

January 1988

## Harper's Ferry Revisited: The Role of Congressional Staff Archivists in Implementing the Congressional Papers Project Report

Faye Phillips  
*Louisiana State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/provenance>



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Phillips, Faye, "Harper's Ferry Revisited: The Role of Congressional Staff Archivists in Implementing the Congressional Papers Project Report," *Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists* 6 no. 1 (1988).  
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/provenance/vol6/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu).

**Harper's Ferry Revisited: The Role of  
Congressional Staff Archivists in Implementing  
the Congressional Papers Project Report**

**Faye Phillips**

The 1978 Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers affirmed the value inherent in senatorial papers. In the years since the conference, archivists and senate staff have struggled with preservation and use questions relating to those papers. In a continuing effort to answer such questions, the Dirksen Congressional Center and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) sponsored a conference on congressional papers at Harpers Ferry, West Virginia in 1985. The final *Congressional Papers Project Report* summarizes the findings of the Harpers Ferry conference and makes recommendations to the NHPRC on funding congressional papers projects. Germane to the NHPRC recommendations are minimum standards for congressional collections and

repositories which accept congressional collections. If followed, such recommendations "would improve substantially the preservation of Congress's record."<sup>1</sup>

While the emphasis of the *Report* is on criteria for funding congressional papers projects, its recommendations establish guidelines for repositories and congressional offices to follow.<sup>2</sup> Although no set of recommendations were issued from the 1978 Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers, many of the points raised then are echoed by the findings of the Harpers Ferry conference and by the recent experiences of congressional staff archivists.

The application of such guidelines, however, is a complex and difficult task. Indeed, the *Congressional Papers Project Report* has many limitations which will be discussed in this article, and many of its recommendations can only be implemented fully by a congressional staff archivist. Based on work in four senate offices, this article will explore the applicability of recommendations from the Harpers Ferry conference to records management and archival activities in the Senate and the role of the congressional staff archivist in facilitating preservation of senatorial records.<sup>3</sup>

In 1986, six senators voluntarily retired from the United States Senate. Historically, this was an important first, for never before had so many senators with as large a total amount of service--one hundred twenty-two years--retired in the same year. One hundred twenty-two years of senate service also means that many years of senatorial papers, which are designated personal papers by statute. Therefore,

---

1 Frank Mackaman, *Congressional Papers Project Report* (Washington, D.C.: National Historical Publications and Records Commission, 1986), 7.

2 *Ibid.*

3 More detailed case histories for the senatorial offices discussed in this article are available from the author.

each of these senators was faced with the preservation of a large part of senate history. Over one hundred tons of congressional papers had been created in the six offices during those years of service. Where were the papers to go? What steps were necessary to transfer papers for preservation? What was archivally valuable and what was not? Was it too late to apply records management practices? Were there guidelines that could be followed in answering such questions? Finally, who would be responsible for answering these questions and implementing the necessary actions?

The "who" in the case of four of the six offices was a congressional staff archivist hired specifically to work in the Washington offices. The work of that congressional staff archivist for these four offices reveals the validity of points raised by the 1978 Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers and the 1985 Congressional Papers Project and provides examples of the impracticality of some of their recommendations.

The *Congressional Papers Project Report* delineates minimum standards for congressional collections and minimum standards for repositories collecting congressional papers, recommends better records management practices in congressional offices, identifies factors "determining the quality of the relationship between congressional offices and repositories," and suggests specialized training for congressional archivists.<sup>4</sup> Previously, the Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers had also discussed points to be used in preserving senate papers. The 1978 conference emphasized the need for records management; early contact with a repository; minimum standards for repositories; limitation of restrictions; ease of access; reduction of bulk; and provided a "Checklist: Steps Toward

---

4 Report, 17-27.

Establishing a Records Disposition Program."<sup>5</sup> The "Checklist" mirrors issues raised by the Harpers Ferry conference and a similar list now appears in the *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Repositories*.<sup>6</sup>

Minimum standards for congressional collections were discussed by the Harpers Ferry conference and approached from the viewpoint of records management at the 1978 conference. Unfortunately, this is a discussion area many archivists fear. Serious questions arise for those building collections of congressional papers, for the insistence on minimum standards could alienate the congressperson whose papers are judged most valuable by archivists. However, the reason to collect only collections meeting minimum standards is clear for ". . .there are relatively few phenomena that a congressional collection best documents."<sup>7</sup> The implication thus is that only the highest quality papers should be collected.

The *Report* lists areas for archivists to use in determining the minimum standards of a congressional collection: the member's stature, the collection's quality, the promise of use, any access restrictions imposed by donors, and the ease with which the collection can be appraised and prepared for use.<sup>8</sup> The stature of the four retiring senators considered here met more than the minimum standards enumerated by the *Report*. All had served in the Senate more than two terms and their careers spanned some of the most tumultuous decades in United States history. Some had

---

5 J. Stanley Kimmitt and Richard A. Baker, *Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers Proceedings* (Washington, D.C.: United States Senate, 1978), 3.

6 Karen Dawley Paul, *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Repositories*, United States Senate Bicentennial Publication #2, S. Pub. 99-4 (Washington, D.C.: United States Senate, 1985).

7 *Report*, 18.

8 *Ibid.*, 36-37.

run for higher office, or held state government executive positions, or had been members of the United States House of Representatives. All served on or chaired powerful senate committees and were leaders in their political parties and communities.

Stature is easier to judge than collection quality in these four cases or in any appraisal of congressional papers. The *Report* recommends that congressional collections "document the roles for which the Member is deemed important. It must do so in quantity and quality, providing completeness and continuity."<sup>9</sup> Such conclusions fail to acknowledge the true manner in which the most important and far reaching decisions are made in Congress. They are made verbally. Documentation for background used to make the decisions does exist, especially in senior staff members papers. But agreements, trade-offs, and the road to the final outcome of major decisions of national policy do not appear in black and white print.

At the 1978 Conference on Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers, historian William Leuchtenburg expressed the problem with documenting senatorial history because of its verbal nature. He commented that many times researchers attempt to use senators' papers to determine particular relationships among senators but find nothing. "That is not because the salient records have been destroyed, but because they never existed. Why should one senator write a letter to another when he can walk down the hall to talk to him or speak to him on the phone? Under such circumstances, the chances are very slim that there will be any record of their exchange. . . ." <sup>10</sup> Leuchtenburg discovered the same to be true with congressional committee records. When doing research on a particular area dealing with the Senate Judiciary Committee he found that ". . .the records of how the committee had reached its decisions. .

---

9 *Ibid.*

10 *Proceedings*, 19.

could not be obtained, because they apparently had never existed." Leuchtenburg concluded that ". . . oral history interviews would fill in some gaps for the recent period."<sup>11</sup>

The *Congressional Papers Project Report* fails to acknowledge Congress's verbal nature. Archivists should realize, however, that this lack in congressional collections can sometimes be resolved. If the records of these four retiring senators serve as a representative example, archivists can find ways to fill many blanks in the historical record through records management in the offices; by collecting the papers of former long-term, high ranking congressional staff members and other colleagues; by including in congressional collections the papers of pre- and post-congressional careers; and by collecting the papers of family members. Gaps in the record can also be filled by oral histories. Regrettably, archivists have long held an aversion to "creating history" through oral histories. The conference on congressional papers should have considered ways to develop oral history projects along with sources for funding, especially for collections meeting minimum standards.

Determining whether a congressional collection meets these minimum standards can be accomplished more easily by a Washington-based congressional staff archivist than by an occasionally visiting repository archivist. The *Report* states that an "archivist can best assess content quality and make preliminary judgments regarding which portions of the collection exemplify the Member's role in the governing process if he or she has a chance to survey all files at one time, regardless of their origin or medium."<sup>12</sup> Certainly this is an ideal which has seldom been achieved. The Washington congressional staff archivist may be able to review files in the senate office, the senate attic storage areas, the Suitland National Records Center, and then travel to the state to review state office files, but never will all files be together

---

11 *Ibid.*, 20.

12 *Ibid.*, 36.

in one place until they reach the repository. However, archivists must review the major components of congressional collections and establish procedures for appraisal previous to receipt of a collection. The *Report* acknowledges that, while appraisal cannot be considered a minimum standard, pre-acceptance appraisal must be required by any funding agency.

Appraisal questions remain unanswered, but the *Report* provides clear guidelines on evaluating the value of a congressional collection. Archivists should look for comprehensive coverage, ancillary files, uniqueness associated with the member, inclusion of background materials, documentation of committee activities, coverage of a long time span, and unsplit collections. In all the cases of these four retiring senators, none of them had transferred items to a repository other than the one that was to receive the bulk of the papers, all contained substantial bodies of background materials on topics with which the senator was involved, all contained extensive files documenting the senators' committee work, and all covered long periods of time. One of the collections, however, did not include ancillary files of principal staff aides nor substantive documentation of nonsenate career. While this lack would have made the collection less valuable to another repository, the repository receiving the collection considered it their most valuable.

Other minimum standards for congressional collections are ease of arrangement and description, appraisal and subsequent use, and preservation. The *Report* states that the following represent minimum quality: a collection's components are well defined and in good order; weedable series are easily distinguished; texts and indexes of automated files and system documentation exist, and automated formats are useable with the repository's technology; random paper files or microfilm are accessible through indexes or lists; nonpaper media items are identified, dated, indexed, and stored under archival conditions; and permanent files are on paper or other media of established quality. The records of only one



of the senators being considered met the majority of these standards. The same office was the only one which had done substantial records management, and it was one of two which had employed a congressional staff archivist. One office employed a congressional staff archivist with no archival training, hence, the effectiveness of the person was limited. Therefore, in three out of the four instances, the majority of the above points had to be addressed in the last year of the senator's time in office after a trained archivist was hired to work on the Washington staff. Either the repository archivist must spend substantial time in Washington working with the congressional staff or a congressional staff archivist must be hired to apply systems that will establish minimum standards for collections.

The 1978 conference discussed such minimum standards for senators' papers as well as research use of the papers. Historians at the conference were concerned about the availability of senatorial papers in appropriate locations, reasoning that limited travel funds will continue to prohibit researchers from reaching obscure locations. Historians were also concerned that collections be acquired by repositories with professionally trained archivists. Archivists and historians agree that "professional arrangement and description affect use more profoundly than does size."<sup>13</sup>

Historians did contend, however, that content and quality, format and volume would also affect the use of a senator's papers. They were against reducing the bulk of the papers by weeding, while realizing that not every item in a senator's papers was worth keeping permanently. Conference participants agreed upon a basic list of items which are weedable.<sup>14</sup> A very similar list also now appears in the *Records Management Handbook* of the Senate. Weeding was part of the records management program in only one of the offices being considered here. The other three offices only

---

<sup>13</sup> *Proceedings*, 69.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 4, 177.

weeded files when advised to do so by the congressional staff archivist during the last year of the senators' terms in office.

Microfilm, like weeding, is not favored by historians as a means of reducing bulk, even though they realize that some items of bulk can only be saved on microfilm. Microfilm was used in each of the four senators' offices for some segments of the office operations. One office used microfilm only for scrapbooks of clippings, and the other three used it for constituent correspondence and some state project files. Two of the offices had consistently microfilmed constituent files and state project files, and in one, indexes and other finding aids were available and in good order. The other office which used microfilm extensively had poor or nonexistent indexes, and during the senator's last year in office, the congressional staff archivist wrote guidelines for researchers to use the microfilm. In one other office, microfilming had been used for a period of time and then abandoned. The congressional staff archivist was required to provide explanations about these various filming policies for researchers in a limited amount of time. A congressional staff archivist can work with the office staff and the senate microfilming department to reduce the bulk of constituent mail through microfilming and oversee production of indexes and finding aids to make the film useable by office staff and researchers. Such work must be done, however, before a senator retires.

Restrictions, like bulk, are detrimental to ease of use of congressional collections. The project *Report* emphasizes that collections which are least encumbered by donors' restrictions are of more value to researchers if all other conditions are similar. The 1978 conference participants first stated this point. In each of the four senate offices only items classified by federal law are under restrictions. Such materials were removed from the collections by the congressional staff archivist and forwarded to the National Archives and Records Administration for declassification at

the appropriate time. Each of the four senators signed a deed of gift with the respective repositories stating that only those items restricted by federal law would be closed to researchers. Each deed of gift included a statement that if archivists subsequently located items they deemed to be of a sensitive nature harmful to living individuals these would also be closed.

The Harpers Ferry conference *Report* recommends minimum standards for repositories also. Similar minimum standards had previously been discussed in the 1978 conference on senators' papers. Senators and their staffs should consider donating papers to repositories with environmentally and security controlled storage areas; those committed to bear the cost of processing, housing, and making the papers available for use on a continued basis; those with appropriate collecting policies; those with adequate and professional staff; those able to handle sensitive data and classified information; those which can promise timely processing; those with technology to make machine readable records useable; those with complementary collections and research resources and the ability to service the materials; and those with a commitment to participate in national data bases. Historian Leuchtenburg in the 1978 conference argued that congressional papers should not be given to small, understaffed libraries because travel to them is difficult and their ability to process papers, which critically affects research use, is minimal.<sup>15</sup>

In the four cases discussed here, two collections went to repositories which met most of the minimum standards. One collection went to a repository which held no other congressional collections, which had no professionally trained archival staff, no clear ability to provide timely processing, no collecting policy, and no plans to participate in national data bases. The repository did, based on its desire to acquire the senator's papers, make a commitment to add professional

---

15 *Ibid.*, 21.

archivists, complete timely processing, and participate in national data bases. They were in close proximity to other research materials, had new and adequate archival storage, and were institutionally committed to providing service to the collection. If the senator had not been retiring, the staff and the congressional staff archivist could have monitored the ability of the repository to meet these minimum standards.

In another of the cases, a collection was donated to a repository where the papers fell outside the collecting policy of the institution. Although a professional archival staff existed, it was a very small staff that became overwhelmed by the volume of the senator's papers and were not overly enthusiastic about receiving them. All four collections went to institutions because of political commitments, not because of the ability of the repository to care for the collection. The *Report* hesitates to address this issue and states that "funding should not be available to help institutions meet minimum standards."<sup>16</sup> However, until archivists have more influence over the placement of papers, outside funding may be the only way substandard repositories which have received congressional collections on political whims can make materials available for research use.

Due to the high cost of caring for congressional collections many repositories have simply stopped acquiring them. Unfortunately, these tend to be the above standard repositories, and their refusal to accept collections provides an impetus for inadequate repositories to collect congressional collections. A congressional staff archivist and staff sensitive to records management and historical perspectives can facilitate the deposit of congressional collections in appropriate repositories. Properly prepared collections will then be more attractive to repositories meeting minimum standards which currently hesitate to accept congressional papers.

---

16 *Report*, 22.

Even senators' staffs will not be able to prevent all political commitments, and archivists must bear responsibility for anticipating such events. Each archival institution which now collects congressional papers should monitor the archival plans and activities of members of Congress, even for those collections which they do not wish to collect. Information gathered should be provided in a cooperative spirit to other archival institutions in the state. A university with no intention of collecting congressional papers may find itself committed to do so by its president. Had the institution whose collecting policy included congressional collections been in touch with the senator and other archival agencies in the state, then the small archival staff overcome by senatorial papers mentioned previously might have been spared such a burden.

Unexpected burdens often come to archival repositories via the institution's chief executive. Written and institutionally accepted collecting policies help to prevent such problems as do acknowledged documentation strategies. Few university administrators will ever attempt to learn about the collecting policies of the manuscripts department, but if those policies are written and endorsed officially, then the manuscript department can more ably combat political commitments which hamper the abilities of the department. This requires archivists to provide collecting policies and to push them through administrative approval.

In addition to collection policies, Patricia Aronsson in "Appraisal of Twentieth-Century Congressional Collections" presents plans for a regional repository system for congressional papers.<sup>17</sup> She suggests that a documentation strategy could be developed allowing for coverage of activities in Congress by keeping selective portions of congressional papers collections. While members probably will not support

---

17 Patricia Aronsson, "Appraisal of Twentieth-Century Congressional Collections," *Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance*, ed. Nancy E. Peace (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1984), 81-104.

a regional repository where their papers are preserved outside their home state, Aronsson's plan for congressional documentation strategies is applicable to single state repositories that acquire large collections and to multi-institution activities in a single state.

Intellectual minimum standards of collecting policies and documentation strategies are as important as repository physical minimum standards. The *Report* skirts these issues. However, more and more archivists are focusing on collecting policies and documentation strategies at conferences and in their research. Congressional archivists must involve themselves in the promotion of and development of policies and strategies to maximize preservation of congressional papers.

Better records management, while not a minimum standard, is also essential to the preservation of congressional papers. "Better records management practices in congressional offices is the most important activity that could be taken to improve the preservation of Congress's record, according to conference participants. Yet the group seemed to feel that archivists have little influence over these practices."<sup>18</sup> While it is true that the impetus for better records management must come from within Congress, archivists can influence what happens. If repository archivists will contact congressional offices at the beginning of congressional terms, an effective records management program can be developed. Repository archivists can also suggest that congressional staff archivists be hired to help institute records management practices.

Congressional staff members hesitate to devote any of their already limited time to records management unless directed to do so by their bosses. Repository archivists must ask senior staff members from offices already committed to records management to pass the word of its value to other members of their state delegations. Then repository

---

<sup>18</sup> *Report*, 23.

archivists can begin a campaign to provide information on records management to Washington staff as well as state office staff.

Records management in the Senate is facilitated by the *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Repositories*. It is hoped that a similar handbook will be produced for the House of Representatives in the near future. Unfortunately, senators' offices tend not to implement procedures from the *Handbook* unless assisted by an archivist. Here again, the repository archivist must be active not passive and gently, but firmly, suggest such procedures, or a congressional staff archivist can attempt to implement them from within.

In the four senate offices considered by this article, only one had actually followed procedures from the *Handbook*. This office had employed a congressional staff archivist who prepared policies supported by the office manager for an effective records management program. The other three offices were aware of the *Handbook*, had reviewed it, and planned in the future to implement records management procedures. However, the senator announced his retirement before records management was put into place. Archivists, through communication with congressional staff, can prevent offices from closing and forwarding papers to a repository without ever having implemented records management programs.

Technology in Congress has affected office functions and records management. The *Report* states that technology is "an opening wedge for improved records management and archival preservation."<sup>19</sup> This will not be true, however, without the intervention of an archivist. In many cases technology has actually hampered records management and destroyed the archival records of congressional offices. All four offices represented here implemented extensive technology systems as a means of faster service to constituents and

---

19 *Ibid.*

as a way to avoid paper files. Backup systems for computers were in existence in only one of the offices. Drafts of bills and reports were overwritten and are not retrievable, file code guides were lost or never existed, and evidence of important messages transmitted electronically was lost. In two of the offices, staff and congressional staff archivists implemented paper backup systems to assure that drafts were printed out before being overwritten and organized file codes with explanatory documentation. These actions helped create collections meeting minimum standards.

The *Report* identifies factors "determining the quality of the relationship between congressional offices and repositories," which will improve records management and the preservation of congressional papers.<sup>20</sup> Two critical points discussed are the need, as already stated, for the repository to have early contact with the congressional office, and for guidelines on mutual expectations. Early and frequent contact by the repository with the congressional office is essential to the proper preservation of files. Contact must be with the staff person responsible for managing office systems, not just the public relations. Repositories should, of course, stay in touch with the congressional office press secretary, but only instructional sessions with the office manager or administrative assistant will result in the application of archival procedures. Some of the repository archivist's contact will need to be in person, for personal reviews of files in Washington insure better quality collections.

Repository archivists should not hesitate to recommend the hiring of a Washington-based congressional staff archivist. It is better to lose some control over the handling of the files in order to gain on-site expertise from an experienced archivist. Repository and congressional staff archivists may disagree on minor points, but they will at least be disagreeing in the same language.

---

20 *Ibid.*, 24-25.



In addition to recommending minimum standards for collections and repositories, the *Report* recommends that statements outlining the mutual expectations between repository and office be developed. A draft gift or deposit agreement can delineate these. Included should be the following: a description of the donor and the receiver; an explanation of materials being given or deposited, including a brief list; inclusive dates and size of the materials; any restrictions on use and the time limit of the restrictions; ownership of literary rights and copyrights; the disposition of duplicate materials; expected time to process fully; allowable use of materials for research prior to completed processing; a description of additions; and whether finding aids or guides are to be produced. Of course, other points regarding the uniqueness of the repository and the congressional collection need to be included in deeds of gift or deposit.

In three of the four instances, a deed of gift written by the congressional staff archivist was signed by the senator and the respective repository. Written into the deeds is the requirement that the repository archivally arrange, describe, and make available for research use the collection within five years of its receipt; that duplicate materials may be discarded by the repository; that only classified materials will be restricted; and that literary and copyrights belong to the repository upon the death of the senator. Future questions of ownership and obligations are already answered by the deeds.

Understanding and acknowledging mutual obligations will improve the preservation of congressional papers, but archivists dealing with such materials need better training and information. The *Congressional Papers Project Report* explores these needs and recommends congressional archival fellowships as well as better communication among congressional archivists. Fellowships will begin to address many of the questions congressional archivists face. The *Report* suggests four to six week fellowships, but experience in congressional offices shows that more time is needed. Four to six weeks is only enough to begin to gain the confidence of congressional staff members which is necessary to the

implementation of any archival program. Additionally, a few weeks spent working in the historical offices of the Senate and House of Representatives will give the archivists a better background in the history of Congress. More one or two year positions for congressional staff archivists and fellowships for repository archivists in conjunction with work in the historical offices will build a true archival program for congressional papers.

Currently, the Society of American Archivists's Congressional Archivists Roundtable provides the only formal network for discussion relating to archival programs for Congress. Congressional staff archivists and repository archivists working with congressional collections need to provide more case studies to each other, publish more information about their work, and develop cooperative programs. The *Report* strongly emphasizes these needs and urges archivists and congressional staff to become involved and concerned about the preservation of Congress's history. However, no coordinated effort has yet evolved between these two groups. Despite the good work of the Senate Historical Office and the House of Representatives Bicentennial Office, only when repository archivists become proactive instead of reactive will progress be made in the management of congressional collections.

Further progress will occur when the hiring of congressional staff archivists is accepted by Congress and repositories. Today, these positions are usually developed by the person hired to fill them. However, more such positions need to be established because of the valuable assistance they bring to Congress. Recommendations made by the *Report* are valid and workable, but only if more archival assistance is given to Congress. From where is this archival assistance to come? Certainly, repository archivists will seek collections that meet minimum standards, but the archivist who has extra time to spend in Washington working in the congressional office is rare, if he exists at all.

Congressional staff archivists can provide assistance for repositories. They will foresee many areas where a collection does not meet minimum standards and implement improvement procedures for the congressional office to

follow. Washington-based congressional staff archivists can do this better than anyone in the repository, because they are on hand, and better than anyone else in the office, because they are trained as archivists. They also can establish records management programs in-house and perhaps free repository archivists to work on oral history to fill in gaps created by the verbal nature of Congress. Appraisal can also be facilitated during establishment of records management programs. Many of the other problems repository archivists find when a congressional collection arrives, such as missing file codes, missing documentation for automated systems records, names and positions of staff members, and identification of photographs can be eliminated by the congressional staff archivist while the office is still functional. Such problems may not be resolvable once office staff are scattered.

In conjunction with managing congressional papers to meet minimum standards, congressional staff archivists can assist members of Congress in locating repositories that meet minimum standards as delineated by the *Report*. The congressional staff archivist may have as little power as other congressional staff in preventing placement of papers at unsuitable repositories because of political whims. However, a congressional staff archivist in the office of a member contemplating placement is more likely to be consulted than not.

Also, as previously stated, congressional staff have limited time which they would seldom devote to records management. Therefore, a congressional staff archivist could implement needed records management programs where no one else would. Of course, not all archival problems for Congress can be solved by congressional staff archivists, but if each office hired a trained archivist the preservation of the history of Congress would be dramatically enhanced, the standards presented in the *Report* might become reality, archival repositories would be less burdened, and jobs would be created for archivists.

The 1978 Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers passed a resolution which challenged archivists, historians, and congressional staff:

Recognizing that the Conference has illuminated important problems of acquisition, research use, organization, processing, arrangement, description, and size of papers of United States senators, be it further resolved that this Conference urge that these and related questions receive further systematic study by representatives of the Senate, of the historical profession, and of the archival profession, through a study group sponsored by the Senate Historical Office and the Society of American Archivists.<sup>21</sup>

Seven years later the Congressional Papers Project Conference in Harpers Ferry finally began to review such issues with the hope of developing guidelines for funding work on congressional papers. Today, only the Harpers Ferry conference, the *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Repositories*, the work of several congressional staff archivists, and a few published articles have dealt with the issues first raised at the 1978 conference. Through such continued efforts and the analysis of the work done, archivists can and will develop better ways to preserve congressional papers and make them available for research.

Faye Phillips is head of the Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Special Collections, Louisiana State University. Previously, she served as archivist to Senators Russell Long, Thomas Eagleton, Charles Mathias, and Gary Hart.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Proceedings*, 121.