

NR_key_name: B8DCBCE27DAAFA6C852561CF00749252

SendTo: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Joseph Freeman/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 06/02/1995

DisplayDate_Time: 6:21:34 PM

ComposedDate: 06/02/1995

ComposedDate_Time: 5:13:16 PM

Subject: Clarification (for me) of Key Issues

BEFORE I APPROACH CHAIRMAN HOWELL OR OTHERS, HOWEVER INFORMALLY, I WANTED TO MAKE CERTAIN I WAS CLEAR ON A FEW items. I don't want my newcomer status and attendant ignorance to reflect badly on the organization as a whole. I wrote these questions out, rather than ask you verbally, both to save you time and to help me clarify my questions. You are welcome to respond verbally -- I just thought I could ask the questions more clearly if I wrote them down (you be the judge!). 1) House Oversight Committee vs. Government Oversight and Reform Committee. The House Oversight Committee (formerly House Administration Committee) has "ownership" of HSCA holdings, and thus we must deal with them on postponement issues. The Government Oversight and Reform Committee (formerly the Government Operations Committee) has general oversight responsibility over the ARRB, and is also the Committee to whom the Board's determinations on postponements must be sent for HSCA documents [Sec. 9(c)(4)(B)] (similarly, for Church Committee documents, the Permanent Select Intelligence Committee has ownership, but the Governmental Affairs Committee has oversight jurisdiction and would be receiving the Board's notices relative to postponement decisions). Do I thus take it that the Government Oversight and Reform Committee has final veto power over Board decisions for HSCA-equity holdings, analogous to the President for Executive Branch documents? I have heard you reference the need for Joint Concurrent Resolutions -- I have missed that, apparently, in the statute. Where is it, or is it in report language (can I get a copy of the report language, by the way?). 2) Is the following statement correct: the then-House Administration Committee has already reviewed all the HSCA documents for possible postponements, but we are all waiting for agency-equity referred HSCA documents to come back? Therefore, the issue remaining to be settled with the now-House Oversight Committee is not what they want to postpone (they've already decided that where they have equity) but rather how joint-equity issues are going to be addressed and who's going to defend which postponements (there is also the issue of the Committee's possible reaction to the Board's decisions as it reviews the Committee's postponement recommendations). 3) Lastly, I was struck by the section (Part III, B) in your draft document on PL 102-526 which suggested that the Board's decision making powers really only constitute "advice" to the President, who the law vests with actual and final decision-making power. I would have supposed that the legislative intent of the "sole and nondelegable" language was to circumscribe the President's ability to delegate his veto power back to the agencies whose recommendations the Board will be acting upon, rather than to circumscribe the Board's authority (if the President could delegate his veto authority, and did so, it would obviously defeat the purpose of the whole exercise). If your reading is sound, why then does the law use a noun like "decision" in regard to the Board's

Body:
recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: