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MEETING ON ECONOMIC FORESIGHT

Monday, May 6, 1974 10:00 a.m.
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William E. Simon
Herbert Stein
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OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

BEFORE THE

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP--EXECUTIVE BRANCH GROUP

ON ECONOMIC FORESIGHT

Monday, May 6, 1974, 10:00 a.m., The Capitol, Room S-208

I have just a few observations. First, on the basis of our initial meeting last week, I would like to say that I am both encouraged and optimistic—encouraged particularly by the spirit in which this proposal was greeted. Exhibited here, I think, has been a high degree of cooperation both as between parties and as between branches.

On the other hand, there is reason for optimism when it is noted that the issue in question was grasped, last week, with a sincere view to resolving its many facets. Mr. Ash, who is no stranger to the task of looking at the whole of the apparatus of government and industry, was the one I believe who suggested this follow-up meeting to see if this group might evaluate the resolution offered by Senator Scott and me or even to begin ourselves to outline the framework of an instrumentality appropriately equipped both to analyze information and to offer at a sufficiently high level of national life, options or alternatives with regard to ways and means by which the requirements of the nation might be fulfilled in terms of resources, materials and commodities.

As Mr. Stein and Mr. Flanagan both suggested last week, there are often times when governmental intervention should not occur; times when private industry unfettered by any governmental involvement must be left on its own to solve the complexities of a given problem. When that course is to be followed, however, it seems to me that the reasons for embracing such an alternative should also be
spelled out by an authoritative body. Government has too often forgotten to do so when it has been concerned with a hasty patchwork repair of an immediate problem. Conscious non-intervention, in short, is as valid and appropriate a consideration as conscious intervention. In our present decision-making process, however, it seems to me that the former option is rarely, if ever, offered as a viable alternative in a fashion that compels its careful consideration.

There are other times, may I say, when private initiative, though required, simply will not occur unless appropriately stimulated or assisted. What would be most helpful, I think—and what we are talking about—is that when looking down the road, in the Congress, in the Executive and in the private sector, our respective fields of vision might be expanded by having a capacity to analyze all of the options available based on a coalescence of the relevant information from many sources. On that basis we would enhance our ability to design rational, timely and coordinated policies.

That we in this group have perceived in an initial way the need and desirability of such a capacity I think is apparent. There comes now the more difficult task. It is to set forth the institutional framework in a way that would include, I hope, an input of viewpoint from the Executive and the Legislative Branches and from significant areas of private life. We could do this on the basis of turning over the entire design job for such an institution to a temporary joint establishing commission—Executive, Congressional and private—as Senator Scott and I have proposed. We can also consider the suggestion of Mr. Ash, of having this group join with representatives of the private sector to set out the design of the institution. The main problem that I see with the second course is one of time. This group may not have sufficient hours available to deal intensely with the questions of institutional structure.
In any case, whatever we agree upon, be it a formal proposal designed by this group plus a private supplement to create an instrumentality to perform the function of economic foresight or an interim establishing commission along the lines of the proposed draft which would make recommendations to the Congress and to the President, it must wind its way through the legislative process. In terms of timing, this legislative distillation period must be kept firmly in mind if we are to achieve our objective. Personally, I would like to see the preliminaries out of the way and a proposal for a full-fledged National Council on National Needs and Economic Foresight ready before the end of the 93d Congress.
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Mr. Chairman: I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this Committee on what I regard as an issue of the most pressing national significance and concern. What you are embarking upon and what so many of us in the Congress, in the Executive and elsewhere in our national life have come to view with increasing alarm could be expressed no better than it has been framed by the enabling charter of this panel: A Subcommittee on Economic Growth: to think ahead, to think long range, to analyze in a very measured methodical way the full spectrum of problems that we as a nation confront in terms of capacity and employment needs, of raw materials and resource requirements. It is a charter, may I suggest, that has emerged out of a deep sense of frustration with the disjointed way government has tended for decades not so much to act but instead to react on a crash basis when a component of this gigantic, intricate machine of the American Economy gets out of whack in ways that impose both suffering and hardship upon great segments of the American public.

What we face may, in part, be characterized as follows: cartels, scarcity, diminishing sources, expanding usage, production restrictions, steep price rises and expedient remedies. What needs to be asked and what you, Mr. Chairman, and your committee with its new mandate are asking through these hearings, and what is being asked over in the Commerce Committee and in others is this: how are we as a nation equipped—or ill-equipped—to address the next crisis in resources or materials or commodities. Do we have at the highest
level of national life an effective capacity to look at all of the information; to identify all of the potential areas of crisis and to have the benefit of assessments as to all of the various remedies available to avert the next crisis or to minimize its impact on the American people.

These questions are answered by the very nature of what you are undertaking in this Committee, by what Senator Magnuson is undertaking in the Commerce Committee and by what others are doing in the Congress and in the Executive Branch, not to speak of the activities of private foundations and universities and corporate establishments. If I have read the signs correctly, therefore, what they point to is the emergence of a firm resolve/when it comes to basic economic needs, the nation must be better equipped and better able to provide more rational answers in the decision-making process.

For all of us, I think the issue was clarified a few months ago when long lines of automobiles accumulated to vie for short rations of gasoline. It is not only that a decision to build or not to build a new refinery or steel mill or chemical plant, or to start a mining operation can have major repercussions throughout a community, the nation or even abroad, it is also that a shortage of raw materials derived from petroleum can shut down auto plants in Detroit and manufacturers of recording tapes in Los Angeles.

It is not so much a lack of study or an absence of data and information. For a quarter century or more, experts have warned about coming crises with regard to vital basic materials and commodities. More important is that we simply have no systematized method of assessing information in order to determine our needs early enough and to move quickly enough to provide a reasoned answer, or even to make the attempt.
What if Government at any time in the past two decades had established a central information unit—a data bank so to speak—charged with compiling statistics on energy resources, analyzing on a continuing basis the status of supply and sources, projecting consumption rates, reporting refining capacity, evaluating current technology and future application and equipped to report anticipated deficiencies directly to Congress and to the President with specific recommendations. There is little doubt, I think, that had such an agency existed, there would have been no fuel crisis, and, certainly, no reason to have addressed the matter on a crash basis, establishing almost overnight a whole new federal bureaucracy so we could meet immediate requirements for heat, light and transportation.

And if it is energy today, of what will we as a nation be in dire need tomorrow? Three or four years ago, the Interior Department told us that there were at least thirteen basic minerals for most of which we depend upon sources outside the United States. The figure has grown to forty or more. They range from aluminum and chromium, to tin, lead, nickel and so on. For at least thirty of these materials, the nation has already become over 60% dependent upon other countries. In part, the dependence may be answered at some unknown future date by new technologies such as the recapture and recycling efforts that are just now barely more than an idea. For now, however, that dependence is with us and it is complicated by what happens when supplier nations gang together.

I realize full well that the President and Secretary Kissinger are trying to improve the bargaining strength of the consumer nations insofar as petroleum is concerned. But what happened with oil is very likely to happen with bauxite, or copper or nickel or zinc or tin or whatever, when the basic needs of heavy consumer societies must be met by sources beyond their national
boundaries. Secretary Kissinger has now gone to the United Nations to stress that interdependence of developed and developing nations with regard to key resources was essential to global stability. But the international instrumentalties he envisioned to accommodate cooperation between producer and consumer nations can be established, it seems to me, only after there is constructed within our own nation a mechanism able to grasp what is needed for our own people not only today but five or ten years hence. It is to this precise task that this Committee has addressed itself. And you are to be commended for your efforts.

As you know, the problem goes well beyond metals or minerals and does not relate only to those in which we are in a dependent status. In 1973, the nation experienced the biggest boost in the cost of groceries in over twenty-five years. Prices for fibers have risen 93 percent. The story of how inflation continues to wrack our people on every front was written graphically in the double digit figures released two or three weeks ago--10\% from March of 1973 to March of 1974; 1\%\% for the first three months of this year.

And while Americans are made to pay more let us not forget that in some areas of the world, the basic commodities are not even available. The problem is worse in Europe, Asia and Latin America. A whole corridor spanning the African Continent is now caught in a struggle for survival under the twin burdens of drought and famine.

In the United States, however, I believe it is largely the question of basic shortages and related matters which will mandate the crises. And the crises, one after another, will pounce on us most assuredly unless and until as a nation we are prepared to adjust our government apparatus here in the Congress, as this Committee is doing, and in the Executive to meet the fundamental problem.
Let me say again, however, that this problem is not really so much one of the absence of information. At last report, more than fifty federal agencies and administrations were collecting and compiling relevant data and that was before any apparatus was set up to address environmental concerns or to monitor product safety or to perform a host of other recently legislated activities.

Take a specific example. In the Commerce Department there are some 160 professionals in the Office of Business Research and Analysis and twenty or thirty of them alone are dealing with information on industrial commodities. Look at it in broader terms. We find that for data on imports and exports, we can turn to the Agriculture, Treasury and Commerce Departments, the Council on Economic Policy, FEO, the Special Trade Representative and more; for production, there are the Interior and Agriculture Departments, HUD, FEO and more; for basic regulatory decisions, there are DOT, ICC, FTC, EPA, the Federal Reserve and more; and so it goes. While the Commerce Department appears to be tightening up on the exports of materials, Treasury is endeavoring to stimulate exports through the DISC incentives. In some instances, two or three different agencies with overlapping responsibilities arrive at contradicting appraisals of the present state and future prospects of the same industry.

The situation is not very different here in the Congress, except in magnitude. When it comes to our diverse and seemingly insatiable appetites for economic information, our Committees reflect the same fractured state as the Executive in terms of who is keeping track of what with regard to such matters as minerals, pesticides, fertilizers, timber and wood materials, tax policy, strategic materials, stockpiles, export policy, foreign trade, production, recycling, resource development, materials allocation, commodity controls, importation, mining and all the rest. It is, therefore, with enormous gratitude that I greet
this Committee's efforts to look ahead and help us all to coordinate our efforts and actions in terms of long range implications regarding any one of these or a host of other concerns and actions we may take with respect thereto.

It is to this specific issue that, I, along with the Republican Leader, Hugh Scott, and others, have endeavored to address ourselves recently. Before getting into these efforts, let me say that all of us, I believe, seek similar objectives. To that end, Hugh Scott and I are exploring whether or not on the basis of all of the studies and recommendations, there can be created as a part of our national life an instrumentality that would serve to coordinate and to interpret all information, to forecast upcoming problems in terms of shortages or other adversities and to provide meaningful assessments of courses that might be followed to avert catastrophe or help us to endure adversity as painlessly as possible.

After all, it was twenty-two years ago that the Paley Commission, after exhaustive analysis, recommended such a high-level agency to provide a continuing and coordinated analysis of the interdependence of government actions with respect to basic economic decisions. The adverse effects of the government's failure to provide such a capacity has been confirmed a number of times since--most recently by the report of the National Commission on Materials Policy filed last year and by the GAO report released a week or so ago.

It was on the basis of this record that has been so well documented, that the Senate Republican Leader and I put the question in these words in a letter to the President last February:

It is our suggestion that we consider bringing together representatives of the Legislative and Executive Branches of the government on a regular basis with those of industry and labor and
other areas of our national life for the purpose of thinking through our national needs, not only as they confront us, today, but as they are likely to be five, ten or more years hence and how they are best to be met. If the government is to intervene in these matters, as it is now doing, an effort ought to be made to put that intervention, as far as possible, on a rational and far-sighted basis.

I think all of us here sense that there exists some kind of requirement to deal with questions of this kind or, I daresay, this Committee would not have undertaken for itself the task of long-range thinking. In the context of the current dialogue on the issue, insofar as my own participation is concerned, I would like to set forth a certain questions which have occurred to me.

The first is: What kind of instrumentality, if any, might meet this requirement? To me, it should be one that is freely representative of the nation if it is to be effective; one, therefore, that would embrace representatives not only of the Legislative and Executive Branches but elements of industry, labor, agriculture and other significant segments of our national life. It should be a continuing instrumentality equipped, first, to draw on information from all sources on the status of resources, materials and commodities and other aspects of our economy—tasks performed now by dozens of agencies and organizations across the spectrum of national life, both public and private. Secondly, it must have the means to forecast the problems by drawing information out of the present massive but fragmented system. Thirdly, it must have the capacity to convert its projections into recommended policy options that might embrace such measures as conservation, research, stockpiling, allocation, modernization, manpower, export controls and whatever else may be necessary to keep vital, the nation's economy. Finally, it must be in a position to report its findings.
and an analysis of proposed remedies to the President and the Congress—the ultimate arbiters of policy and the sources of action for the federal government. In turn, the work product of such an instrumentality could be weighed and evaluated by this and other interested Committees and by the agencies concerned downtown to the end that our overall approach is the most comprehensive and rational that can be devised.

In my view, what the nation needs and needs vitally is a full-fledged Council on Domestic Needs and Economic Foresight, staffed sufficiently and equipped fully to give the President and the Congress and the public the kind of integrated perception of our national requirements now and in the future which has heretofore been lacking.

I should stress, here, Mr. Chairman, that what the Joint Leadership of the Senate is pursuing in concert with the House Leadership and with the President's designees in the Executive, is a course of action similar in scope and magnitude to that upon which you and your Committee have now embarked. In the Commerce Committee and others, similar efforts have been undertaken. All of these endeavors should be pursued unrelentingly and without delay to the end that at the soonest time possible, as a nation, we have acquired a field of vision expanded by the capacity to view all of the effects of our action or inaction today not just in the context of tomorrow, but in terms of five or ten years hence.

Whatever the immediate results of any one of these pursuits, including those in which I am engaged, let us keep in mind our common concern: It is that we here in the Congress as the policy makers and those in the Executive as the policy implementors will be fully prepared and equipped to address the next major challenge to our national stability. Steps taken now, to be sure, could not
possibly undo the damage of what has been thrust upon the nation with regard to energy. Steps taken now just might, however, keep the nation from stumbling headlong into the next crisis, and the next and the next, each contributing more to the irrationality of an already disjointed economic condition that, unless corrected, will lead us inexorably to our economic devastation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
United States Senate
Office of the Majority Leader
Washington, D.C. 20510

May 13, 1974

MEMORANDUM

TO: Messrs. Simon, Ash and Rhodes
FROM: Mike Mansfield

We begin with preponderant agreement on the need to find some way to coordinate and assess information on natural resources, materials and commodities and related data so as to be able to look ahead a number of years and avoid or mitigate crises. I think we are groping for some kind of instrumentality, without line-functions in the government, but so constituted as to be able to draw on existing sources of information and focus issues and alternatives in an authoritative fashion for Congress, the Executive Branch and the public.

The likelihood of a series of crises in the future and the need for an instrumentality to deal with them, I think, is already clear to most of us. In my judgment, therefore, it would be a waste of time for the leadership group to study the question of whether such a need exists. There have already been immeasurable studies of this question in both branches of the government and in private research centers. In general, these studies recognize the likelihood of a series of future crises and deplore the lack of some central instrumentality for anticipating them and delineating remedies in a timely fashion, perhaps, as much as five or ten years in advance.

In originally suggesting these joint leadership meetings, Senator Scott and I proceeded on the assumption that if there is any area of our
national life in which partisanship and adversary proceedings can be put aside, it is in the common concern for the economic future of the nation. We were not interested in fixing blame for past or current crises. We were interested in how to deal with those looming on the horizon.

If we have the right forum in this leadership group for considering a question of this kind—and I think we do—then we should proceed forthwith, as the next step, to examine how best to approach the job of designing the kind of instrumentality which can do the job of coordinating relevant data on the problems looming in our economic future and delineating alternative courses of action for dealing with them.

What are the alternative approaches open to us?

(1) We could, ourselves, try to design an instrumentality—a council on economic foresight. Frankly, I do not think any of us, over the next few months, will have a fraction of the time which will be required to deal with this subject.

(2) Alternatively, we could bring into the midst of the leadership group, authorities from the private sector and, together with them, try to come up with the design of an instrumentality. If we do not enlist persons from outside government at the outset, in my judgment, whatever we designed is likely to prove bureaucratically ingrown and, in the end, ineffectual.

(3) We could also contract with some university or well-known research group to draw up for us a design of an instrumentality; or

(4) We could set up a temporary transitional commission which may or may not include some of us as well as others from the two branches of the government plus authorities from the private sector to prepare a design for an instrumentality.
It seems to me that these are really the basic choices which govern where we go from here. Any one of them or some modification thereof may be suitable. If none is, it is always open to us, of course, to dissolve and leave the question where we found it.

As you know, Senator Scott and I have suggested alternative 4, in the form of a draft resolution which we have since modified (see attached copy of new draft). This draft resolution provides for an executive-legislative-private transitional establishing commission. It would be a temporary group which would be directed to work on the assumption that the need for better economic foresight in the nation is established and that some organized, coordinated structure is needed for dealing with problems such as that which affected us in the recent petroleum crisis. The transitional establishing commission would be directed, further, to deal with the single question of how best to set up a permanent instrumentality on economic foresight. It would not, of course, be that instrument. The Commission's job would be confined largely to taking an overall look at the structure of the Federal government--both branches--as it is pertinent to questions of economic foresight and the relationship of this federal structure to the private economy. It would be expected to come back in a few months--this temporary establishing commission--able to say to us: "This is the kind of instrument that is needed. Its membership should be constituted in this fashion. It should be chosen in this way. It should have such and such powers. It should be charged with doing so and so, and it should communicate its findings to the Congress and to the President and so forth."

Having prepared and transmitted to us draft legislation along these lines, the transitional establishing commission would then be dissolved. If we concurred in its findings, the members of this leadership group and, hopefully, the President would then try to have enacted the legislation which would carry into effect its recommendations on a permanent instrumentality.
At the last meeting of the full leadership group, I think there was some confusion as to what we should try to do as a next step, and that is why this subcommittee is meeting. I think that if the subcommittee feels that the draft resolution of Senator Scott and mine, as now revised, or some modification thereof, is the best approach, we should recommend it to the full group. If, in our judgment, it is not the best way to approach this problem, then we should be prepared to propose to the full group at the next meeting one of the other alternatives or some modification thereof as the most effective way of reaching our objective.

Time, it seems to me, is of the essence in this interim stage. So I would suggest that the second main point which must be addressed by this subcommittee is that of a deadline. On this issue, we have much less flexibility, as I see it, than may generally be realized. Various committees are well along in considering bills dealing with aspects of the question of materials-forecasting and new machinery for that purpose. Other legislative proposals suggesting various other approaches can also be anticipated. That is all to the good, as far as it goes, and I would hope that all proposals in the legislative mill would be examined by any transitional establishing group which we might seek to set up.

However, there is also a danger of fragmentation in what is happening. Even as we meet here, the splitting of the problem goes on. Last week, for example, the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously included in the State Department bill the creation of an overall agency to monitor all commodities and materials entering and leaving the nation giving it certain powers to forecast deficiencies and to recommend policy as it might relate to foreign affairs. The Government Operations Committee is about to report a bill establishing an information and future analysis system but dealing only with energy. EPA is about
to unleash a comprehensive data information system which is designed to perceive only the environmental impact of economic decisions. A Commodity Scarcity Study is underway on the part of OMB and three or four other agencies but not including all executive departments. In addition, a group under the Special Trade Representative is considering the same forecasting problems from a different point of view. New bills have been introduced in the House.

I do not question the value, per se, of any of these fragmentary undertakings. I note only that we continue to lack a central instrumentality and that ought to be the focus of the leadership group's concern.

Therefore, I would propose that this subcommittee recommend to the leadership group that we should act without delay if we intend to act at all. We need to decide promptly how to approach the problem of designing an overall instrumentality capable of bringing the pieces together. The alternative is to let the fragmentation go on by bits and pieces through legislation and executive orders of one kind or another.

If we can see our way to reasonably common ground by May 31, then, hopefully, Senator Scott and I on the Senate side and Congressmen Rhodes and O'Neill on the other, will be willing to introduce legislation which will set up transitional-establishing machinery. I must emphasize, however, that in my judgment, May 31 is just about the ultimate date if this joint leadership group is to provide a coordinating and focusing input in the legislative and bureaucratic formative processes which, in any event, are going to go on, with all their duplication and overlapping, both in Congress and downtown.
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on _____

A BILL

To establish a Transitional National Commission on Domestic Needs and Economic Foresight

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

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Transitional National Commission on Domestic Needs and Economic Foresight Act of 1974."

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Section 2. (a) There is established as an independent instrumentality of the Federal Government a Transitional National Commission on Domestic Needs and Economic Foresight (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be comprised of 12 members selected as follows:

(1) The President, in consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House of Representatives, shall appoint 4 members of the Commission from among persons in private life.
(2) The President shall designate four senior officials of the Executive Branch, to serve without additional compensation as members of the Commission.

(3) The President of the Senate, after consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate, shall appoint two Senators to be members of the Commission and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House of Representatives, shall appoint two Members of Congress to be members of the Commission. Members appointed under this paragraph shall serve as members of the Commission without additional compensation.

(b) The Commission shall rotate from among its members a Chairman and Vice Chairman which officers shall rotate between the Executive and Legislative Branch designees and those appointed from the private sector.

(c) Each member of the Commission appointed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be entitled to be compensated at a rate equal to the per diem equivalent of the rate for an individual occupying a position under level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, when engaged in the actual performance of duties as such a member, and all members of the Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the function of the Commission upon completion of its investigation to make a full report to the President and to the Congress recommending the establishment of an independent agency to provide for a continuing and comprehensive examination and analysis of the economy of the United States and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall include in the report required by this section specific and detailed recommendations to assure that the independent agency will be representative of the Executive and Legislative Branches and the Private Sector and will have adequate authority and resources to make a continuing study of and periodic reports with respect to--
(1) the existence or possibility of any long-or short-term shortages or market adversities affecting the supply of any natural resources, raw agriculture commodities, materials, manufactured products (including any possible impairment of productive capacity which may result from shortages in materials, resources, commodities, manufactured products, plant or equipment, or capital investment) and the reason for such shortages or adversities;

(2) the need for, and the assessment of alternative actions necessary to increase the availability of the items referred to in clause (1), or to correct the adversity affecting the availability of any such items;

(3) the long-term objectives for the economy of the United States, establishing rational relationships between the domestic economic policy and the foreign economic policy of the United States, regulation of imports and exports and such other remedies that will assure the effective participation by the United States in the international economy.

(c) In addition to its functions under subsection (b), the Commission shall recommend the means by which such independent agency shall coordinate information with respect to the economic life of the United States,

(d) The Commission shall prepare and publish such periodic reports and recommendations, as required by Sec. 4, as it deems appropriate, and shall transmit a final report with its recommendations to the President and the Congress not later than four months from the date of enactment of the Act.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to establish such advisory committees as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out any specific analytical or investigative undertakings on behalf of the Commission. Any such committee shall be subject to the relevant provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
POWERS

Sec. 6. (a) Subject to such rules and regulations it may adopt the Commission, through its Chairman shall have the power to--

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director at not to exceed, $40,000 per annum, and such additional staff personnel as is deemed necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to Chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule under section 5332 of such title; and

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 a day for individuals.

(b) The Commission or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, as it may deem advisable.

ASSISTANCE OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Sec. 7. Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the Federal Government, including the Congress, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, and independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman, such data, reports, and other information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.