard and may not need the additional time. It would be a precautionary measure.

Senator MONRONEY. It is still our purpose, if we can, to get to the floor this session to consider it and pass the bill.

Senator CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move we vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. State your amendment again, please.

Senator CANNON. My amendment is that on page 1, line 6, we delete the words "with the expiration of such Congress" and insert in lieu thereof the words "February 28, 1967"; that on page 2, line 4, after the word "advisable" we insert the following:

Provided, That no report shall be made until the chairman of each standing committee of the Senate shall have been given the opportunity to appear before the Special Committee and present his views.

Senator MONRONEY. Going back to this February 28, this applies only to this resolution; it does not involve any money or anything?

I think the other would be the most important.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Senator MONRONEY. I want to terminate it as fast as I can, but I do hate to be up against a deadline that I would have to come back and ask for additional authority. If you want to make that applicable, as Senator Pell has suggested, to the first session, I think we could manage it and be completed probably by February 28.

Senator PELL. Why do we not make it the first session?

Senator CANNON. The membership of the House changes in the meantime. You may not even have the same group. The other resolution simply authorizes them to meet and report. They are ready to do that now. They have made their report. I really do

not think the other resolution needs to be changed. This is just a matter of holding hearing here before the chairman of the special committee and getting a report from the committee chairman.

Senator PELL. As I understand it, your point is we either should leave it as it is, shall quit at the expiration of this Congress, or have the leeway to go right through the first session; is that it?

Senator MONRONEY. Yes; because, believe me, we want to present it as fast as we can. But the first session would give us more elbow room if it is absolutely necessary to carry over until next session.

Senator PELL. How about March 31?

Mr. HARRISON. The only point I have is this: The Joint Committee goes out of existence at the end of December; so does its expense money; so does the staff authorization. If we pass this resolution which creates a special committee of the Senate, then possibly funds should be included through to January 31, 1967, under normal procedure. I assume Senator Monroney, you are going to use the joint committee staff to take care of your special committee for the time being?

Senator MONRONEY. Yes. They have to serve the House, too, because they have a problem getting their bill out. Some of their changes in jurisdiction involving the House are violently opposed by Congressman Adam Clayton Powell who says we are cutting down his jurisdiction.

Senator CANNON. I would suggest we act on this amendment as it is, and then I have some legislative history that I want to make here that may help out, but first I want to ask for a vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a second to that motion?

Senator CURTIS. I second the motion.

Senator BYRD. I have a question. The committee chairmen will not be confined to the discussion of jurisdictions and realinement of committees, will they?

Senator CANNON. They will have the opportunity to appear and present their views on the entire proposal.

Senator BYRD. On the entire proposal.

Senator Cannon, do you see any objection to including the ranking minority members?

Some of these have been chairmen and I think they would have very valuable suggestions.

Senator CANNON. I would certainly have no objection. I am sure if they want to appear the chairman of the special committee would be glad to have them.

Senator BYRD. Why do we not put it in?

Senator CURTIS. I move to amend.

Senator CANNON. So it will read:

Provided, That no report shall be made until the chairman and ranking minority member of each standing committee of the Senate shall have been given the opportunity to appear before the Special Committee and present their views.

Senator CURTIS. And that means full standing committees and not down to the subcommittees.

Senator PELL. What is the objection to making it go on the whole first session?

Senator CURTIS. I think you will end up a year from now, at the end of the first session, haggling about the whole thing unless you put a deadline on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

Senator MONRONEY. I am not concerned about it. I think we can be through by the 31st of March, but if you want to make it the full first session——

Senator PELL. You do not object to the 28th of February?

Senator MONRONEY. I am a little skeptical that we get the vote through the two Houses. If you start to setting the date on the 28th on February, you might be bogged down in the House.

Senator CANNON. Very well, I will modify it to read "March 31, 1967."

Senator MONRONEY. This is because of the two Houses. We have no control over the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further discussion?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. All in favor of the amendments say "aye"; opposed, "no." [Chorus of "ayes."]

So, the amendments are adopted.

Senator BYRD. The record will show they were unanimously adopted, will it not, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the record here, that I would hope that the distinguished chairman of the special committee would give not less than a week's notice to each of the chairmen of the standing committees when he is to start his hearings, and that those hearings not extend for longer than a week's period of time. So that approximately 2 weeks from this time he would be ready to do his staff work with respect to reporting the bill to the floor, I would also hope that we could all work with the leadership in trying to see that this bill be given some priority so that it could be considered before the end of this session.

Senator MONRONEY. It would please us tremendously if we get it out for consideration and get it passed.

Let me interject here: The House will not be engaged in the civil rights matter and, therefore, will probably be able to get it to the floor when the Senate has completed action.

Senator CANNON. We have not acted finally on the resolution.

I move we adopt the resolution as amended.

Senator MONRONEY. May I say one thing before you take action?

I am afraid, in all candor, that we are going to have to come back to this committee for extension of the life of the joint committee, as suggested, probably by the time limit given by Senator Pell.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be no problem about that, Mr. Chairman.

Is there a motion to adopt this resolution as amended?

Senator PELL. What about money? Should we ask for money?

Senator MONRONEY. That would be handled in the joint committee.

Senator CURTIS. I second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been moved and seconded that the resolution, as amended, be adopted.

All in favor say "aye." [Unanimous chorus of "ayes."]

Senator CURTIS. I move that this record be printed and made available.

Senator PELL. Second it.

The CHAIRMAN. All in favor say "aye." [Unanimous chorus of "ayes."]

So ordered.

Senator MONRONEY. Very well, Mr. Chairman. We will try to get the hearing started next week. I would like to limit it to the 1 week, if we can.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Monroney, for being with us.

Senator CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one further motion on this matter. I would like to move that the chairman be authorized to write a letter to the majority and minority leadership outlining what we have done, and, if need be, sending a copy of today's transcript saying that we hope that the leadership, at such time as this bill is reported to the floor, will give priority and consideration to it in order that it may be considered by Congress during this session.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection?

Senator MONRONEY. We are talking of hearings relating to committee jurisdictional matters?

Senator CANNON. That is correct.

Senator MONRONEY. Whatever the chairman wanted to talk about—on the full report. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much for being with us.

Is there any objection to Senator Cannon's motion? Do I hear any objection to it?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. That will be ordered. Also, the transcript of this meeting will be printed, and a copy will go to each Member of the Senate.

I have received letters regarding Senate Resolution 293, the subject of this meeting, from Senators Magnuson and Jackson, who were present today, and also from Senators Mundt and Saltonstall. Senator Magnuson's letter is cosigned by Senator Cotton. Without objection those letters will be included as a part of the record of this meeting.

(The letters referred to follow:)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
August 23, 1966.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR EVERETT: Thank you for your letter dated August 17, 1966, concerning Senate Resolution 293. This resolution, as we understand it, would establish a Committee whose only function would be to report the bill prepared by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Debate and discussion, then, would be limited to the Senate floor and there would be no chance for testimony and change in Committee.

As the Chairman and ranking minority member of a major standing committee, we feel that we must state our opposition to this procedure.

The Joint Committee is to be congratulated for its fine and thorough work in many areas. We note from the Joint Committee's Final Report, however, that, under the heading of Committee Jurisdiction, the Joint Committee limits its recommendation on Committee Jurisdiction to four specific proposals, of which three are substantive. Senate Recommendation No. 2 would transfer the Bureau of Standards and research involving environmental science to an expanded Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and the draft bill proposes the additional transfer of the jurisdiction over the Weather Bureau to that Committee. These three subjects are presently under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. Our committee has devoted considerable study to these substantive areas and our staff, which has developed considerable expertise, has laid the groundwork for additional future legislation. Examples of our legislative activity during this the 89th Congress in the field of environmental

science include the State Technical Services Act, the Standard Reference Data Act, and the Committee's present consideration of a comprehensive weather modification bill. It is likely that our weather modification bill will be reported at the Committee's next executive session.

The transfer to an expanded Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of "Research and development in environmental sciences, including the Environmental Sciences Services Administration" confuses the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction in regard to the fast developing field of oceanography and the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. With the Commerce Committee retaining the jurisdiction over the Merchant Marine, Coast Guard, and Fisheries legislation, overall guidance of our Nation's oceanography program will become hopelessly confused just when consolidation of the program was being achieved. This is only one ambiguity to which careful Committee consideration should be given before a bill is reported to the floor.

In addition to the recommendations discussed above, the proposed bill raises several other questions concerning committee jurisdiction which we believe should be considered before it is reported to the floor. All of the recommendations of the Joint Committee in regard to the Commerce Committee transfer some of our jurisdiction to other Committees without consideration of those subjects, such as urban mass transportation, which justifiably could be added to the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee.

In light of the questions raised above, we feel that a procedural short cut on these recommendations would be inadvisable wlthout further examination and study by the appropriate committee.

Since the Joint Committee's recommendations in regard to committee jurisdiction have a vital affect on only three committees, further examination would not cause the "great . . . massive duplication of hearings" mentioned in the Hearing of August 17 on S. Res. 293. *But* the changes contemplated are of such serious nature that they ought not be rushed to the floor.

Considering the seriousness of this matter, and the speed which is being contemplated both within the Joint Committee and on the floor, we do not agree that this is simply a procedural matter. With the present Senate timetable as announced by the Senate leadership, there will not be "ample opportunity to exercise . . . independent judgment . . . on the Senate floor." Accordingly, although we appreciate your letter and understand that it is sent as a matter of information we must express strong objections to this short cut procedure.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

NORRIS COTTON,
Ranking Minority Member.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
August 23, 1966.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR EVERETT: Thank you for your letter of August 17 in connection with S. Res. 293 which would establish a Special Committee with legislative authority to act on a bill designed to implement the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

As Chairman of a major standing committee, I recognize that the legislative branch of our Federal government must be organized in such a manner as to be responsive to the critical needs of our society at this point in history. However, as I am sure you will agree, in order for the Senate to adequately consider any proposed changes in our present organization, it will be necessary for each member to have an opportunity to critically examine in detail the recommendations submitted. Therefore, I have serious reservations concerning the procedure you have outlined in connection with S. Res. 293.

You have stated in your letter that Senators will have ample opportunity to express their viewpoints on the legislation on the Senate Floor. I strongly contend that the Senate Floor is not the place to carefully and objectively analyze the legislation which will be reported. It will be necessary to hold additional hearings at the Committee level on specific legislation which embraces the proposed changes.

I urge that the role of the Special Committee be clarified and an assurance be given that an opportunity for hearings and consultation with the Special Committee be provided before final action is taken by your Committee on S. Res. 293.

I will be happy to make any statements in support of my position, if that is your desire.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON, *Chairman.*

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1966.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR EV: Thank you for writing me as you did on August 17.

Please put me down as emphatically favoring early approval of S. Res. 293. I think this is the only efficient and expeditious manner for bringing the reform proposals of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress to the attention of the Senate as a whole.

I completely agree that the procedure to be followed is correctly outlined in S. Res. 293 and that only by submitting an omnibus bill to the Senate can we get this matter before us so that the desirable reforms can be adopted and that any that the Senate consider undesirable can be eliminated by amendment.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT, *U.S. Senator.*

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 22, 1966.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EVERETT: I have your two letters regarding Senator Mike Monroney's testimony and the hearing on S. Res. 293. I know that there has been much work by the House and Senate members of this committee. I only feel that if they can draft one bill, it would be more helpful for them to do so and to submit it to the Senate as an expression of their views.

My suggestion is bolstered by recalling the procedure in the 79th Congress in 1946. The draft of the committee was supported by Senator LaFollette at that time. As I recall it, we debated it for at least a week, if not more, and the final result was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

In answer to the question contained in your letter, I am glad to recommend that the same procedure be adopted in connection with S. Res. 293. I believe it will be the method most generally supported by informed persons as to reorganization procedures. Of course, we must have an independent judgment on the proposals recommended for legislation.

With kindest personal regards and thanks for inviting me to express my opinion, I am,

Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
U.S. Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. That concludes the day's business.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your attendance this morning.

(At 11:22 a.m., the committee stood in adjournment, subject to the call of the Chair.)

A11600 762827