



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1966

No. 59

FAIR WARNING ACT OF 1966

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this morning's papers carried the news that General Motors Corp. had recalled certain Chevrolet model automobiles for repair of dangerous defects. Notification of the defects in certain of these models reportedly was made several months ago to 6,500 General Motors dealers, but not to members of the public at large who might own or operate such autos. I believe that such notification should have been made at that time as well to those who drive these automobiles every day—and in particular, this was necessary in my State of Minnesota. We were told in the papers that under conditions of wet, heavy snow or slush, the throttles on certain models of Chevrolet cars could stick, and the cars would continue forward even though the driver took his foot off the accelerator. These are common conditions in Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, and indeed throughout much of the Nation.

Since I believe that the consumer has the right to know when the automobile he drives has dangerous defects, I am introducing today the Fair Warning Act of 1966, which will provide that automobile manufacturers must notify owners, dealers, and the public of dangerous defects in the cars in which they are driving and riding.

The President's bill on traffic safety requires the promulgation of auto safety standards, but it is reasonable to assume that such standards will not become effective for at least 3 or 4 years after the bill passes. My bill would provide immediate protection to the consumer and purchaser of automobiles. And indeed, even if auto standards are adopted, it will be possible to revise them for use in the production only of new models. But the consumer has a right to know immediately, not after a year or more has elapsed. And he would be protected only if he could afford the costly venture of buying a new car.

In summary, my bill would require the manufacturer of automobiles to notify people who have cars which are defective. It places the burden of discovering the defect on the manufacturer because he has designed, produced, and inspected the automobile, and is in the best possible position to know of the defects in the automobile, and the remedies for correcting the defect.

The proposed legislation provides for criminal penalties and a presumption of negligence to aid the civil litigant. In addition, the Attorney General is authorized to receive complaints on auto defects and notify the manufacturer of such complaints. The information received by the Attorney General will be public information and available to litigants.

The bill requires the manufacturer to notify all owners of defective automobiles by registered mail, to notify its own dealers, and to make public notice in newspapers circulating in all areas in which the defective automobiles have been sold. The obligation of notification falls on the manufacturer whenever he knows or should know of the defect. Notification must be made immediately to the owners of such cars, not exceeding 30 days after the defect becomes known.

Two methods of enforcement are provided. First, the manufacturer is liable to a fine of \$1,000 for each such defective automobile, or imprisonment, or both. Second, failure to comply shall constitute negligence on the part of the manufacturer in any lawsuit brought against the manufacturer for loss of life, injuries or property damage arising out of the defect.

In the past, manufacturers have asked their dealers to recall certain types of automobiles to repair dangerous defects. Recently some adjustment had to be made in the braking system of some 500 of the Buick Le Sabres built during 1965. Dealers were told to call these models in for repair. The Ford Motor Co. is reportedly completing its program of calling in some 40,000 Lincoln Continentals for repair of a dangerous defect in their braking system. Notice was not sent to each owner.

We are all familiar with the well-publicized case of the Chevrolet Corvair, which for several years had a rear end suspension system which tended to buckle under and cause the auto to roll over in turning. Dealers were offered kits to improve this defect, but no general notification was made to those who owned these models.

In 1959, the Supreme Court of Michigan considered a case in which the brake fluid of the Buick Roadmaster could be sucked into the engine, robbing the driver of any braking power. The dealers were notified of this defect, but the consumers and purchasers were not unless they happened to bring their cars in for servicing. The Michigan Supreme Court said that in their view the facts in the case imposed a duty on General Motors to take all reasonable means to convey effective warning to those who had purchased these Buicks of the very real danger which could confront them when driving the car.

In November of 1964 Chrysler Corp. sent a bulletin to dealers urging them to recall for inspection certain models of the 1965 Plymouths, Chryslers, and Dodges to determine whether a steering bracket needed welding. But no attempt was made to get in touch directly with the owners of the cars and warn them of the possibility of danger.

In 1965, Ford Motor Co. notified some 30,000 owners that a change in the rear suspension of the 1965 Ford could improve the ride, and urged them to bring these cars in to the dealers. But no mention was made of the fact that, in addition to improving the ride, the vehicle was subject to complete loss of control if the suspension arm were to break loose from the chassis.

We cannot continue to permit people to drive "time bombs" which can cause fatal or crippling accidents without warning. The owner of a car, which often carries his family and loved ones, must be able to drive knowing that he can do so with safety. Senator Ribicoff has said that more than 500,000 Americans have been killed in motor vehicle accidents since the end of World War II—125,000 more than the Nation lost in battle in all of that war and the Korean war. In that period more than 10 million Americans were injured, compared with the 774,000 wounded in those wars. We must act now to meet this problem, and full information to the consumer is essential if the war against traffic fatalities is to be won.

The fact that most of the automobiles we drive do not have defects which can cause injury to life and limb, while a tribute to the auto industry, is perhaps the most effective argument for this legislation. The American public rightly expects that the cars they drive are safe, and must be told when they are not. If they are not, the tragic traffic accident death and injury toll will continue to mount regardless of how safely we drive. Cars are far too complicated today for the consumer to be able to determine a defect until it is too late. Fair warning immediately upon discovery is the public responsibility of the producer.

This legislation will give the consumer that fair warning. I ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3187) to provide for notification of buyers and owners of automobiles having defects which render the operation of such automobiles inherently dangerous to life and limb, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1966

No. 75

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT— AMENDMENT NO. 537

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fine editorial from the Washington Post of May 2, 1966, entitled "Next," recommending the inclusion of Amendment No. 537 in the Traffic Safety Act legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1966]

NEXT?

In April alone, the public has learned that Lincoln has told dealers to recall 40,000 Continentals to repair a braking defect.

Buick told dealers last December to recall certain 1964 models for a possibly troublesome brake condition.

Chrysler Corp., told dealers in November 1964, to recall certain Plymouths, Chryslers, and Dodges for a welding job on a steering bracket.

Ford told 30,000 owners of 1965 cars that their ride could be improved by a change in the rear suspension, not saying that their cars could go out of control if a suspension arm broke.

Dodge recalled 17,500 cars for a throttle change, not saying safety was at stake.

Chevrolet told dealers last July to recall 16,000 models for a faulty front door latch.

GM has just told dealers to recall 1,500,000 Chevelles and Chevrolets with Powerglide transmissions because the throttle could stick.

Pontiac recalled 80,000 1961 Tempests considered too lowslung to clear possible road obstacles.

Buick found that some 15,000 1963 Specials had fenders that could cut their tires, but made no effort to recall them for repair.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, has introduced an amendment to the administration's traffic safety bill that would require auto manufacturers to notify owners and dealers at once of new-car defects that might involve safety. Another amendment, by Senators ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, and ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, would require manufacturers to give copies of communications with dealers about defects to the Secretary of Commerce or Transportation; the Secretary would be empowered to issue public warnings. Mr. Ribicoff has also requested—and received—the manufacturers' agreement to supply a complete list of product defect warnings issued since 1960.

The administration's bill does not touch the critical matter of defect reports. The Mondale and Ribicoff-Kennedy amendments ought to be added to it.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1966

No. 171

EXECUTIVE ORGANIZATION REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. MONDALE. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Senators BURNICK, MOSS, and YARBOROUGH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a periodic Executive Organization Review Commission.

There is a definite need today for a new Hoover Commission. In the 11 years since the second Hoover Commission presented its final report, the Federal budget has grown by almost \$50 billion; Federal civilian employment has risen from 2,324,000 to 2,806,000; and we have undergone a continuing proliferation of departments, commissions, bureaus, boards, offices, independent establishments, and other executive agencies.

According to the annual report of the Government Operations Committee on "Organization of Federal Executive Departments and Agencies," there were at the beginning of this year some 53 so-called independent agencies in the executive branch, in addition to the 11 Cabinet departments. This represents an increase from 46 independent agencies 10 years ago. But the actual change has been much greater. We have seen within that 10 years the creation of at least 44 new agencies—some only temporary—and the abolition or transfer of a number only slightly smaller.

The creation of each of these agencies may have been justified in terms of its own individual mission. But when we step back and look at the whole Federal structure, we see numerous policy areas where program responsibility is scattered widely through the executive establishment. There is education, where according to an analysis submitted in support of the President's 1967 budget:

Ten Cabinet departments and more than 15 other agencies support or conduct education, training, and related programs as an integral part of their agency's mission.

Or we can look at consumer protection, a field in which I have a special interest—here, according to one recent report, there are 33 Federal agencies engaged in 296 consumer protection activities. And the number of agencies that deal with urban affairs—even after the creation of a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development—is still enormous.

And as we all are aware, the magnificent work of this 89th Congress has contributed considerably to the complexity of our Federal Establishment. We have enacted vast new programs, like medicare. We have multiplied Federal support of education. We have taken bold new steps in civil rights, in fighting air and water pollution, in completely reshaping food for peace, in agriculture and rural development, in meeting the crisis of our cities, and in other fields too numerous and too widespread to recount here today.

But, inevitably, we have thought of each program mainly in terms of how it would meet a particular need, how it would relate to the duties of a particular agency. We have not given enough attention to how everything fits together. And we have not acted to insure that we have an overall Federal structure which can really do the job we have called on it to do, and do this job in as effective and economical a manner as possible.

A new Hoover-type commission can provide us with the fresh new look we need. It can help us chart a course toward a more efficient and effective Federal establishment.

I need not elaborate on the accomplishments of the first and second Hoover Commissions. Two of our distinguished colleagues, Senators McCLELLAN and AIKEN, sat on these Commissions. Many others among today's Senators were present in this body while these Commissions were active. They know the record of the first Commission's recommendations, 72 percent were adopted.

For the second, the score was 64 percent.

Among the major accomplishments were creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration, major reorganizations in State and Defense, modernization of Federal budgeting, improvement of the Federal career service—and the saving of many billions of dollars.

Yet despite these achievements, we have let more than 11 years elapse since the second Hoover Commission submitted its report.

This is not to imply, of course, that these 11 years have seen no action on this vast problem.

In the Executive Office of the President, the Bureau of the Budget has a continuing responsibility for promoting organizational efficiency. The General Accounting Office oversees program operations for the Congress.

President Johnson has demonstrated a continuing concern for building a more efficient Federal structure. The new Department of Housing and Urban Development is living testimony to his work, and that of his predecessor. And the Senate has just approved the President's call for creation of a Department of Transportation.

Here in the Senate, my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has been holding very important hearings in the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization which he heads. The Ribicoff subcommittee has already made a breakthrough in the field of auto safety, and it has now turned its attention to a review of the range and adequacy of our programs to meet the crisis of urban areas.

I hope all of these efforts will continue. Yet there is still, I strongly feel, a need for a periodic, comprehensive review of the entire range of Federal organization, a review conducted by a bipartisan, high-level body independent of the executive and the Congress, a review to give us periodically a fresh new look, a review which a new Hoover Commission can best provide.

My bill would establish such a commission.

Unlike earlier such legislation, my bill would recognize that executive reorganization can no longer be treated as a one-shot affair. Our Government will continue to grow, just as our Nation is growing. If we do not take a periodic hard look at its overall operation, we may one day be confronted with a bureaucratic tangle that it is impossible to unravel. For in the words of Harry S. Truman:

The improvement of the organization of government is a continuous and never-ending process.

To provide such a periodic look, my bill explicitly calls for the appointment of a new Commission every 10 years. Should the Congress feel that an organizational overhaul is urgently needed before that time, it could create a new Commission sooner. Thus the time period between studies would not be rigid, unable to be adapted to unanticipated future needs. But my proposal would guarantee that, barring future congressional action to the contrary, we would have an overall organizational review at least once a decade.

On each Commission would serve 12 distinguished citizens—2 from each House of Congress, 2 from the executive branch, and 6 from private life. To insure bipartisanship, no more than 6 of the 12 members could belong to the same political party.

The Commission would serve approximately 30 months, submitting its report not later than March 1 of the third year after its establishment. This would allow enough time for an organized, systematic, and thorough review.

The Commission would submit periodic reports on its findings and recommendations as it deems appropriate, and then a final report summarizing previous pro-

posals and making final recommendations. Having submitted this report, it would cease to exist, until its successor was appointed 7½ years later.

In the interim between Commissions, this bill would provide for the Comptroller General to maintain records of the action by the Congress and the executive branch on the last Commission's recommendations. The records and papers of Commissions that had completed their work would, according to established procedures, be deposited in the National Archives, where they would I am assured, be available to the public at large.

The Commission would have broad powers. It could hire a substantial staff, headed by an executive director. It could draw on experts from many walks of national life. It would hold hearings, have general access to Federal records, and make use of the most up-to-date data processing equipment. And it would serve long enough to contract out special studies to scholars and other independent investigators, and receive their reports in time for careful consideration.

And most important of all, the Commission would be given a broad mandate.

One major objective would be cost cutting. This is particularly important at a time when we have an economy under serious inflationary pressures. But the elimination of duplication and unnecessary expenses, the saving of every dollar we can possibly save, should always have the highest priority.

And if efficiency is vital, so also is program effectiveness. I have already pointed out, as have so many of my colleagues before me, that just to pass a law here on the Hill does not guarantee the type of program we want, directed toward the people we want it to benefit. The Nation will be shortchanged if programs become bogged down in unnecessary redtape. The Government must be organized so as to implement these programs, so as to put flesh on the skeleton of legislative intent.

So the Commission would consider questions involving the possible establishment of new departments and the elimination of the modification of present ones. It would examine the present organizational structure, and the principles upon which it is based. It would look closely at the record of recent organizational innovations—such as the Office of Economic Opportunity in the Executive Office of the President, or the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In other words, it would be expected to investigate, in the most comprehensive way possible, how the policies and programs set forth by this Congress can be most effectively and economically accomplished.

Here let me make one crucial point. A truly efficient and effective Government organization is not just one that can circulate paper rapidly—though we all know how much this would help—or coordinate its programs here at the Washington end. It also must be an organization which can be responsive, as never before, to the needs and requests and demands of communities and individual citizens throughout the United States.

Here, I am convinced, is one of the great unsolved problems of Government organization. How can a large bureaucracy, with its labyrinth of regulations and redtape, with employees numbering in the millions, operating increasingly through impersonal machines and processes—how can this Government be truly responsive in its program to the needs of the man at the local level?

To take one example, I have noticed time after time, in my brief service in this body, how local school boards, or community action councils in the poverty program, will spend months working their hearts out on a proposal for Federal grant assistance, to meet what they

are convinced is an obvious community need, only to find that their proposal is out of tune with the guidelines or the priorities, or that no more money is available this year for that particular program. And during all this time, all too often, contact and communication between the local people and agency representatives here in Washington or in the field has been negligible.

Part of our job as Senators, of course, is to help to supply this vital human element, to serve as a bridge of communication between our constituents and the executive branch. I am not advocating that we relinquish this role. Every day Members of Congress receive hundreds of requests from citizens and communities to help them break through bureaucratic logjams. As elected representatives of the people, we shall continue to help them out in every way possible.

But this problem is too big to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. It pervades the whole system we have established of Federal assistance to help meet local needs. This problem urgently needs the type of study this Commission could be expected to provide. For the executive agencies should be more responsive on their own to the needs of citizens, without so much prodding from Capitol Hill, and in all cases, not just those that come to the attention of Senators and Congressmen.

This must be one of the paramount objectives of our federal system. And so any executive organization review commission should not aim only to eliminate nonessential and duplicated services, and to reduce administrative costs, vital though this is. It should also study concrete ways to make Federal agencies more responsive to the needs of individuals and communities at the local level.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be reprinted at this point in the *RECORD*, together with a short summary of its major provisions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The bill (S. 3888) to establish a commission to investigate the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization and methods of operation of the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONDALE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

S. 3888

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SECTION 1. (a) Not later than September 1 of the calendar year 1967, and of every tenth year thereafter (unless the Congress shall by law provide for establishment of a new commission before such ten years have expired), a bipartisan commission to be known as the Executive Organization Review Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") shall be established.

(b) Each such Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Two appointed by the President of the United States, from the executive branch of Government;

(2) Two Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate;

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(4) Six persons from private life appointed by the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, acting by common agreement.

(c) Not more than six members shall be from the same political party.

(d) Vacancies in each Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Each Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(f) Seven members of each Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION

SEC. 2. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of each Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress. Officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government who are members of each Commission shall serve

without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the executive branch of the Government.

(b) Each member of each Commission appointed from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per diem for each day on which he is engaged in the performance of duties of the Commission.

(c) All members of each Commission shall be reimbursed by the Commission for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 3. (a) Each Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the organization and methods of operation of all departments, agencies, and government corporations of the executive branch of the Government (including ongoing reorganization powers and mechanisms) to determine the effectiveness and efficiency such organization and methods of operation provide in carrying out the policies of the Congress and the President. Such study and investigation shall include consideration of the following:

(1) reduction of expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions, through:

(a) adoption of more efficient methods of operation;

(b) elimination of nonessential services, activities, and functions; and

(c) elimination of duplication of services, activities, and functions; and

(d) elimination of services, activities, and functions which can better be performed by private enterprise;

(2) improvement of the effectiveness of the executive branch in carrying out the policies of the Congress and the President, through:

(a) consolidation and coordination of services, activities, and functions of a similar nature, or contributing to substantially the same policy, including the possible creation of new Cabinet departments and the elimination of existing departments or realignment of their responsibilities;

(b) recruiting of men and women of the highest caliber for Government service and making the most effective and complete use of their talents;

(c) applications of modern management techniques to the methods of operation of the Government; and

(d) improving communications within and between agencies of the executive branch, between the executive and legislative branches, and between the Federal Government and State and local governments; and

(3) improvement of the capability of the executive branch to respond to the needs, requests, and communications of private citizens, businesses, labor unions, and other groups and organizations at the local level, including, but not limited to, coordination of information available to such citizens relating to Federal assistance.

(b) Each Commission may transmit to the President and the Congress such interim reports as it deems advisable, and shall transmit its final report to the President and to the Congress not later than March 1 of the third year after the year in which it is appointed. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission together with recommendations for changes in existing organization, including such administrative actions and legislative enactments as it deems appropriate. Sixty days after submission of its final report under this subsection, each Commission shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Each Commission, or any three members thereof as authorized by such Commission, may conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or otherwise secure data and expressions of opinions pertinent to the study. In connection therewith each Commission is authorized by majority vote—

(1) to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties; (2) to administer oaths;

(3) in the case of disobedience to a subpoena or order issued under this subsection to invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance with such subpoena or order; and

(4) to pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

(b) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which an inquiry is carried on may, in case of refusal to obey a subpoena or order issued under subsection (a) of this section, issue an order requiring compliance therewith; and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) Each Commission is authorized to require directly from the head of any Federal department, agency, or Government corporation available information deemed useful in the discharge of its duties. Each Federal department, agency or Government corporation is authorized and directed to cooperate with each Commission and to furnish all information requested by each Commission to the extent permitted by law.

(d) Each Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State

agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) Each Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations or the provisions of chapter 51 of title 5 of the United States Code, to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director, and the executive director, with the approval of each Commission, may employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate prescribed for GS-18 in the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) The executive director, with the approval of each Commission, is authorized to obtain services in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem.

(c) The head of any Federal department, agency or government corporation is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to assist in carrying out the duties of each Commission under this Act.

(d) The General Services Administration shall provide administrative services for each Commission on a reimbursable basis.

INTERIM REVIEW: COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 6. After the submission of the final report as provided in section 2(b) and prior to the appointment of a succeeding commission, the Comptroller General of the United States shall (1) conduct a review of the recommendations of the preceding Commission to determine the extent to which such recommendations have been implemented; (2) maintain appropriate records relating to such recommendations; (3) furnish at the request of a Chairman of an appropriate Committee of the Congress information relating to such recommendations; and (4) report to the President and to the Congress at such times as he deems appropriate on his responsibilities under this section.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The summary presented by Mr. MONDALE is as follows:

A SHORT SUMMARY OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH AN EXECUTIVE ORGANIZATION REVIEW COMMISSION

1. Periodic Establishment of Commission—on or before September 1, 1967, and every tenth year thereafter, a 12-member Executive Organization Review Commission shall be established, composed of two Senators appointed by the President of the Senate, two Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, two members of the executive branch chosen by the President of the United States, and six members chosen by the President, Vice President, and Speaker acting in agreement. No more than six of the members shall belong to the same political party.

2. Functions—the Commission's role is similar to that of the earlier Hoover Commissions, to conduct a thorough review of executive branch organizations and make comprehensive recommendations for its improvement. It shall aim at: 1) reducing costs, through elimination of nonessential and duplicating services, and adoption of improved methods of operation; 2) improving effectiveness in carrying out Congressional and Presidential policies, through consolidation and coordination of programs in the same or related fields, modern management techniques, wise personnel policies, and improved interagency and inter-governmental communications; 3) making the government more responsive to the problems and needs of individual citizens and groups at the local level.

3. Powers—the Commission may hold hearings, subpoena witnesses, obtain information from federal agencies, contract out particular research projects, and hire staff without regard to civil service laws.

4. Report and Termination of Commission—the Commission shall make such interim reports as it deems appropriate, and shall transmit its final report to the Congress not later than March of the third year after its appointment. Sixty days after submitting this final report, it shall cease to exist, to be re-established with new membership ten years after its original appointment.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org