Resolution No. 9, with reference to the critical situation of the coffee growers of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 6102. A bill granting a pension to William Ridgway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 6103. A bill granting a pension to Florence Cravens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 6104. A bill granting a pension to Jessie C. Donaldson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6105. A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Harold R. Wood; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 6106. A bill granting a pension to Isabelle Bullock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 6107. A bill for the relief of Barnet Warren; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 6108. A bill for the relief of Regina Howell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHEL:

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims or the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. J. W. Marks, of Stephens County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2827. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of the Federation of Italian-American Societies of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the lifting of the embargo on the shipment of war materials to warring countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2828. By Mr. EATON of California: Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of South Gate, Calif., and signed by H. C. Peiffer, as city clerk, urging the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to House bill 4576, to the end that the relief afforded thereby may be experienced at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2829. By Mr. ENGEL: Petition of Edward Baltzer, Harry Smith, A. E. Johnson, and others of Mason County, Mich., urging adoption of the Ludlow war referendum bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2830. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y., opposing the shipment of horses and mules to foreign countries in the event of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2831. Also, petition of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., urging support of House bill 944, wool labeling bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2832. Also, petition of Caddo Lodge, No. 769, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Marshall, Tex., urging support of House bill 4862; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2833. Also, petition of the Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corporation, New York City, concerning House bill 1809; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2834. Also, petition of the Jewish Fellowship Unit, No. 1, New York City, concerning the Rogers-Wagner refugee bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2835. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., concerning the Martin wool labeling bill (H. R. 944); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2836. Also, petition of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., concerning the Wheeler bill (S. 2009); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2837. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of J. M. Hogl, secretary of Townsend Club of Wheeling, W. Va., urging the Ways and Means Committee to make a favorable report on House bill 2, known as the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2838. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kans.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2839. Also, petition of Townsend Club, No. 1, of Junction City, Kans.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2840. Also, petition of G. E. Segelquist, of Scranton, Kans., and approximately 250 other citizens of that community; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2841. By Mr. SANDAGER: Memorial of the Pawtucket Businessmen's Association and Chamber of Commerce, Pawtucket, R. I., commending the action of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury and concurring with the reasons given: (1) It is especially urgent that at this time we do not place any avoidable burden on American productive enterprise; (2) a suspension of the increase in the tax-rate scheduled to take place in 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2842. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of citizens and members of Marissa (Ill.) Townsend Club, John A. Stodghill, president, with endorsements from local organizations of United Mine Workers of America, Progressive Mine Workers of America, and its auxiliary, and Workers' Alliance, urging enactment of House bill 2, known as the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2843. Also, petition of Hoyleton (Ill.) Townsend Club, No. 1, F. William Grote, secretary, urging enactment of House bill No. 2, known as the Townsend Old Age Pension Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2844. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Roy Walling, president of the Columbus Society for Handicapped, signed by 2,000 persons and petitioning for the enactment of a law providing pensions for all needy handicapped persons who by reason of their disability are kept from gainful employment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2845. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Empire Typographical Conference of the International Typographical Union, Niagara Falls, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

2846. Also, petition of the American Society of Mammalogists, College Station, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to predatory prey regulations in national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O gracious Father of mankind, do Thou cleanse our prayer from all human dross and attune our hearts to Thee. Draw near us, through Christ, that Thy promises may assume fresh meaning and power. O Thou who art the Father-God, who made the mother's heart like unto Thine own, care for our youth and keep them from the sin and shame which bruise the souls which love them most. When vicissitude comes, when adversity overtakes, and when the storm breaks, hold Thou the hand and cheer the trembling heart. Oh, may the shifting sand beneath weary feet be as

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

stable as the Rock of Ages. We praise Thee that light is sown for the righteous and gladness for the upright in heart.

Speak Lord and may Thy servants hear: Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths.

In the adorable name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 16, 19, 27, 32, 46, and 49, to the bill (H. R. 4852) entitled, "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2065. An act to provide for the regulation of the sale of certain securities in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, and the regulation of the trust indentures under which the same are issued, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE TAXATION OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES AND SALARIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably (H. Rept. No. 533) a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee on Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the resolution (S. Res. 303, 75th Cong.) establishing a Special Committee on the Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to correct the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when the vote was taken Monday on roll call No. 60 on the veterans' bill I was in one of the committee rooms of the Capitol on committee business. The bells did not ring. I knew nothing of the roll call until I picked up the RECORD on the following day. I have always consistently supported legislation for the veterans and their dependents, and had I been here I would have voted "yea" on the passage of this bill. I would like to have this statement appear in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the New York Times this morning on the death of Frank P. Walsh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable John T. Cahill, United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5138) to make unlawful attempts to overthrow the Government of the United States, to require licensing of civilian military organizations, to make unlawful attempts to interfere with the discipline of the Army and Navy, to require registration and fingerprinting of aliens, to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals in certain cases, and for other purposes; and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the bill, the title of which has just been reported, be rereferred from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Is there objection?

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I have to serve notice on the House, then, that we will move tomorrow that this reference be made.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered yesterday before the National Chamber of Commerce by S. Clay Williams. I am informed this speech is too long to conform to the rule, and this morning I have an estimate from the Public Printer. I now renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio discussion participated in by a Senator, a Congressman, and a former Congressman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and refer to bills that have been introduced in behalf of people of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the time of the Members of the House this morning except to bring this resolution to your attention, as we will have under consideration very soon the problem of dairy products being made a basic commodity. I call your attention to this joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature, in which they ask that this be done not only for the dairymen of the State of Wisconsin but throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the joint resolution to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to provide by law that dairy products be made a basic commodity

Whereas dairying comprises a wide and varied agricultural enterprise which provides a major income for a large number of farmers in the several dairy States; and

Whereas because large sums of money are invested in the dairy sections of today for the purpose of producing dairy products of good quality and due to climatic conditions dairy farmers cannot profitably engage in other types of farming; and

Whereas the dairy farmer is at a disadvantage compared with the cotton, corn, and wheat farmer in that the Agricultural Adjustment Act does not control the production of dairy products; and

Whereas the dairy industry would be immeasurably benefited if it were made subject to the Agricultural Adjustment Act and dairy farmers favor control of production in dairying in the manner provided in said act for controlling production of agricultural products affected thereby: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that dairy products be made a basic commodity and that a parity payment be made to equal the difference between the average price of butter on the New York market and the parity price; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore made, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 60, the veterans' pension bill, for the benefit of widows and orphans, I was recorded, erroneously, as being against the bill on a pair. I should have been recorded in favor of it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to invite all of you and your friends and your guests at the lunch-time hour to partake of some of the famous Lebanon County bologna, of which I have a supply here, and which will be available in the cloakrooms for those of you who are too busy to get to the House restaurant. Those of you who have lunch at the House restaurant will find it available there. This is a very unique product. It is both very good and very sustaining. It is manufactured in Palmyra, Pa., one of the finest towns in our entire State, by the Palmyra Bologna Co., and I am sure you will all enjoy it. Try it yourselves and get your friends to come with you to lunch. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein discussions between Senator TAFT and Representative SMITH of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard something today about Pennsylvania bologna and I hope you will all enjoy it at the lunch hour, but the greatest "boloney" I have ever heard offered to the American taxpayer is the proposal, which, according to one of the newspapers, has been offered with respect to giving Members of Congress who have served 10 years a pension of from $3,000 to $3,600 a year. That would be the greatest "boloney" that the American taxpayers ever heard of, and it is way beyond the question whether we ought to give everybody in this country $200 a month old-age pension. It may be termed more bologna for Congressmen. Oh, when will it ever cease? We are crushing by every act and by every law the American people. We are not helping them, we are not making them secure when we break down the Government of our people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know to whom the gentleman refers, but if he is referring to me, I have not suggested any pension for Members of Congress. I have suggested that we might put them under the civil-service retirement system, which covers 600,000 Federal employees, and under which the employees pay a large part of the cost themselves. I think if Members of Congress provide a system for 600,000 Federal employees and for 40,000,000 private employees, there is no reason why we should not supply a similar system for Members of Congress based upon a contributory plan, and there is no "boloney" in that, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short financial statement of the Electric Light & Power System of Tacoma, Wash.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 19, and, pending that motion, I would ask if there is any disposition on the part of the minority to come to any agreement with reference to time for debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that we, of course, have no desire to prolong the debate beyond what may be reasonable, and I may suggest that we go into Committee and see what time is actually needed, and later we can arrive at some conclusion about limiting debate.

Mr. COCHRAN. Very well. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

Mr. HINSHAW. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of order there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Arnold	Duncan	Mansfield	Satterfield
Bland	Evans	McReynolds	Shannon
Buckley, N. Y.	Ferguson	Mitchell	Short
Bulwinkle	Flannagan	Mouton	Sirovich
Clark	Folger	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Crowther	Fulmer	Myers	Smith, W. Va.
Curley	Hartley	Norton	Stearns, N. H.
D'Alesandro	Healey	Osmers	Sweeney
Darden	Horton	Peterson, Fla.	Terry
Delaney	Jenks, N. H.	Reece, Tenn.	Vinson, Ga.
Dies	Kelly	Sabath	Wadsworth

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 19, and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the debate may be equally controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 19, and, pending that motion, asks unanimous consent that the debate be controlled equally by himself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know how much time there will be for debate.

The SPEAKER. The time has not been agreed upon and is not involved in this request. Under the rule, the time cannot exceed 10 hours.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 19, with Mr. MCGRANERY in the chair.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 19

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. I, transmitted to Congress by the President on April 25, 1939.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCGRANERY). Under the order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 hours.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the concurrent resolution under consideration, submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], has for its purpose to set aside the first plan of Government reorganization submitted by the President. Your committee has recommended that it be not agreed to, which, if approved by the House, means the order will go into effect 60 days from date of submission.

We have heard a great deal with reference to reduction of Government expenditures. Those who are in favor of a reduction of Government expenditures have an opportunity to show by their votes today that they really are.

We have heard that we want better efficiency in the executive branch of the Government. The Executive order of the President will bring that about. Everyone desires simplification of procedure. Washington today is crowded with members of the United States Chamber of Commerce from all over the country. Ask any one of them how difficult it is for them to find the Government agency they want to do business with. In grouping these Government agencies the President simplifies procedure. It will enable them to reach the official they would like to talk to without employing a guard.

The Executive order submitted by the President is practically unanimously endorsed by the press of the Nation, by the businessmen of the Nation, and by the taxpayers of the Nation.

Under the law debate on this resolution cannot exceed 10 hours. Up to the moment I have requests for only a few minutes' time. I cannot conceive of the necessity of offering a defense for this Executive order. It is so meritorious it needs no defense.

As there is no one on this side who has anything to say at the moment, I ask the gentleman from New York to use some of his time.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, as has been properly said by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], the burden is certainly on the minority, represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It is going to be our policy to figuratively let the gentleman from New York and those who may be associated with him "shell the woods" on this proposition, and it is our present policy to only reserve for ourselves 10 minutes. Is that not correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is correct. I therefore ask the gentleman from New York to use some of his time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important measures that will be brought before the House of Representatives. I am satisfied that it will not promote efficiency in the Government and that it will not reduce expenses. I solicit your respectful attention to the situation that is presented by it.

To my mind the only possible way for the House of Representatives to approve of this proposition would be because it had not had thorough study on the part of the House. To my mind the only way that anyone can justify a position in favor of it is on the broad theory of reorganization without a detailed study of the program.

I desire to go very carefully into the proposition. Contrary to my usual custom, I have written out exactly what I propose to say, and I am going to read it, in spite of the fact that it makes it more difficult to follow. It is going to be a detailed analysis of the proposal and detailed reasons for my objections to it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the features of the reorganization proposal submitted by the President on the 25th of April, 1939, are:

PART 1. EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The transfer to the Executive Office of the President of four items:

(1) The Bureau of the Budget.

(2) The Central Statistical Board.

(3) The National Resources Committee.

(4) The handling of personnel.

Of these transfers unquestionably that of the Bureau of the Budget is proper. It never did have a proper place in the Treasury Department.

The Central Statistical Board is about to expire by operation of law; it has been a total failure insofar as coordinating the statistical activities of the Government and insofar as reducing the expenses or creating any efficiency in the collection of statistics. It should be abolished because it serves no useful purpose whatever. No temporary agency which has not authority under law to continue should be placed in a permanent set-up.

The National Resources Committee has never done anything except propose the wild spending of public funds, which we did not have and which did not in any way help the economic situation of the United States. This outfit has no legal existence; it is operated as a part of the relief set-up under the W. P. A. and expires on the 30th of June without further legislative action by Congress. This is one of the things that stands in the way of recovery and is operating to promote the reactionary policies of the President to keep the country in debt and constructing projects which it cannot afford and which are not economic. Instead of being made a part of reorganization it should be abolished.

The President states in his message:

> Because of an exemption in the act it is impossible to transfer to the Executive Office the administration of the third managerial function of the Government—that of personnel. However, I desire to inform the Congress that it is my purpose to name one of the administrative assistants to the President, authorized in the Reorganization Act of 1939, to serve as a liaison agent of the White House on personnel management.

In this way the President attempts to get around the exemption of the Civil Service Commission and the civil service laws, which was contained in the Reorganization Act. It is clearly improper and indicates a contempt of the act of Congress in exempting the Civil Service Commission.

Does the President intend by this operation to put into force and effect, through his own office, the management of the Civil Service Commission's activities and the civil service law in spite of any feeling in Congress or law that it has passed? It seems to me that this is one of the major reasons why we should not at this time in any way favor any of the proposal that has been submitted to us by the President.

PART 2. FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The President attempts to set up a new agency handling or controlling upward of $2,000,000,000 a year, and perhaps more. This plan creates the Federal Security Agency as a new agency without any authority whatever in the Reorganization Act for that purpose. To this agency are transferred:

(1) The Social Security Board;

(2) The United States Employment Service;

(3) The Office of Education;

(4) The Public Health Service;

(5) The National Youth Administration; and

(6) The Civilian Conservation Corps.

The first four named are old agencies of the Government. The fifth, the N. Y. A., expires June 30, 1939, and should not be renewed. It is an attempt on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with the problem of education, which should be in the hands of the States. If, as a matter of relief, the States need to handle some such activity it should be done in that way and not be a national organization headed by such a man as Aubrey Williams. This organization should not be continued.

The C. C. C., the sixth item, expires by operation of law on the 1st of July 1940.

The mixing of temporary agencies, such as these last two, with regular activities of the Government tends to destroy the efficiency of the operations of the Government. For my own part, I believe that a very large portion of the operations of the Social Security Board must be changed very decidedly if we are to have business recovery in this country. I think that the act is the greatest menace to the underprivileged in this country that exists. The taxes that are levied on business prevent the operation of business and the employment of our people and destroy a possibility of its successful operation. Under those circumstances to set up a new bureau having charge of six agencies, one of which, although permanent, is exceedingly dangerous and which should be reorganized and much of its activity eliminated in the interest of the people, and two of which are only temporary relief agencies which should not be continued when the processes of government can be so changed as to permit the private employment of our people. It seems utterly ridiculous to call anything a reorganization to promote efficiency and to combine permanent activities with temporary relief activities which are at best merely an expedient.

PART 3. FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Here another agency is created without any authority of law. Salaries and positions are provided, and a new authority is placed over old agencies as follows:

(a) Bureau of Public Roads, now functioning satisfactorily in the Department of Agriculture.

(b) The Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division, now in the Treasury Department which is operating as efficiently as could be expected in these days of queer governmental operations.

(c) The Branch of Building Management of the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior, which has charge of the public buildings in the District of Columbia.

And the following relief, emergency, and temporary agencies:

(a) The United States Housing Authority, which has authority to dump money into alleged slum-clearance projects, where nothing is ever to be repaid to the Government.

(b) The P. W. A., which expired insofar as the granting of new projects is concerned on the 1st of January last.

(c) The W. P. A., which will expire on June 30 next.

No further extension should be given to the United States Housing Authority. It has had available to dump out of the Treasury $800,000,000 for the construction of alleged slum-clearance projects which will cost tremendous sums of money and where an attempt is made to give, in the ultimate analysis, one-tenth of 1 percent of the poor people practically rent free—a charge being made only equal to the amount of the heat provided and the maintenance—the last being paid for by a grant from the Federal Government, at the expense of 99.9 percent of the underprivileged class. This activity should be stopped.

The W. P. A. and the P. W. A. are notoriously inefficient. Of course, the evidence before the investigating committee of the W. P. A. was that the cost of projects under its care was nearly double that of public projects built by a contractor in the regular way.

The P. W. A. unquestionably throughout the country has induced communities to go into buildings which they could not afford to maintain and pay for. The cost of these buildings has been always at least 10 percent more as a result of this operation and generally is a great deal more than that. These two activities should be done away with. A consolidation of these activities under a set-up which I believe to be illegal is absolutely ridiculous. It will absolutely destroy the efficiency and integrity of the entire construction forces of the Government and bring them down to the level of temporary relief agencies.

This new set-up under the President's reorganization plan contains two agencies which expire on June 30, before the proposal can take effect, and another which has exhausted its power to make grants and borrow money. That anyone who studied the proposition could think for a moment of supporting this kind of a proposition is not sensible. It certainly is not businesslike. It certainly is not patriotism. It certainly is not meeting our responsibilities as Members of Congress.

PART 4. FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY

Here again a new agency is created without, in my opinion, any authority of law, superimposed above the others.

The outstanding ridiculous feature of this is the transfer to it of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. This is the Board set up by law for the general control of the savings and loan institutions. It has absolutely no place in a governmental loaning agency. It is an absolute breach of faith with the savings and loan institutions of the Government for us to transfer this Board to a Federal loaning agency. It should not be permitted.

There will be no economy or efficiency resulting from this transfer; the only thing that will result will be the imposition of a useless overhead on almost all of these agencies. This will cost money. It will not promote efficiency but will destroy it.

The Congress should be so sensible of its obligations to the American people that it will express immediately its disapproval of a program to destroy efficiency of government and to mess up temporary relief activities with permanent activities. It should express its disapproval of a plan which obviously will cost money and not save it. No reorganization plan superimposing an overhead on any authority has ever saved money. The only way we can save money is by destroying useless activities. You cannot combine inefficiency of temporary activities without destroying the efficiency of the regular activities.

I am asking that the Congress put patriotism above partisanship and at this time vote in favor of this resolution to protect what little is left after 6 long years of abuse of the efficiency of governmental institutions. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Chairman, many Members have requested information as to when a vote may be reached on this resolution. Let

me say it is our purpose to endeavor to keep the House in session today until the resolution is disposed of.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, what could be of greater interest to the public at the moment than the question raised by the pending resolution?

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to disturb the Committee, but I do want to hear the debate on this important matter, and certainly the House is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and I sympathize with him because I have no doubt he wants to know something about this measure.

Mr. KELLER. I do.

Mr. GIFFORD. It has been stated that 10 minutes is sufficient time for the Democratic side of the House to rubber stamp, according to custom, this very important message. No hearings have been held. It must pass immediately before the public becomes aroused over it.

I quote from the President's message:

> These measures have all had only one supreme purpose—to make democracy work, to strengthen the arms of democracy in peace or war—

Exactly. This President of ours wants to strengthen the arms of government even in peacetime. He wants tremendous power. This has not heretofore been supposed to be the plan of government during peacetimes.

> We are not free if our administration is weak. But we are free if we know, and others know, that we are strong; that we can be tough as well as tender-hearted.

I know I am tender-hearted to the last degree; my only hope today is that I can be tough. When messages like this come from the President I am reminded of what has gone on heretofore, and, if I may be pardoned a pleasantry, I will use this one:

> WIFE. Every time you see a pretty girl you forget that you are married.
>
> HUSBAND. Not at all. Nothing brings home to me the fact with so much force.

When a pretty message like this comes in under the guise of saving money, there comes to me with much force a reminder of with whom we are dealing in our official relations.

It will be expected that we of the minority who are members of the Committee on Reorganization should make comments on this first installment of the President's recommendations leading to further centralization of power in the hands of the Executive.

This particular measure should possibly not be regarded as a measure for united Republican opposition. However, the minority may well keep in mind that this President of ours has constantly demonstrated his insatiable thirst for power over all governmental functions, even to the point of control of the Supreme Court itself which has been that strong bulwark of safety against those who would do violence to that great charter of our liberties, namely, the Constitution of the United States.

Let us refresh our minds by quoting again the President's exact words:

> We have taken vast powers back to Washington which, in other hands, might be extremely dangerous.

After 6 years of constant attempts at control of Government and the browbeating of legislators themselves, and the constant injection of strange doctrines, especially during the Tugwellian era, it is highly important that any recommendations from the White House should be carefully considered. However, Congressmen are deprived of any real information as to the effect of the proposed changes brought about in this plan No. I, beause no official of the Government dares whisper a word of protest or even approach his Congressman on the matter. The threat of Secretary Ickes, openly proclaimed, that any such approach by anyone under his Department would be disciplined applies generally.

The Democratic Boston Post this morning carries an editorial which I shall let you enjoy with me:

It is as follows:

> The boldface effrontery of the warning issued yesterday to P. W. A. workers by Secretary Ickes should be awarded the grand prize. Mr. Ickes informs employees of that alphabetical bureau they will be disciplined if they are found working against the President's reorganization plan. No fault could be found if the memorandum sent to all employees had been a general statement in opposition to any political undertakings, but to single out one specific measure, and the intimation is that they are to work for it, not against it, savors too much of absolute dictatorship.

I remind you again that we have had no hearings, we have called nobody in to advise with us.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Always to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is it the President's plan or Congress' plan?

Mr. GIFFORD. The President said something about working on it for 2 long years, and it appeared suddenly after we gave him the authority in a recent bill.

The gentleman well knows the extraordinary powers originally asked for and how carefully we attempted to limit such powers.

Congressmen recognize the unfairness to those now holding responsible positions if we should insist on their expression of opinion. Many conscientious, successful heads of departments are now to be relegated to the background under full control of someone at the top politically appointed, and who, judging from so many appointments heretofore made, would be taken from a list of men whose only real qualification would be that they are "yes" men for the Executive.

Shall I name some of those appointees? Are they not fresh in your memory?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Always to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. How about the "yes" men who were appointed in previous administrations—Mr. Fall and others?

Mr. GIFFORD. I should think the gentleman would get tired of mentioning Mr. Fall. We have been very kind to this administration. You have had a committee to watch over expenditures that has never been allowed to meet. I, for one, have repeatedly protested on this floor against such inactivity. I am not in pursuit of personalities. You have used the name "Fall." There are probably scoundrels in both administrations. Is one man sufficient to blacken the whole Republican Party, of which I am a member? Does that blacken me because of Fall's action?

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman states that the Committee on Expenditures has not been permitted to act.

Mr. GIFFORD. Exactly.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman not know that that committee at this session of Congress has already reported to the House, and the House has passed, six bills?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; peanut bills. No examinations or investigations are made, such as the Appropriations Committee is now conducting in reference to the W. P. A. If present disclosures do not satisfy the gentleman from Missouri that the Committee on Expenditures should long ago have investigated the W. P. A., then I know of no argument that could be brought forward. It has proven the necessity for the demands I have repeatedly made.

It is true that the success of large corporations depends most largely upon the ability of their executive heads. The President of these United States, in contrast with arguments made by him so many times heretofore, says, in his message, that this plan conforms to methods of executive administration used by the large private enterprises which are engaged in carrying on production. When it suits his purposes the "economic royalists" and the great corporations, as operated, are perfect examples for his purpose. I cannot reconcile the two viewpoints as expressed by our Chief Executive.

Such men are appointed by boards of directors with a view to special qualifications for that particular business. Politi-

cal debts owed by the party and elected officials must be paid by distributing the plums of office. That is how we got Fall, if you will recall.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is that a new philosophy of American government?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; but that is why this method cannot work. You cannot make of a republic a Hitler Government such as the President seems to desire.

Able and efficient heads of departments will now be hampered and made subject to the will and whims of some one placed over many activities, who possibly might not properly understand the problems of any particular one of them.

We read this morning of the probable resignation of the head of the C. C. C. Men like Mr. Fechner are now to be dumped in the personnel grade of Government employees; and even though it says that all personnel are to be transferred, the heads of these departments certainly have the appointive power and, as I have said repeatedly, "many heads may roll." Many of them were appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. Now they are relegated simply to personnel. Will these independent officials stand for that? They will soon realize the difficulty of explaining their problems and having intelligent and sympathetic assistance from the man at the top, whose attention will be diverted among many activities. Each one will have to await his turn for consideration. The President and legislative committees will get less intelligent information from the one man than they formerly received from the real head of the activity itself. However, discipline and a repression of independent view and action will be a real accomplishment of this centralization of authority.

After 17 years of service in this House, I can only marvel at the change of attitude in the Democratic Party. In my earlier service, centralization of power and even the word "subsidy" would start the Democratic oratorical leaders into a frenzy of debate against such proposals.

Now, however, having fed at the public trough by the workings of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution and by Federal aid extended in every direction that mind of man can invent, all States less fortunate in economic wealth are now seemingly willing to sacrifice their liberties—formerly termed States' rights—a willingness to accept vast centralization of power and dictatorship from Washington.

Does anyone want to deny that? If so, I yield.

Let us not forget the Brownlow report incorporating the President's desire for power, which was referred to our Reorganization Committee and considered in secret for so many months, lest the public hear of those extraordinary demands. We must not forget how the people of the Nation became aroused over those demands, the spectacular fight on the floor of the Congress and the defeat of that first reorganization bill.

Many a man who votes the President this power today—and I hope it will not be a party measure—will have some difficulty in explaining to his people back home why he voted for it, because we ourselves know little about the workings of this plan as yet. It came upon us suddenly. We have had no time to study it. It is not fully explained, and yet you must vote for it. Considering how the public conscience was aroused to the degree that it was, a year ago, if you are now looking for your own safety I would not know what to suggest as a road to safety. It is plainly evident that the plan to rubber stamp it in so short a time is an attempt to prevent the opportunity of hearing from home about the measure.

To be sure, the bill which was recently passed was of very mild proportions as compared to the original demands. Independent agencies of the Government and a few other activities were specifically exempted. He could not abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission and several other agencies. However, you will note that in this plan we are considering today several activities are taken away from those exempted departments and placed under new supervisors, to be hereafter appointed. This illustrates how gradually any of these exempted departments could be robbed of their activities until only a skeleton might remain.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I thought that would get a response.

Mr. WARREN. I am wondering if the gentleman from Massachusetts will cite just one single activity that has been taken away from any of the exempt agencies and placed anywhere else. The gentleman just stated that now, and I think he ought to tell the House about it.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am very glad to. If I can read, it states here that the Bureau of Public Roads shall be taken away from the Department of Agriculture and placed somewhere else. There are perhaps a dozen of such cases.

Mr. WARREN. But the Bureau of Public Roads was never exempt.

Mr. GIFFORD. The Department of Agriculture was exempted, was it not?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, indeed no.

Mr. GIFFORD. What was exempted?

Mr. WARREN. Why, the 15 or 18 different agencies mentioned in the act.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not have it at hand, but it does not matter. If I have made an error there, I am greatly surprised.

Mr. WARREN. I am sure the gentleman has made an error.

Mr. GIFFORD. I hardly think that I am in error. Many activities of these departments will be placed under new departments, I am sure. Was the Department of the Interior exempted?

Mr. WARREN. Of course, the Department of the Interior was not exempted.

Mr. GIFFORD. So that you can whiffle that about.

Mr. WARREN. Not at all.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the President wants to, can he abolish the Department of the Interior?

Mr. WARREN. No, indeed; he cannot abolish any department of Government.

Mr. GIFFORD. They cannot abolish that?

Mr. WARREN. But the gentleman made the statement——

Mr. GIFFORD. I still make it and I still insist on it.

Mr. WARREN. In justice to the House the gentleman ought to name just one specific activity.

Mr. GIFFORD. In justice to the House I will say that the gentleman from North Carolina says they cannot trouble the Department of the Interior, but they are taking away many of the activities that are grouped under it—many bureaus, even P. W. A. It may be that the gentleman can explain that to you; but if you read the plan you will understand the Department of the Interior is losing some of the bureaus that are under it. I claim they can remove many activities from these departments that are exempt.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would look at page 2 of the President's message, he would find the statement in the next to the last paragraph that the President has set up an administrative agency in his own office to handle personnel, in spite of what he regards as a prohibition in the exemption of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GIFFORD. It may be the language of my statement was not as exact as it might have been; but if you read the report, you will see that these activities are being removed from the departments. That is perfectly plain.

It is not comforting to keep in mind that these vast powers in other hands might be dangerous. Some of us may feel that these powers are being transferred into hands that are now conceivably somewhat dangerous. It will be noted in portions of this present plan that heads of these newly formed agencies will have the power of reappointment and of making new appointments, and many heads will probably fall. Many heads will not wait to roll. If they have had independence of action and now do not want to be subjected to a higher power, they will probably remove themselves from dictated action. Many will remove their own heads before the operation can be performed.

It is highly regrettable that sufficient hearings could not be conducted and the advice of heads of departments taken as to the desirability of many of the suggested changes in this plan. Unless such information is forthcoming, how can the Members of this House vote intelligently? To many of us the claim that there will be a saving of money is not proven. It is ridiculous to many of us. Salaries of the new appointees and the clouds of assistants, clerks, and messengers; added floor space; travel expenses; together with the demand for new rock piles of great buildings, to bring them together under one roof, if possible, will undoubtedly more than offset any possible savings that might be claimed by coordination. Under a Democratic administration always seeking to make more jobs, how much overlapping would be prevented? No; the word "coordination" should be "submission."

I have had some experience in the reorganization of the activities of a State, in my own State, where 90 departments were said to have been brought under 19 heads. Did we notice any savings? We did not. For some 4 years I was chairman of that appropriation committee, so-called, having charge of the budget, and did we notice any savings?

Under a democratic form of government, efficiency is the most difficult end to attain; and unless a nation is fortunate in having really competent executives who fully understand the real problems we are placed in a more unfortunate position than existed previously.

Now, much to my regret, I cannot bring myself to vote for the bill under present consideration, bringing about this transfer of great powers leading to more centralization of government. I would be unfair to myself to vote for a measure with no hearings and with such a lack of information, and certainly in this situation it is much safer to vote "no."

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Has not the gentleman observed in the press a deliberate propaganda effort to leave the impression on the public that this is a very innocuous measure as compared with the original proposition?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have carefully studied the press, and I must confess—and this will be advanced by the other side—there is an almost unanimous approval by the editorial press of the country of this reorganization bill; but half of the editorials expressed grave doubt as to any savings, and they all practically note that there is no abolition of any jobs. But why should they not speak favorably of it? Everybody believes in a reorganization plan properly considered. They have had no opportunity to study this matter and comment as they should upon it. It is only a generalization of editorial opinion, but it is our duty to study the exact condition that is going to prevail in each and every department which we set up, and for the workings of which we are responsible. At present we have had no opportunity to pass upon this. Only a generalization of approval has been had, and almost unanimous doubt is expressed that there will be any real saving. And where there is no saving and no abolition of jobs, what does a reorganization bill amount to?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman tell us whether there have been any hearings on this bill or any testimony taken by the committee?

Mr. GIFFORD. The Taber resolution was considered for about 15 minutes and voted out adversely.

Mr. MOTT. Has any other investigation or hearing been had on the President's proposal?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; the less we know about this, the better for us, appears to be the plan of the majority.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman tell us why that was the case?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, of course, I can only say what I think. In view of what happened to this Congress last year, because of the expressed public opinion of our constituents, it must not be permitted to happen again, and time must not be given for criticism or opposition.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. I would like to tell the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from Massachusetts and every one else in the House why there was no opportunity for a hearing. This situation is not of our making. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] immediately rushed down and offered a disapproval resolution. Under the act itself, the committee would have been discharged on Saturday on this resolution. If the gentleman had not introduced that resolution then, of course, he would have had 30 or 40 days to have analyzed and studied it, but after he acted, of course, under the bill there has to be action on it. That is not of our making. The gentleman from New York did that.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will permit, may I inquire whether there was not opportunity to hold hearings and take testimony after the bill was introduced? Did the gentleman say he had only 5 days within which to report it out?

Mr. WARREN. There was never any request for a hearing until yesterday, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked if we would have hearings. His resolution has been pending for a week and it would be subject to discharge on Saturday of this week. Now, you gentlemen created that situation. We did not do it, and therefore it is not up to you to come in here and complain.

Mr. MOTT. So far as I am concerned I have created nothing. I am inquiring why no hearings were had on this matter.

Mr. GIFFORD. I need only to refer to the evident joy on the part of the gentleman from North Carolina that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] acted so quickly. It served him in a difficult situation. I do not know whether sufficient signatures could have been procured to force it out of the committee or not, but no action by the House was desired because if we expressed no disapproval, of course, it would then become law. It is too late to argue now, but it is a sufficient reason for anyone to vote against any reorganization plan because of that novel method by which it can become law without affirmative action by both branches of this Congress. [Applause.]

Constant should be our remonstrance against such action. Why did we so forget ourselves that we should ever have set that precedent of legislation becoming law without the affirmative action of both branches? If one branch is in violent disagreement and the other in agreement, still it becomes a law.

There are many phases which I had intended to discuss, but I have not the time. I shall rely upon that very able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], of the analytical mind, who will, in the brief period allowed him, give you some real information as to the effect of this reorganization plan upon the particular departments involved.

It is the general plan which interests me. The whole theory of representative government is at stake. During the last 6 years democratic government has gradually been undermined by these new doctrines. Now, even the able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], for whom we have such high regard, during this administration, although conservative as he is, has had to yield to the word "subsidy"; to the taking away of States' rights. I know he cannot subscribe to that doctrine. But, like a good soldier, he has had to go along with his President. You will only take 10 minutes because it is not wise. It is always for the minority to try to speak of these matters. It is a distressing job sometimes when I take the floor and criticize a little or want to amend a little. Even my newspapers are unkind enough to say I am against the whole proposition. That is the risk one takes. Take it all. If you object at all, you are against the proposition.

I want to talk about these six anonymities. There are to be six of them under the control of the President. He says they are to have no power over anybody. That is what the President assured us. Ah, evidently we are going to have six "Charlie Wests" sitting in the dining room. He could not see all of us. So there will have to be six of them to lobby

for the White House. After having looked into it—we get no information about what they are going to do—they do not have any power. What on earth are they for? They can only say that the President is pretty busy and he needs six secretaries. He can have all the secretaries he wants now. No. It is for a peculiar and particular reason.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The gentleman refers to them as "Charlie Wests." Did he not intend to say "Charlie McCarthys"?

Mr. GIFFORD. Worse than that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. They are not only men to say "yes" but they are men to look us up. They want to know who our friends are, who control us, who our mothers-in-law may be, who may have influence over us. We heard about Ickes yesterday saying that he handled the purse strings. Shall there be another Ickes put at the head of this Public Works Agency and enlarge the scope of his dictatorship? Will you vote for a measure giving all that power to another Ickes? Will you vote for a measure giving this power to another Harry Hopkins, the social worker, whom the President appointed, the last man on earth that could bring any confidence to the businessmen of the country?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I think I had better be interrupted in this outburst of oratory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I had no intention of having an outburst of oratory, but has the gentleman dined yet, and has he taken advantage of the invitation that was extended?

Mr. GIFFORD. I suppose the gentleman is trying to say that what I am saying is a lot of "boloney." I recognize the insinuation. That is a mean statement to make. I think he could have put it this way: "Why is the gentleman talking like a fool?" Why did you not say that? Then I could have said, "I have to talk that way so that you can understand me." [Laughter and applause.] You will pardon me, but it was a mean statement that you made.

Speaking about bologna, if I may have a happy ending to these remarks, this thing may look good to you. "I thought you said that water was lukewarm. It was cold as ice." "Well, it 'looked' warm, did it not?" I hope you get it. This may "look" good. But after you try it out it may be anything but good. The last 6 years of experimentation on we guinea pigs is still within our memory.

I will close by a rather unhappy line to some of you, I am sure, but I often take some risks. I found this little verse the other day. It may not tie up the argument I have tried to make on centralization of power, but it does tie with my argument with these new dealers of the Tugwellian stripe and the actions of this administration heretofore:

> Ten minutes! My, oh, my, how the donkey struts
> Since its insides have been filled with New Deal guts!
> It has been rejuvenated by that "brain trust" nuts!
> But one-third of the people still live in huts.

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I heard a story the other day that rather aptly characterizes the bill that is before us. It is the story of a colored woman who was the servant in a rather generous family. She had become dissatisfied and had taken employment with another family of rather shabby gentility and slightly down at the heel. After 2 weeks with the new employer, she came back to the original family. The master said, "Mandy, what brings you back? Didn't you like it over there?"

"Well," she says, "Massa, there has been too much shufflin' of de dishes for the fewness of the vittles."

I would suggest with respect to this bill that there has been a lot of shuffling of the dishes but a fewness of the "vittles."

You can argue with facility on both sides of this bill. I recall when I was in the law school a very whimsical dean who was worried and solicitous about a certain student because he had that peculiar mental agility that enabled him to argue on both sides of a question. You can argue with eloquence and persuasiveness on both sides of the pending bill. There is a preponderance of editorial opinion in the country in favor of the reorganization plan, but my opinion is that they have not had an opportunity to analyze it. We do not see the implications of the plan. I confess frankly that after some study I do not understand its implications. I do not know what the ultimate purpose is, but let me show you what I mean by the implications in this plan. For instance, on page 12 of the report which embodies, of course, the plan, this statement is made with respect to the Office of Education, which is in the Interior Department:

> The Office of Education and its functions shall be administered by the Commissioner of Education under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator.

That will be the new administrator, understand; he has not been appointed yet. He is the man who is going to receive $12,000 a year to take over John Studebaker's agency, which is now in the Department of the Interior, and which is a clearing house for education. John Studebaker will lose his identity to a considerable extent; he will lose in some measure at least his power and authority to determine the policies of that agency, because the reorganization plan states that he shall be under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. COCHRAN. At the present time Mr. Studebaker, in the Bureau of Education, is under the Secretary of the Interior. All that will happen under this Executive order will be his transfer into this new agency, where he will have a superior the same as he has today; but the new superior will be in the same position that the present superior will be in. He will have no power to change existing laws or to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Education. If there were a change in the Presidency would there be a change of Secretaries of the Interior? Mr. Studebaker has served under many superiors who have been Secretaries of the Interior. He has always been a subordinate officer, and he remains one under this set-up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has my friend finished?

Mr. COCHRAN. I have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Bureau of Education was put in the Interior Department a long time ago because it was just the miscellaneous department of the Government. It was the catch-all. There was a time when the Department of Agriculture was the catch-all, and they finally stuck the Weather Bureau down there. There was a time when the Treasury Department was the catch-all, and they put the Bureau of Public Health in the Treasury Department. That is how the Bureau of Education was assigned to the Department of the Interior in the first place, with virtually complete autonomy and independence. It is intended now to transfer it to the Federal Security Agency.

I ask my friend from Missouri: Who is going to be the administrator? What will be his viewpoint? What will be his philosophy? How is he going to impress his views and his ideology upon the Department of Education? That is the essential thing about it and that is the reason I mention this as one of the implications. That I cannot see, and any good friend from Missouri cannot see. I do not offer this particularly as a reason for voting against reorganization as such, but I am pointing out to you that there is some reason, of course, for the editorial sentiment in the country today. They have not had an opportunity to analyze all the implications of the plan, and we have not either. You cannot do it in the short space of 8 or 10 days.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman asked me a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Personally, I have no idea who is going to be the administrator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. Secondly, the administrator will have no power to go beyond existing law. He will be required by the Congress of the United States to administer existing law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Existing law, I may say to my friend, has exactly nothing to do with it so far as the broad policy of the Federal Security Agency is concerned. When they start out upon a course of security doctrine in the country the Department of Education rises and falls with it in the same proportion as any other agency that may be impounded in that particular organization.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought I was going to have a chance to make a little speech, but I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The New Deal gentleman's statement in defense of the transfer of the Bureau of Education clearly indicates that not one thin dime will be saved the taxpayers' Treasury by reason of this transfer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose there are some here who are in about that same mixed frame of mind in which I find myself with respect to this bill. I know there are countless agencies and people in the country who want the Government simplified. So do I. We hoped for some modicum of economy even though the deficit for this fiscal year will be four thousand millions of dollars. The $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 or even $35,000,000 which is the suggested saving under this bill is a mere drop in the bucket; it is simply idle talk. With one hand we spend billions, with the other we reclaim a few pennies.

But I have some doubts as to whether that economy will be effected, because when the three new administrators are set up at $12,000 a year and the three assistants are set up at $9,000 a year, and then the coordinating staff is set up to coordinate each one of the five or six agencies in these new groupings, as I stated, I have some grave doubts as to whether or not a single dollar will be saved.

The other thing is this, and the gentleman from North Carolina alluded to it a moment ago: There is no abolition of functions. I think in my speech on the reorganization matter here some weeks or months ago I styled this the regrouping bill, not reorganization bill. I used a simile at that time. I said, "They can rearrange the flowers in the governmental vase, but they cannot remove any, even though they become drooped and somewhat faded."

Here is the living evidence of it. Here is the regrouping of agencies. There has been no dissipation of personnel under the pending bill. So I am wondering where the economies are going to be effected?

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. It seems to me that the able gentleman from Illinois has put his finger on a sore spot. Instead of abolishing any of these agencies, whether they be temporary in character or not, it simply reshuffles the cards and sets up, in addition, three new administrators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is pretty nearly the situation.

Let us look at the bill and see what it contains, if you are interested in a bit of analysis. The first thing it does is to take the Budget Bureau from the Treasury and put it in the executive department. It was put in the Treasury under the Accounting Act of 1921. Frankly, I see no objection personally to putting the Budget Bureau in the executive department. I think that is the proper place for it. It functions close to the President and he ought to have control. The Treasury has never exercised control, as a matter of fact. So, to me, that is a wholly unobjectionable transfer, and I think it is probably in the interest of efficiency.

Next comes the Central Statistical Board, which is put in the Executive Office. We have had this matter of the Central Statistical Board before the Appropriations Committee for a number of years. My own notion was that it ought to die. It will die this year in the natural course of events. But if they are going to preserve the Central Statistical Board, if they are going to insist on keeping it, then it is all right to merge it with the Budget Bureau, because it may exercise a rather salutary effect and be in position where it can exercise some authority upon governmental agencies.

As the thing is today, with thousands of forms and questionnaires going out, most of these agencies do not have to pay any attention to the Central Statistical Board and, as a matter of fact, they do not pay much attention to it. The result is that the economies have been moderate, to say the least. But if you will merge that agency with the Budget Bureau and make it a case of dollars and cents and appropriations to be made, with this board sitting in the picture they may be able to do some good. So it is quite all right and I have no objection. In my opinion it ought to be lined up with the Budget Bureau.

The next item is the National Resources Planning Board. If there must be such a board, if those functions must be handled by a separate board, then I have no objection to having them placed in the executive branch, because planning, after all, is one of the functions that must be lodged with the President. However, I do make the statement that the planning functions could have been exercised by broadening the power of the Budget Bureau, perhaps, and we might not have gotten so many wild-eyed, crackpot schemes. My objection would be to keeping the Planning Board as an agency but rather expanding somewhat the functions of the Budget Bureau, because then you tie up planning with dollars and cents, you tie it up with the Budget, you tie it up with the appropriations that will be recommended and the estimates that will be made; so they will have some regard for the fiscal solidarity of the Government. But you go out and dip down most anywhere and get a few long-haired planners together, give them plenty of authority, and they will start right out to remake this country. That is the danger of a separate integral planning board.

You will remember when Dr. Tugwell in 1933 made that rather sage observation in one of his books. He stated, "I will roll up my sleeves and remake America." He testified to that effect before a Senate committee. Too often that is the trouble with professional planners. You know, we have been going along now for 160 years pretty well, until one of these visionaries comes along and decides that the good old U. S. A. is not good enough for this generation; it has to be remade and altered to order. So, if there is to be any planning, why not let the Budget Bureau do it? Why not enlarge its functions? Let us shuffle off one more agency. It would be in the interest of simplicity, in the interest of economy, and in the interest of efficiency.

Finally, in the Executive Office there has been placed the Federal Employment Stabilization Office. It has not functioned much heretofore. The reason is they have never received any money, and it seems Government agencies cannot function without the long green. Its purpose has been to coordinate activities and look after the employment potentialities of public works. So, if there is to be a Federal Stabilization Office, very well, let it be put in the executive branch. I have no objection.

So much for the first part of this bill. Now comes item No. 2, the creation of the Federal Security Agency.

There will be an administrator at $12,000 a year, there will be an assistant administrator at $9,000 a year, and there will be a coordinating staff to vitiate many of the possibilities of economy.

Let us make up our minds about this: You set up a Federal Security Agency, and what you have done is set up a department of social or public welfare. You can call it by any other name that you like, it will smell just as sweet or not so sweet. This is going to coordinate the social and welfare activities in the country. It is going to run into lots of difficulty. Here is one danger I want to point out. I think it will become a very powerful lobbying agency in the future, because in proportion as we walk in the pathway of social welfare we reach out and take away from the States the social-welfare functions and activities that they have carried on, and rightly

should carry on. So you are going to create here a great agency which, when it gets its guns trained upon Congress, will wangle extra dollars out of it and the economies will go with the wind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not very unfortunate also that the United States Employment Agency is taken from under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor? The Department has all the statistics on the subject and knows how to enforce the laws, and so forth. The Department finds jobs for people and was created for that purpose, to protect labor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I find myself in disagreement with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts on that particular item, and I am coming to it right now, for this reason: We have overlapping and duplicated service now in the field of employment service. There is the United States Employment Service, which administers grants-in-aid to the respective States.

As I recall, about 50 percent is paid by Uncle Sam to maintain these agencies, and the other 50 percent is made up from State and local sources. In the Social Security Board we have the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, which also makes grants-in-aid to States. There is, therefore, a sharing or division of responsibility for the same line of work; and in the interest of getting away from confusion and in the interest of coordinating that activity, I am not so sure but that placing it in some agency and merging those two functions will be quite all right.

The question has been raised that the functions of veterans' placement may suffer as a result thereof. That may or may not be, and I am not prepared to say, simply because I do not know; but my notion is that while there may have been some hostility expressed in the Social Security Board with reference to the veterans' placement, the thing can be worked out; and if it is not worked out, why, the Congress of the United States by suitable legislation can say that the veterans will get a square shake in the matter of placement, certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The veterans are very much opposed to this consolidation. They have felt it was the only place where they could go to secure jobs. They have also felt that if they were under the Social Security Board they would have unemployment insurance rather than jobs, and jobs pay much better wages, of course, than the compensation they could get for unemployment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But we have this peculiar situation today: We have the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation in the Social Security Board actually making grants of larger amounts than are made by the United States Employment Service, and yet the United States Employment Service shares the responsibility of certification and of the administration of these funds. I believe it would be in the interest of economy and in the interest of expedition to merge these two activities. So, expressing purely a personal opinion, I am not particularly opposed to that item in the reorganization plan.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman so far is making a very fair and very intelligent analysis. He expresses a fear that this Federal security agency may become superlobbyists. As the gentleman well knows, there are 28 separate and distinct agencies of the Government dealing with welfare problems. I am wondering where the gentleman believes these agencies should go and whether there is not a fertile field for consolidation among these 28 agencies. Where could they go except into a security agency?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say that the gentleman in part is correct. I am simply raising the question rather than expressing a fear, for if the administrator of the Federal Security Agency is one who is possessed of a philosophy that will lead us into various and devious paths of the security principle, we know not how far, then it means he has at his command all these agencies, and every beneficiary of these agencies, and it will become a frightful pressure upon the appropriating branch of this Government. Make no mistake about that. We have seen it work before. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I presume the gentleman will explain later why the W. P. A. is made a works administration matter rather than a relief matter? Is it a relief matter or a work matter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is a relief matter.

Mr. GIFFORD. Then why does it not go under this?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a question for which we must find the answer if we can.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. What is the necessity for weaving these temporary agencies in with permanent agencies?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will permit, I wanted to discourse on that very briefly just a little later.

Now, going on with the Federal Security Agency, there comes the Bureau of Public Health. It is over in the Treasury Department. You know how it got there. A long time ago it was the Marine Hospital Service. Shipping, Customs, Coast Guard, and that sort of thing were in the Treasury Department, so the Marine Hospital Service was there also and properly there. Later it was converted into the Bureau of Public Health and remained in the Treasury Department. Now it is proposed to put it in the Federal Security Agency. Is it a good or is it a bad move? Well, you take your choice, but I will say to you that it has enjoyed a full measure of independence in the Treasury heretofore. When it gets into the new agency the plan provides that the Bureau of Public Health shall be under the direction and the supervision of the Federal Security Administrator. The Surgeon General of the Bureau of Public Health may or may not remain a free agent. Up to this time he has been a free agent. He could go on the radio and discuss anything in the broad field of public health. He has done a great and a good work in that respect. Now, when he gets into the new agency, he will be under the direction and supervision of the new Administrator. What will the new administrator want? Will he want the Congress to enlarge the functions of health to carry on new social-welfare activities that probably will entail the expenditure of hundreds of millions a year for some kind of socialized health program ranging the whole field of medicine and dentistry?

I do not know. I do not know who the administrator is going to be. I do not know what recommendations he will make to the Congress, but when he turns on all the heat that is at his command, they may wangle some kind of a bill and it may not be particularly to our liking. We may feel it ought to be deferred a number of years, but when they start out, make no mistake, the full power of that lobbying agency will be turned upon the Congress of the United States. They cannot get it until you write it into law, but there is pending in the Senate and there is pending here now a bill providing for a Federal Health Insurance Corporation. I have forgotten who introduced it on this side. The genial Senator from Kansas, ARTHUR CAPPER, introduced it in the Senate. It is to set up an agency to make grants-in-aid to States for health, and it is virtually to make civil servants out of the doctors and the physicians in the country. That will be the ultimate implication of it when we put the Bureau of Public Health under the new Federal Security Agency and let them become a part of the social-welfare activities of the United States.

You see what you are doing? You are placing all these agencies in one basket. You are making them essentially social-welfare agencies and you are concentrating that power in the Federal Government. You are taking it away from the States where it rightfully belongs. Who would profess to see or to understand what the ultimate and logical end of

that sort of thing is going to be? I do not know, and I certainly am not going to cast any aspersions upon anybody. I am not going to professionally view with alarm, rather, I just want to point out with what impartiality I can, something which I think is here that bears watching.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. I wonder if the gentleman is thinking of that as anything new. Do we not face that same thing in relation to every new enterprise as well as every old one?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the point of the gentleman's question?

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman is setting out that there is danger of this House being called upon to pass some law to accomplish some purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not a danger, but rather something that we see here every day.

Mr. KELLER. I was going to ask if that is anything new or anything that is especially affected by this reorganization bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the essential point I am trying to make about the Federal Security Agency is this. As you coordinate all these social-welfare activities, take them away from the States, drop them into one basket here, array them with ample money, give them a chance to lobby with all the power at their command and the large number of the beneficiaries of the Federal Security Agency, we may be constrained under pressure, as we have been so often, and it is no secret in the country as to the pressure put on Congress before to push things through, that we have not had a chance, perhaps, to examine in detail as we should, to impose new social-welfare legislation on the country when it is suffering already from a species of legislative indigestion. Do you not think it is time that we wait a little bit?

Now, how soon is this new agency going to move? I will tell you how soon it is going to move. It is going to move as soon as the administrator has been appointed, and he will be appointed just as soon as the action of this House is known either this afternoon or tomorrow. After the appointment of the administrator, then comes coordination and then comes the devising of new social-welfare programs, to be administered where? From the States? No; it is to be administered from the great gilded domes in Washington, D. C.

Mr. KELLER. Does the gentleman doubt that future Congresses will be as competent about our future activities as is the present one?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We would hesitate to admit that fact, but I suppose they will be.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the gentleman from Illinois conceive of any agency in the United States Government under the executive branch that is more out of place than the United States Public Health Service in the Treasury Department?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will admit to the gentleman that from the standpoint of functions it has no particular place in the Treasury Department. It got there, of course, very naturally, as a derivation of the marine hospital which was placed there, but I am speaking about this thing not so much from the standpoint of functions as I am from the standpoint of the independence of the Bureau of Public Health and the fear that they may convert it into a social-welfare agency as against the fine independence and the beautiful accomplishments that it has rendered and achieved for the American people throughout the life of that agency.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman expressed the fear——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not fear; the gentleman should not say I cherish fear—let us say there is a question in my mind about it.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman has referred to the activities of the Public Health Service, saying it might be placed in a position to grant Federal aid to the States.

I want to ask the gentleman now whether he will join me, if that bill comes before this House, and use his great talent to help bring about its defeat?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be a fair question but for the fact that I do not have any idea what is going to be in that bill. It keeps me busy trying to find out what is in this bill today, let alone finding out what is going to be in some other bill that is now in the amoebic stage, that is just emerging forward to development for the time when it will be deposited on the floor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 15 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They might bring in a bill calling for $5,000,000 to coordinate certain health activities. It might be unobjectionable. They might bring in a contributory scheme that might carry $200,000,000 or $500,000,000 or $800,000,000, and then we may have to retrace our steps even as we are going to do under one title of the Social Security Act, in order to appease the businessmen of the country and to lift the great deterrent tax obstruction. They are going to forego the glorious privilege of collecting that other one-half of 1 percent from now until 1942. So, in all fairness, you cannot express yourself upon a nebulous proposal of which I know exactly nothing.

Mr. COCHRAN. Knowing the principle involved, does not the gentleman believe that $5,000,000 at the outset is just as dangerous as $50,000,000, because once it is started there is no stopping it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman can tell me the basis on which that bill will be set up, I can give him an answer right now. He does not know and I do not know. I cannot even argue about the principle until I find out whether it is going to be concentrated here or whether we will shovel a little money to the States and let them do the job without regimenting the doctors and physicians and surgeons of the country.

Mr. COCHRAN. All Federal aid is concentrated in Washington, because the rules and regulations are set up under which it is to be allocated, and unless the States abide by the rules and regulations they will get no allocation. So, therefore, the power would be centralized in the Bureau of Public Health.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. With fear and trembling I must confess that my brother from Missouri is exactly correct. It is concentrated in Washington and it has been provoking alarm and apprehension in the hearts and minds of the American people.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The Reorganization Act prohibits the President from creating a new department, but if he had authority under that act to create a new department and he wanted to create a department of social security or a department of public works, would he go about it in any different manner than he has gone about the creation of these two agencies? And, in the gentleman's opinion, is there any real difference between the agency as set up in this plan and a department, at the head of which would be a secretary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is exactly correct. For instance, the President in his message says we will consolidate all these functions in 10 executive departments and 3 agencies. Now, the next step will be—why not call them secretaries? Why not give them executive departmental rank? Then you have not 10 Cabinet departments, but you have 13; and you will have absorbed those functions, permanent and temporary alike. Where the temporary expires, the chances are we will be asked to confer that authority upon those that are permanent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is there anything in this reorganization plan that does decentralize or tends to stop the centralization of power here in Washington?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. It is very definitely centralized. The bill speaks for itself in that respect. It means more and more control of functions down here. I do not pass upon that item so much at this particular time, because there may come times when some centralization of divergent agencies scattered all over and placed under one authority might be all right, but there is no manner of adjusting one's self to that problem academically. But here is a proposition before us, and I am seeking to do it with respect to the proposition before us.

Now, what I have said about the Bureau of Health is in a measure true of the Office of Education. It is in the Department of the Interior. It has enjoyed great freedom and independence. It is the clearing house, if you please, for educational information. Now, if it is brought under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administration, I do not know what is going to happen, but I venture the opinion that Mr. Studebaker is not going to enjoy quite the liberty of action and quite the freedom and quite the independence that he has enjoyed up to this time. That is my opinion. It looks to me like a very natural inference in this situation.

The National Youth Administration is concentrated under the Federal Security Agency. Opinions differ as to the National Youth Administration. I have received many letters from people back home who want the appropriations continued, who think it is a good thing.

I am not insensible that it is just temporary. Put it in here and it may expire, but you know there is going to be a way of making the National Youth Administration permanent just as sure as anything, and you will see these temporary agencies falling into the mold of permanent rigidity when you hitch them up with a couple of permanent horses. Hitch up a weak horse with a strong horse and keep it there long enough and one of two things is going to happen: Either one will go up or the other will drop down. With five permanent agencies put one or two temporary agencies and what is going to happen? Why, the temporary agencies are going to fit right in there like part of a three-team unit. After a time National Youth Administration, whether we like it or not, is probably going to be hardened into permanency and will become another of the social-welfare activities, not of the States but of the United States of America, administered from Washington.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. Is not the gentleman speculating?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, yes; quite.

Mr. WARREN. He is speculating as to what some future Congress may do. The gentleman, it seems to me, has gotten away from the trend of his early argument. I would say that unless the gentleman changes his argument terribly in the next 5 minutes, I am going to be disappointed if he does not vote against this resolution, for he is making a mighty good speech for it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my good friend from North Carolina that I approach this entirely with an open mind. I say to him frankly that I do not know how I am going to vote on this bill, whether I am going to vote for it or vote against it. I think many others are not quite sure, simply because they do not quite know. I make full and free confession of it, because you know open confession is good for the soul. I take advantage of this opportunity to think out loud, and probably out of my thinking will come a few solid propositions that will become the platform on which I can stand when the roll is intoned.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Is it not the gentleman's purpose to point out the implications of the plan? In order to do this he must speculate to a considerable degree. Is not that right?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. I say to my friend that I not only speculate on future Congresses, but I speculate on what we will do in this session and in the next session.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. SHORT. Under existing law many of these temporary agencies born under the cry of emergency will soon expire.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. If this reorganization plan, however, is enacted into law not one, not a few, but several, if not many, of these so-called temporary agencies born of emergency will be frozen into a permanent agency of government along with other bureaus.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me admonish the gentleman that the original reorganization bill did not contemplate that a temporary agency might be continued whose functions would otherwise expire.

Mr. SHORT. But their functions will become absorbed in other ways.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; assimilation and absorption go on continuously.

Mr. SHORT. What is the difference?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Their objects and purposes are merged, as we have seen so often, and they become permanent functions after awhile. So much for the National Youth Administration. Let us look for a moment at one more item, the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The Civilian Conservation Corps is also grouped with others in the Federal Security Agency. The C. C. C. expires on the 30th of June 1940. It has received a fine testimonial from people everywhere. I think rather highly of the Civilian Conservation Corps. They have done a splendid lot of work, but it is not a security agency. There is not a Member of this House who lives out in the country anywhere but can testify that it is a conservation agency. We see them out there doing conservation work. Some of these camps are concentrated under the Interior Department, others in the Department of Agriculture, and some are doing work for the War Department.

Mr. DONDERO. And they are fighting forest fires.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are fighting forest fires, yes; and these are not security functions; these constitute conservation. So to place the C. C. C. under Federal Security is rather illogical.

Let us now look at Federal Works for a moment. I think the saving is going to be small, for one thing, in consolidating P. W. A., W. P. A., the Public Buildings Branch of Procurement, the Buildings Management Branch of the National Parks Service, and the United States Housing Authority in the Federal Works Agency. There is a tendency, I would say, as has been pointed out before, to confuse the credit and engineering service performed by the Government with the construction services. Let us look at it for a moment with this premise in mind.

The Bureau of Public Roads will be shifted from the Department of Agriculture and put under the Federal Works Agency. The Bureau of Public Roads is not a construction agency, is not a works agency. If you have any idea that it is, ask Mr. MacDonald about it. It is a credit distribution agency operating under the Federal Aid Act of 1916—the Hayden-Cartwright Act and amendments thereto. Under these acts the Federal Government makes grants to the States in proportion to population and other factors. The States submit their plans after we tell them how much money they are to receive from the Federal Treasury. We do a little laboratory work here, we spend a million or so for supervision, but it is very essentially a supervisory agency, not a construction agency.

Now, we put it in the Federal Works Agency, and there is some objection to that. After all, the big job they are going to undertake from here on out for a while will be the farm-to-market road system. It will be built by the States. It will be administered by the highway agency. The money will come from here. The plans will be approved here. The supervision will be from here. But it is not a works agency.

Yet under this reorganization proposal it is put in the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. I would like to know whether, in the gentleman's opinion, we can save money in reorganizing otherwise than by consolidating the smaller agencies into the larger ones?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the gentleman ask whether we can save any money?

Mr. KELLER. Yes. I would like to know how it can be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We can save a paltry sum. You cannot abolish a single function under the bill. You can consolidate them; you can transfer them; but the bill recites specifically that you cannot abolish functions. Frankly, I share with the gentleman some apprehension as to how we are going to save money in substantial quantities so that we can make some impression upon the American people so far as economy is concerned. At the maximum—and my friend from North Carolina will bear me out—it is pretended we will save $35,000,000.

Mr. KELLER. How much?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Thirty-five million dollars at the very outside.

Mr. WARREN. Fifteen million dollars to twenty million dollars on an overhead of $235,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. That is a rather substantial saving.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Look at the President's own estimate of the deficit for 1939 and for 1940. What is it for 1940? When we wind up on June 30, 1941, what will be the deficit? According to the President, $3,400,000,000, or thereabouts. Now, then, we will pass some deficiency bills. So we will go right back to $4,000,000,000. What is $15,000,000? What is $20,000,000? What incentive is that to the business element of the country to start the wheels going so that 11,000,000 pairs of idle hands can get back to work? What incentive is it? Not much.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman several times in his speech has lamented the fact that we are not able to abolish functions. I also lament that fact. I am going to recall a little ancient history to the gentleman. When that question was up I looked over there and I saw my distinguished friend from Illinois stand up over there and support an amendment which would prohibit the abolition of any functions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no recollection of that, I may say. If the gentleman will bear me out, in the conference with the Senate——

Mr. WARREN. This was not in conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The thing we contended for was the fact that under the bill you could abolish no function. You could achieve no substantial economy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman will recall that the provision prohibiting the abolishment of functions was not in the House bill. It was placed in the bill by the Senate. The minority Members of the House in conference were opposed to receding upon that proposition. I called attention on the floor of the House when the conference report was up for consideration to the fact that the bill would not result in savings because it prohibited the abolishment of functions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so; and I think that was the position that was taken.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman from New York is entirely correct about what happened in conference. The Senate prohibited the abolition of functions and we were more or less sandbagged into accepting that proposition. The point I make is that as the bill left the House it provided for abolition of functions, and when the amendment was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] supported the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no recollection of that. I have not refreshed myself on all the action that took place at that time. The gentleman may or may not be correct, but I have some doubt as to whether he is correct. If there is any record to substantiate that, I would, in all humility, admit my own error.

Mr. KELLER. May I ask another question? Does not the gentleman think the N. Y. A. has been a great blessing to the youth of the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my good friend from Illinois, it would take quite a while to answer that question. It probably has redeeming features and some not so redeeming.

Mr. KELLER. I wonder if the gentleman has looked into the matter, and I ask the question for the reason that educators of the country have written me on the subject. I have not only been thoroughly convinced from their viewpoint, but from the viewpoint of the actual operation of it in my own district. There I say it has been an unqualified blessing in every way. There has been only one difficulty and that is the fact it has not been capable of very great extension along the very lines we are using at the present time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may be that one of the real objections to the N. Y. A. might be located in the person of one by the name of Aubrey Williams, who has a habit of making the most curious and peculiar speeches about people sticking together in order to keep the administration in power, regardless of the method by which that may be done.

So N. Y. A. in some measure rises and falls by the horizon of ideals that has been established by the man down there, who certainly is a political realist if there ever was one.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I do not want to answer for the gentleman from Illinois but as for myself I should like to say to the gentleman that practically every Member of this House worked his own way through school and college by firing furnaces, mowing lawns, and polishing doorknobs, but the youth of today under N. Y. A. have been robbed of their independence, their self-respect has been destroyed, ambition has been absolutely eaten out of their hearts, and they have been rendered dependent upon a patronizing and paternalistic Government in Washington.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman accepts the idea that the present crowd are no good; is that the idea?

Mr. SHORT. In addition to that, it has fostered communism; otherwise it is fine.

Mr. KELLER. I do not favor communism, but will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield further.

Let me say to the members of the committee today that when you think of the youth of the country and of the programs and panaceas that have gone out from here, I know of no more expressive way to show the disintegration of spirit on the part of some of the youth of America than to read this headline carried in a high-school paper at Denver in June when those young men and women came out into the realistic world. This headline was, "W. P. A., here we come." God save the mark that the youth of America should look out into the horizon and then draw themselves up to full stature and say, "W. P. A., here we come." [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from Denver.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I may say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that on sundry and divers other occasions

he has referred to Denver, in some cases without complete accuracy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my friend I will give my friend the authority for that statement. It comes from the Readers' Digest, which is pretty fair authority, I would say.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I should like to see the original paper and not a secondary authority such as the gentleman refers to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the gentleman say it has or has not happened? Does the gentleman say it has not happened?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It has not been demonstrated by the mere statement of the gentleman, based on a secondary hearsay source.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am saying that the statement comes from the Readers' Digest, which is a pretty authoritative source that is quoted in many deliberative bodies of the United States.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Whether or not it is quoted in deliberative bodies of the United States, I will say it is not a complete or accurate authority.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, the gentleman gets up here and says, "It is not true, because I never heard of it." I will say in all deference to my friend that that is no argument at all. If the gentleman wants to disprove it as against the authority of the Readers' Digest, why, first of all, let him write to the Denver high school and see whether this headline did not appear. That would be infinitely better.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The evident purpose of the gentleman has been on this and other occasions to make reference to something that is alleged to exist or to have happened in Denver and to make a slighting remark about Denver. Even if the incident occurred—and the gentleman has produced no sufficient evidence of its occurrence, as he, as a lawyer, well knows—it was a mere bit of schoolboy humor, not an evidence of the disintegration of spirit on the part of the youth of Denver or of America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not yield any more, unless my friend has some authority that it did not happen. I stick to my statement, and I have quoted the authority. If the gentleman wants it, I will bring the written authority to him insofar as I have it.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Bring it in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may be secondary, but I am willing to consider it as a kind of primary authority. The gentleman should not get upset because I talk about his town, because they talk about my town.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any further.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. This is not the first time the gentleman has misrepresented things alleged to exist or to have happened in Denver, and then when the gentleman's attention has been called to such errors he has declined to correct them.

Mr. BENDER rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had no idea my friend from Denver was so thin-skinned about his town and about the great State of Colorado, I may say. It could have happened anywhere, as a matter of fact.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman I am always ready to defend my city and my State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield merely to make this statement: The opposition to this proposition asked for 10 minutes in which to present their case, and we were given 5 hours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid it is not going to be enough.

Mr. BENDER. Since we started using our 5 hours the opposition has taken up most of the time of this side. If the gentleman wants additional time, I would suggest that he ask for it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With apologies to everybody, including my good friend from Colorado—and I still stand by that statement until it is disproved——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not just now. I am afraid my hour will be up. I asked for only 30 minutes and I will be violating the rules of the House shortly. I want to complete first my discussion of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue now and I will yield later.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman does me too much honor, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, let us go on for a moment to the United States Housing Authority, which has been lumped in with Federal Works Agency. It deals with public housing problems and would it not have been more logical to take all the housing agencies and lump them in one group and set up a kind of housing authority for housing administration? Here, for instance, we have Home Owners' Loan Corporation and it actually disburses money on homes and administers property as well. Then there is the Federal Housing Administration, which insures loans that are made by private financing institutions or, at least, it did at one time. Then there is the United States Housing Authority, which deals with slum clearance, the building of group houses and large units through public housing bodies, and, finally, there is the Farm Security Administration, which has been doing some work in that direction, and I would say that if this matter were pursued from the standpoint of logic it would have been infinitely better, instead of putting the United States Housing Authority under the Federal Works Agency, to set up an integral housing group and to consolidate all the housing activities of the United States in such a group. It would really develop efficiency and effect a national housing program that is well coordinated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then there is the Public Buildings Branch of the Procurement Division and the Buildings Management of the National Park Service. As the name implies, this is a management service. One looks after buildings in the District of Columbia, and the other looks after buildings in other sections of the country.

I believe a merger of these two functions is quite all right. It does not necessarily have to be in the Federal Works Agency, because it is not a works function. It could have been left in the Treasury Department.

Now comes the W. P. A. I am only going to make one observation about it, and that is this: W. P. A., as we all know, and as was stated to us at the time we created W. P. A., was essentially a relief agency, a work relief agency, but not essentially a works agency as comes within the compass of the Federal Works Agency proposed in the reorganization plan. It does not deal necessarily with durable buildings nor with public works as we conceive the term, and so I am not so sure it ought to belong in the agency as provided.

This is all I want to say about the second group; and, finally, there comes the loan agencies. The Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation are kept in the Department of Agriculture.

I think it is O. K. to put Commodity Credit Corporation there because they are dealing with farm commodities and surpluses, but, so far as the Farm Credit Administration is concerned and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation dealing with consolidated bonds in land banks and rural credits, if it is a credit agency, why not put it where it belongs? If you are going to recognize extensions of credit as a policy of government, why not put it in the Treasury? If it is done for the purpose of having some influence upon currency reform and monetary measures, it might very well have been grouped in the Federal Reserve Board. I am just making the suggestion. I recognize the fact that they deal with rural people, that they deal with credits to farmers, but the objective, of course, is credit pure and simple, and it ought to be classified and identified from the functional standpoint as a

credit agency, and maybe it ought to have been in the Treasury Department. In any event, to leave them in the Department of Agriculture will mean that the head of that Department might be importuned on credit matters relating to agriculture to the point where it impairs his freedom to deal with the basic problems of agricultural production and distribution as he should.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for the suggestion he makes, and I hope the President one of these days will follow out his suggestions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am pleased the RECORD will show that the gentleman and I are in agreement on that. As a matter of fact, the gentleman and I agree on lots of things. I like the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman does not like me a bit better than I like him, and he knows it. [Laughter.] I gave the gentleman a fine fish dinner yesterday, did I not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. And I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois upon his wonderful speech today. He has found credit in the President's order. He has also doubted the wisdom of some of his suggestions; but what worries mè, after hearing the gentleman's excellent speech, is whether he is going to vote "yes" or "no" or "present" on this resolution. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Missouri is not going to embarrass me with that kind of question. I want to say I feasted royally on the trout and the whitefish he served downstairs, and today I want to repay him by trying to find a few fish in this bill.

Now, getting back to the loan agencies, there is included, of course, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Electric Home and Farm Authority, the RFC Mortgage Co., and others.

There is listed here the Electric Home and Farm Authority, dealing with the discount of paper, discount of paper that is issued for the purchase of washing machines, curling irons, electric ironers, and all that sort of thing.

A credit agency. Why was it not grouped with the Rural Electrification Administration, which advances money for wiring houses, installing plumbing on the farms, and all that sort of thing? That would have been the logical place for it.

As for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which is lumped in the Federal lending agencies, why was it not set up with the other housing agencies? The Federal Housing Administration, the United States Housing Authority, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, properly speaking, should all have gone into the same group.

There is included also the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Why was it not placed with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from a functional standpoint? That probably would have been better.

Finally, there is the Export-Import Bank. Here it is put in the Federal lending agency. Properly speaking, it ought to have gone with the Department of Commerce.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I have occupied the floor longer than I should and have trespassed upon your patience and good humor, so I want to bring this rather informal discussion to a close. I had only one purpose in making this statement today, and that is in my humble way to show what is going to happen, as I see it: how they are going to be allocated in these different agencies; what their functions are; and my own personal judgment as to where they might better have been included, in the interest of simplification, identity of interest and function, and finally, perhaps, just a little bit of economy. You can take it or leave it. I can see considerations for approving this bill. The editorial opinion of the country, for instance, says it is all right. They have not analyzed it. We do not know what the implications are. I do not believe I have a right to asperse the character or reputation or idealism of the President of the United States and to say that this is what he is going to do, and that is what he is going to do, or that he is going to subvert some agency to something other than a good public end, but you can see the political possibilities in some of these.

So I say to you I see good and I see bad. I resolve it into your keeping.

Before I close, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sure the gentleman does not want to leave the impression that American college boys and girls would look forward to W. P. A. if private enterprise offered them an opportunity to work at decent wages?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, the gentleman is absolutely correct. There is no vigorous, pulsing, young American heart that would accept relief or the bitter crumbs of charity or the hand-outs of any government, no matter how bountiful it might be, if he could look the world in the face and with rugged hands and feeling heart say to the world, "I have got a job." That is the answer.

There may be simplicity in this measure, but there are times when it is doubtful whether substance should be sacrificed for streamlining. This bill may produce some efficiency. In fact, the subordination of heads of departments like that of Education and Public Health and Public Roads to the administrators of the new departments may provide so much efficiency as to be destructive of the will of Congress. And as for economy, the estimated saving of $20,000,000 a year might be and probably will be offset by the increased appropriations which will be requested when these new agencies get under way and mark out their fields of activity. Abraham Lincoln used to say that every proposition was a mixture of good and bad and that the true rule was to accept when the good outweighed the bad and to reject it when the bad outweighed the good. I am of the opinion that in this bill the Nation must give too much for what it gets. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman indicate how many other speakers he has, simply for information?

Mr. TABER. I have three at the present time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, since this bill was passed on April 3, asking that we have reorganization of government, we have the first proposal submitted to the Congress, a big dose in a short time. I am confident that the Government needs reorganization. No one can believe that we do not, if he knows anything about our Government. In order to prove that assertion, I want to read to you from a speech that was entered in the RECORD by Senator VAN NUYS. It is a speech given by Senator BYRD last October. Just let me read to you a part of this speech, and if it does not prove to all Members of Congress that we need reorganization, then I certainly do not know what the Members of Congress might be thinking about:

> The fact is that we are paying for a gigantic, gangling Government of some 150 major agencies and an uncounted number of subdivisions. We are paying for a Government that has not had a thorough overhauling since it was established. It has been growing continually, but since the turn of the century the record shows marked increases in costs and complexity. Piled upon a previous accumulation of disjointed agencies we now have half again as many agencies as we had before the depressions, when, to meet emergencies, we created by statute and Executive orders, agency after agency virtually without regard for coordination in the Federal Government pattern.
>
> Some of these agencies fill very definite needs. Others overlap. Some have outlived their usefulness or have been superseded. There are glaring cases of duplicated effort. Where the Government was complex before, it frequently is found to be confusing now. To point out 50 Federal agency legal divisions in Washington alone is enough to describe the Federal jungle.
>
> There have been at least 29 agencies concerned with lending Government funds, according to reports taken from Government records.
>
> There have been at least three agencies concerned with insuring deposits and loans.

There have been at least 34 agencies concerned with the acquisition of land.

There have been at least 16 agencies concerned with wildlife preservation.

There have been at least 10 agencies concerned with Government construction.

There have been at least nine agencies concerned with credit and finance.

There have been at least a dozen agencies concerned with home and community planning.

There have been at least 10 agencies concerned with materials of construction.

There are more than twoscore personnel officers for the Government listed in Washington offices alone.

There are more than 100 information and publications offices in Federal agencies at Washington.

There are more than 100 Federal agency libraries in Washington, besides the Library of Congress.

The Federal Government operates an average of one motor vehicle for every 1,200 people in the United States, and they travel enough miles every year to traverse nearly every highway in the world.

Without counting those who are on relief, or those receiving pensions, or those in the Army, the Navy, and the Marines, or those in the legislative and judicial branch of the Government, there are more people on the Federal civil executive pay roll than there are people—men, women, and children—living in the State of Maine, or New Hampshire, or Vermont, or Rhode Island, or North Dakota, or South Dakota, or Delaware, or Montana, or Idaho, or Wyoming, or New Mexico, or Arizona, or Utah, or Nevada.

The great majority of these people do not work in Washington, and there are more than a hundred thousand of them in the Nation's Capital. This number alone is twice as many as 5 years ago.

The above statement of the good Democratic Senator from Virginia shows definitely we need reorganization. How will we accomplish it? How will it be done? Who will do it? That is the great and all-important question. At least it is to me. Remember the President had for 2 years the power to reorganize and he did nothing. No guaranty of saving any money for Government operation has been shown; but, on the contrary, it looks like the continuation of New Deal agencies set up by the New Deal and operated by the New Deal in an extravagant manner.

Senator BYRD's statement goes on to state how many people have been employed, and the fact that in the last 5 years we have doubled the number of employees on the Government pay roll. So it certainly does prove to us that we need reorganization of the Government.

What are some of these new bureaus? I will enumerate a few of them:

1. Agricultural Adjustment Administration.
2. Alley Dwelling Authority.
3. Central Statistical Board.
4. Civilian Conservation Corps.
5. Commodity Credit Corporation.
6. Corporation of Foreign Security Holders (discontinued).
7. Disaster Loan Corporation.
8. Electric Home and Farm Authority.
9. Emergency Conservation Work (replaced by C. C. C.).
10. Executive Council (replaced by National Emergency Council).
11. Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C.
12. Farm Credit Administration.
13. Farm Security Administration.
14. Federal Alcohol Control Administration (replaced by Federal Alcohol Administration).
15. Federal Alcohol Administration.
16. Federal Civil Works Administration (replaced by Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works).
17. Federal Communications Commission.
18. Federal Coordinator of Transportation (discontinued).
19. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
20. Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.
21. Federal Emergency Relief Administration.
22. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
23. Federal Housing Administration.
24. Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
25. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
26. Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation.
27. Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.
28. Federal Surplus Relief Corporation (replaced by Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation).
29. Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
30. National Archives.
31. National Bituminous Coal Commission.
32. National Emergency Council.
33. National Labor Relations Board.
34. National Mediation Board.
35. National Railroad Adjustment Board.
36. National Recovery Administration (discontinued).
37. National Resources Committee.
38. National Youth Administration.
39. Prison Industries Reorganization Administration.
40. Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation (discontinued).
41. Public Works Emergency Leasing Corporation (discontinued).
42. Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
43. Railroad Retirement Board.
44. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
45. Resettlement Administration (replaced by Farm Security Administration).
46. RFC Mortgage Co.
47. Rural Electrification Administration.
48. Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C. (discontinued).
49. Securities and Exchange Commission.
50. Social Security Board.
51. Soil Conservation Service.
52. Soil Erosion Service (replaced by the Soil Conservation Service).
53. Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.
54. Tennessee Valley Authority.
55. United States Maritime Commission.
56. Works Progress Administration.

This list does not include certain Federal boards, commissions, committees, etc., established for certain special purposes, temporary in nature, viz: National industrial labor boards, Petroleum Administrative Board, Committee on Economic Security, Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission, Special Mexican Claims Commission, etc.

Nor does it include certain bureaus or divisions created by the consolidation of functions within a Federal agency, or certain federally sponsored agencies or associations such as Savings and Loan Division, Federal Home Loan Bank Board; Procurement Division, Department of the Treasury; National Reemployment Service; Federal Credit Union System; Federal land banks; production credit corporations; etc.

Sources: United States Government Manual, United States Statutes at Large, Executive orders.

The great question, however, is, How shall we reorganize the Government? I ask the gentleman from North Carolina or the gentleman from Missouri—two Members of the House in whom I have as great confidence as anyone else in Congress—since they have tried to work out this reorganization plan, and since it has been proposed and the bill has been passed, what part have they played in this reorganization? Has it been their work, their handiwork, that is suggested in this reorganization reported by the President of the United States? I would like an answer.

Mr. WARREN. Does the gentleman ask that question of me?

Mr. RICH. I would like an answer to my question from you, please.

Mr. WARREN. I assure the gentleman that it is not my handiwork. I like candor. I can tell the gentleman that the gentleman from Missouri and I were told what this order would be, and had an opportunity to know of its general content several days before it was submitted to the Congress. Outside of that, I know nothing whatever about it.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. If the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Missouri were to carry out the proposals of this reorganization plan, I would have a whole lot more of confidence in it than I do with its coming from the Chief Executive of the United States.

Again I state that I hold no ill will whatsoever toward the President of the United States, but I call attention to these statements made by the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. He made this statement at Sioux City on September 29, 1932:

> We are attempting too many functions, and we need a simplification of what the Federal Government is giving to the people.
>
> I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetimes in all our history—one which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs or reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the present President of the United States, made that statement in Sioux City, Iowa, in 1932, when he was seeking election as President. Let us look at the record of the President of the United States since his election to office. He has authorized by Executive order, or has requested the Congress to set up more bureaus, more functions of government, than any 10 Presidents in the history of our Nation.

I quote again from a statement of the President. This statement was made in Brooklyn on November 4, 1932:

The people of America demand a reduction of Federal expenditure. It can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of existing departments, but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus, and functions, and it can be done by consolidating many activities of the Government.

Many times in the preelection campaign he promised to cut down Government agencies, Government functions, and Government expenditures. Has he done it? Has he made any effort to do it?

No. Instead he has done the very opposite.

The whole meat in the coconut of our consideration of this reorganization proposal is summed up in the following observation: If a man promises to do one thing and then does something else, how many times shall we place our confidence in him? How many times are we to give him sole power to do something when he promises one thing but does the direct opposite?

If the resolution now under consideration passes, the reorganization he has proposed will become effective, and we shall have passed over to him and confirmed that right and that privilege.

The Democratic platform of 1932 promised:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

The President himself said:

I am for that platform 100 percent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. Since the gentleman is quoting platforms, I call his attention to the Republican platform of 1932, which favored a reorganization of the Government and which said that the President of the United States is the only one who could do it.

Mr. RICH. The Republican platform; yes. But they did not expect such a President as we have now. [Laughter.] They expected an honest, honorable, conscientious, hard-working man, a man who has had experience, a man who knows something about business, a man who when he says he will do a thing, does it. The people of the United States got fooled, and so did the Republican Party.

Let us go a little further in the matter of the proposed reorganization. We have 10 major departments of government. My idea of reorganizing the functions of government was a reorganization of functions of long standing, not of temporary agencies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have listened intently to the gentleman two or three times today on this matter, but I still would like to know what the gentleman's position is. Is he against the bill or is he for it?

Mr. RICH. I think this way: We need reorganization, but I have seen things happen here that have disturbed me profoundly. When I place confidence in men to do certain things and they fail me not once but two, three, or four times, I do not propose to put my faith in them longer. Certain things belong to the Congress and must be reclaimed by the Congress. We are supposed to cut down Government expenses. We are supposed to give an honest and efficient reorganization of the Government. This is your duty, this is my duty; and I propose to do my best honestly and conscientiously to do my duty.

If we place this power in the hands of the President, we do not know whether there will be any accomplishments or not, and I am not going to trust him any further. That is my answer.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield. I do not have the time.

Mr. Chairman, we are not by this bill reorganizing the old functions of the Government. We are taking these New Deal agencies that were set up and making them greater. We are making them permanent. Putting them under the direct supervision of the President.

We are starting a Federal works agency and making that a permanent set-up of the Government. We are creating a Federal security agency as one of the major bureaus. We are creating a Federal lending agency, as if it were going to be necessary for the Federal Government all the rest of our lives to continue making the loans that are being made today.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from North Carolina, I ask the gentleman from Missouri, I ask the majority leader, I ask all the gentlemen on that side of the aisle this question: If we continue to go into debt to the extent of three, four, or five billion dollars a year, as we have in the last 5 years, where are we headed? What is going to happen to us? I ask anyone on that side of the aisle that question. Where are we going to get the money? We have been promised time and time again that the American resources would be conserved. We find that from July 1 last year until April 28 this year, the Government has gone in the red to the extent of $2,882,952,434. The Government will be in the red to the extent of at least three and one-half billion dollars before July 1 this year, and it will be in the red another three and one-half billion dollars when we get through with the year 1940.

Mr. Majority Leader, you promised to some day try to have the Budget balanced. When is that time going to come? Let me read a quotation from a statement the majority leader made on January 18, 1938. Nothing could have been finer, nothing could have been more appropriate, but we want to know when that time is coming. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said at that time that, "Some of these days whether we want it or not, we have got to do what the sane individual would do, what the sane, sound management of a corporation would do if it is to continue to operate; that is at some time this Government must balance its outgo with its income."

Mr. Majority Leader, when will that time be? Can you tell us? Have you got any idea? Has any Member on this side of the aisle any idea or can he tell us when that sometime will come?

Let us hope it will come soon. This reorganization bill in saving will be only a drop in the bucket. I question if there will be any saving at all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the expressed opposition to the reorganization measure that was before the Congress last year was profound and overwhelming. Its attempted passage struck fear into the hearts of all true Americans. They saw in its passage a dangerous thrust against our Constitution and liberties. That opinion was expressed to Congress in sufficient volume and intensity to bring about the defeat of the measure. The event heartened many of us to believe that possibly, after all, our statesmanship showed promise of preserving something of our Constitution and American system.

Came the second reorganization bill April 3, 1939. It passed both Houses easily. No opposition by the public was apparent. Yet, in my opinion, this reorganization measure is at least twice as bad as the one defeated last year. Why did the public not oppose it? Because they did not understand it. It was framed in such a manner and couched in such terms as to conceal its real intent and meaning. Indeed, it was so cleverly drawn and presented that it gave the appearance of not being a reorganization measure at all. It did not contain even a suggestion of any plan. Its context merely stated the President would submit a plan to Congress. It did contain a sop for many Congressmen, the exemption of some 21 Government agencies from any reorgani-

zation plan the President might set up. Apparently this had a sweetening effect upon many of the Members. I am certain if no agencies had been exempted the bill would not have passed. Yet just a little reflection should convince anyone that the exemption of these 21 agencies from the control of the Executive was an utterly futile gesture. Every agency of this entire Government is now a prey to complete Executive control and domination. I shall show the reason for this later.

It is difficult to describe the iniquity of this bill. First of all, it represents something entirely new in legislation in the United States. Perhaps no precedent for it can be found in the proceedings of any of our legislative bodies. The measure provided not for a reorganization plan but for the submission by the President of one. Then it provided that any plan he might submit would become a law, unless both Houses of Congress rejected it. Legislation by negative action. Of course, the promoters of the bill very well knew if they could get this through there would be little or no opportunity to defeat any reorganization plan that might be submitted. Once it was passed it became a very easy matter to so frame a plan and to so manage it here in Congress as to make it practically invulnerable to successful attack. This we now see before us.

The defeated reorganization bill of last year at least had the merit of being forthright. It actually embodied a reorganization plan which Congress and the Nation could see and understand. The bill we passed contains all but an infinitesimally small part of last year's measures, but in true Machiavellian style, which characterizes so much of recent legislation passed by this Congress, its true intent is completely concealed. This reorganization bill might better be called a handcuff bill. The President wanted his reorganization bill, and in order to get it he had to first put handcuffs on Congress. This is the first time Congress ever passed a bill handcuffing itself, which gives the Chief Executive complete power to pass his own legislation. Oh, what wisdom, statesmanship, and patriotism were here exhibited by this, the greatest parliamentary body that ever was or perhaps will be. Imagine the thrill our children and future generations will get when they read about this.

Are these powers really sought to effect economies and efficiency in our governmental departments? After adding from 50 to 75 new and all-powerful bureaus and 300,000 new political jobs, after doubling the regular operating costs of the Government, after increasing the Federal debt by $25,000,000,000 in peacetime within a period of 6 years, in the midst of the most profligate and wasteful spending any nation in the world was ever engaged, with the President lashing Congress into more and more spending, and with such colossal inefficiency in government operation as never before recorded in history, we are now to believe the purpose of this reorganization bill is to bring about efficiency and economy in government.

"The overhead administrative costs of all the agencies affected in reorganization plan No. I is about $250,000,000," says the President in his "first plan on Government reorganization." He estimates his plan No. I will make an annual saving of between fifteen million and twenty million dollars, or about 7 percent—but this affects only the administrative costs of these agencies and "does not include the loans they make, the benefits they make, the wages of the unemployed who have been given jobs; it does not include the loans and grants to States, or, in short, the functional expense." Bravo! Well, we can be glad it is not 25 percent reduction in government costs he is promising. You remember he did that once and we got an increase of 150 to 200 percent. At the same rate the 7 percent decrease he is promising will perhaps result in no more than 21 percent increase. [Applause.]

Then note the new high-salaried political jobs he creates:

(1) National Resources Planning Board, five members, $50 a day.

(2) Federal Security Administrator, $12,000 a year.

(3) Assistant Federal Security Administrator, $9,000 a year.

(4) Federal Works Administrator, $12,000 a year.

(5) Assistant Federal Works Administrator, $9,000 a year.

(6) Commissioner of Public Building Assistant, $9,000 a year.

(7) Commissioner Public Works, $10,000 a year.

(8) Works Progress Administration Commissioner, $10,000 a year.

(9) Federal Loan Administrator, $12,000 a year.

(10) Federal Loan Administrator Assistant, $9,000 a year.

The President's plan abolishes none of the mushroom bureaus which have developed in the last few years. He says not a word about the 300,000 new political jobs which have been created. These are all to be left intact, "to take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned," as Thomas Jefferson would say.

Now, what does it mean that some 21 agencies—Civil Service Commission, Coast Guard, and so forth—are exempted from the provisions of the act? Really the irony of these exemptions is the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. How can this inclusion in the exemptions possibly affect the President's power over this Board when all of them are appointees of the Executive and he already dominates that body completely?

What possibly can these exemptions mean in the face of all the powers now vested in the Chief Executive. He now has complete control over 47 Government corporations with assets in excess of $8,000,000,000, and which have authority to issue $8,000,000,000 more, with practically no check by the Comptroller General. He exercises the principal control over nearly 2,000 corporations partially owned by the Government, with assets of $4,000,000,000. Through the F. D. I. C., Government ownership of bank stocks, and his complete control of the Federal Reserve System he has virtual control of the credit of the banks, involving $60,000,000,000. Through loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies to insurance companies, building and loan associations, mortgage loan companies, railroads, private industry, and so forth, he has vast control over industry in general.

I pointed out to you here a few days ago that with the President's power over the banking system it is possible for him to issue more than thirty billions of fiat money. He has complete control of the fifteen and one-half billion dollars of gold buried in the ground in Kentucky, which is 60 percent of the world's monetary gold stock. He has unlimited power to use all the commodities of the United States to buy and buy and buy more gold. He has unlimited power over the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, which he can and does use to bolster and depress foreign currencies. He has unlimited power to use our commodities to buy more and more silver, for which we have no more use than a Chinaman's queue. He now virtually has unlimited power to fix the purchasing power of the dollar. In the face of all this unheard-of power delegated to one man, what boots it to have exempted a few of these agencies from his reorganization plan? Why, they will be swallowed up and digested by this power so completely that there will be nothing left of them but their names.

What madness is it that impels this Congress to continue to vote away to the Chief Executive our constitutional right and duty as a legislative body? From whence comes the evil spirit that causes us to thus barter away the liberties of our people for no more than a little temporary political gain? Well, one thing is certain—we have about reached the limit. There is no longer much left to give over to the President. All industry, all agriculture, all labor is now virtually in subjection to one-man power. Encroachment by the Executive upon all the other departments is now in the stage of consolidating all of them in one. The Father of our Country solemnly warned us in his Farewell Address of the danger of such encroachment when he said it will "create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism." In connection therewith, he further said:

> A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of this position.

We might also, with appropriateness, refer to another part of Washington's Farewell Address. Here we see in this Chamber today the full fruition of the spirit of party against which he also so solemnly warned us. He told us of its great dangers, how it may appear in popular government "in its greatest rankness," and how it could become our "worst enemy."

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.

Is it not possible for this body here today to rise above this evil spirit? Can we not, for a few moments, divest ourselves of it long enough to realize what our solemn duty on this occasion may be? May it not possibly help us in this hour of trial if we think of the future—perhaps the heritage of our children? What are we leaving them? That is the big question now.

However, whatever action this body may take on this measure, and, for that matter, in perpetuating the present despotic regime, I, for one, am not resigned. I have faith that millions and millions of my fellow countrymen join with me in this feeling, and we shall yet break these shackles that are cruelly strangling out our social and economic existence. I am sure in due time we shall regain the heritage of our fathers, as so nobly expressed by Thomas Jefferson:

A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free in their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned.

[Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this is just another phase of the juggling that has been going on ever since Congress convened. We are not establishing a permanent reform or relief that will be beneficial to the people generally; we are just juggling. This is another of the things we are doing to make permanent activities that were originally labeled as emergencies.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. No; I will not yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman has made a statement I would like to correct.

Mr. BENDER. I will yield when I get through.

Mr. COCHRAN. The law specifically provides that an agency cannot continue beyond the date Congress sets for its expiration.

Mr. BENDER. When you freeze emergency activities under a permanent heading and hide them under a general agency you are helping to make them permanent. When you make it possible for their employees to go under civil service you are perpetuating activities that should stand out like sore thumbs to remind the people that nothing has been accomplished in the way of correcting the evils these agencies were set up to correct. Despite the conditions of this depression—this recession or whatever else you label it—that has been with us for 7 long years, no effort has been made to abolish any of these emergency agencies. In a very clever way they are so concealed the people cannot see what is going on as readily as they could if the activities showed up, I repeat, like sore thumbs.

This business of juggling agencies is kidding the American people into thinking they are getting something when in reality they are getting nothing. They are asking for bread and we give them a stone. They are asking for employment, they are asking for relief from relief, and they are asking for a permanent solution of the problems of this depression and we give them a sleight-of-hand performance. You say to businessmen, "We are going to give you a breathing spell," and then you beat hell out of them while you kid them into believing that they are getting a breathing spell. [Applause.]

One gentleman on the other side, in questioning one of my colleagues on this side said, "Where will these agencies go?" I say the sooner they go out the window, the better off we will all be. They have done nothing else but reduce the earning power and the incomes of not the lower third, mind you, but the lower half of the people. Since this administration came into power, instead of having the lower third, you have 20 percent of the people actually dependent upon the Government for support and sustenance, and you have another 32 percent, according to the Gallup poll, that are within 3 months of the poorhouse.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. No; I will not yield.

If you are going to do anything in the way of real reorganization, let us take this whole business and take plenty of time to discuss it and go into it carefully. This Congress was told by the electorate last November to do something about this situation, and yet we sit idly by and permit these artful pieces of juggling to be presented and passed on to the people, who are made to feel they are getting something when in reality they are getting nothing at all. Our business interests and our people are calling on us and have called repeatedly for help. How about private industry? Private industry wants the "go" sign. Private industry wants to be relieved of the continual prying into its affairs and making it impossible for it to make a reasonable profit and provide employment. Business wants to provide jobs and pay a regular American living wage. If those of us here who voted against this reorganization plan originally fail to vote against this plan now, we are being very inconsistent. In order to be consistent with our previous vote we can do nothing else, being the minority though we are, than to take a position against this measure. We should not fool our people back home into believing they are getting something when in reality they are just getting an empty bag, with a hole in the bag at that. I am voting for the Taber amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD].

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, it is always popular for reformers to try to make people believe they are doing something for them. I was in the Legislature of New York for some years and we had this same proposition coming up from the Democrats. They told the people how much they could do by reforming government and finally brought about reform in government. They preached it so long the people really believed them. But when they cut down departments and combined them they had to have more high-priced men at the head, just as we are going to have in the present reform of government. We had to have more agencies and more departments, and we had to have better men, and when we got through it cost us one-third more for our government than it had cost in the beginning, and did not add any to efficiency in government. Now, we have this same gentleman who is asking for reform in government in our Nation. He was at the head of the government of the State of New York at one time. That is where he got his primary education. That is the reason he is such a good man now. You know we have not got over his being Governor yet. Just at this session of the legislature we have had to cut down the appropriations for schools, we have had to cut down the appropriations for highways, and we have had to cut down the appropriations for many activities to try to cure some of the evils that the present President of the United States foisted upon the State of New York. He did this all in good faith, supposedly. I think he did the very best he could, but he left our budget way out of balance and we have never been able to get it back in balance again. So we have had to go into these savings that we could ill afford to do. It has been hard on the people of our State, and although the taxes have been increased tremendously we have never been able to catch up with the tax burden in all of these years.

Now, we have the same thing here. We have reform in government. We are going to juggle about the departments. We are going to appoint expensive men at the head of them to administer them, but what is that going to do for us? When we get all through I venture to say that the Govern-

ment is going to cost us more than it has ever cost us before. Yet this man, in his wild sayings when he was going about the State campaigning for election, told us he was going to reduce these expenses by 25 percent. I suppose he thought he was going to do it. We do not think up there he has much business ability. We do not charge that he did this deliberately. He did not make the statement deliberately. He just did not know so much about government, and when we get all through here we are going to have the same thing here we have in New York State and our children's children will have to pinch and connive and save to catch up in the years to come, if we ever do catch up with this terrible bonded indebtedness that has been put upon this Government and on the people and the taxpayers of this Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, when the reorganization measure was up last year and the country was aroused, it was defeated. I spoke and voted against that bill and this year, when the reorganization bill was brought up again, I spoke and voted against it. My reasons for opposing those measures were the reasons that were generally accepted throughout the country.

Under the Constitution the Congress is invested with the power to reorganize the various branches of the Government and the American people expressed themselves to the effect that they did not desire Congress to transfer this legislative authority to the President.

Recently, we passed an act by which we surrendered our legislative authority and gave it to the President, and so far as this legislation is concerned, we abdicated instead of legislating. [Applause.]

Congress has the power and should reorganize the Government. What has been the history of the President's record to justify us in believing that he can do it? We know that in the State of New York, where he was Governor for several years, governmental agencies and officials grew in number year by year and the debt of that great State grew year by year.

When Mr. Roosevelt was seeking this great office he said that he was going to cut out useless bureaus and commissions. What has been the result? He has added more bureaus and commissions than any President or any dozen Presidents.

He said we had too many officeholders. When Hoover went out we had about 530,000 officeholders. If you count those engaged by the Department of Agriculture throughout the country, we have now 1,100,000 officeholders. He has given us more bureaus than any President. He has increased the number of officeholders more than any President. What is there in the record of President Roosevelt to convince you or me that he is going to reduce commissions or reduce the number of officeholders or reduce the expense of government?

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In just a moment.

The fact about it is there is nothing to this reorganization plan to convince anybody that there is going to be any reduction in the number of officeholders. It freezes into the general administrative agencies of this Government emergency commissions and bureaus, a thing many of us hoped to get rid of, and this is emphasized here in the President's plan. It will not be 6 months or 12 months until a lot of these emergency agencies will become a part of the warp and woof of the Government itself, and it will be impossible to take them out or get rid of them.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. The gentleman has perhaps answered the question I was going to ask him, and that is, Does not this plan contemplate perpetuation in office of the present officeholders?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In my view of it, it does. A bill will soon be brought up to put all these emergency officeholders under civil service, giving a permanent status.

Mr. SHORT. In other words, it is impossible to unscramble eggs.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes. It will be a difficult matter, without this reorganization, to get rid of many of these so-called emergency bureaus and commissions; but it will make it much more difficult if we pass this reorganization measure and make them a part of and intertwine them with the regular agencies of the Government.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. I am just wondering if a new Congress, different from the one at present in power, and a new President of a different party were elected in 1940, could not undo this whole thing?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Well, that is the trouble with the New Deal set-up. You have been doing this and doing that; we have emergency this and emergency that; saying we are going to get rid of it; yet every move you make tends toward making it permanent.

Mr. KELLER. Could you not do just what I have suggested?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Oh, there will be a new Congress and there will be a Republican House. It will be Republican; and there will be a new President just because of New Deal proposals of this kind. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. In that case could you not undo this whole thing?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why should we commit a wrong today and wait 2 years to correct the wrong?

Mr. KELLER. You ought not fret about it if you cannot do it so quickly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But here is the trouble with this situation. You and I know that the President himself did not work out this plan of reorganization. He got it just as we have been having bills handed to us for the last 6 years—from the bureaucrats down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. They have been preparing these bills and sending them up to the Congress. The President did not have the time. He had to take the plans of the commissioners, administrators, and other bureaucrats who helped him and had most to do with handing to you and to me this reorganization proposition. It is the bureaucrats' plan.

Now, I object to it for another reason; not only because it is our duty but we have the right and power to reorganize the Government if it needs it. I, for one, am unwilling to admit that I am a legislative eunuch and that I must depend solely upon the bureaucrats at the other end of the Avenue to hand to me what I ought to vote for and what I ought to do as a Member of the House. [Applause.]

Here is where it irks me so much: These bureaus that have grown fat and powerful, who desire above all things that they continue and grow, have asked the President to bring this bill in and to weave each one of these emergency agencies into the regular department of the Government. They, no doubt, helped write into the reorganization bill that proposition that you cannot do away with any function of this Government, however useless it may be. Although we have three or four hundred thousand useless officeholders, under this bill you cannot do away with a single one of them. You have to keep them all.

If you have to keep them all, you have to keep all the officeholders. There is nothing to the claim you are going to save the taxpayers any money. But what do they send up here to you and to me? The President says it is necessary to preserve the democracy of this country; yet 531 of us, elected as Representatives and Senators by 130,000,000 people, do not have the right to dot an "i" or cross a "t." It cannot be amended or changed. Are you willing to admit that the group at the other end of the Avenue can get up something that is so perfect that neither the House nor the Senate of the United States dare to dot an "i" or cross a "t" in the document they sent here to us and to the Senate of the United States? [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Does the Congress dot an "i" or cross a "t" in the rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Well, I just have to laugh at that question. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Well, does it? Does it?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It was the Congress that created the Interstate Commerce Commission as an agency of Congress to do certain things. It was not handed to Congress by the bureaucrats.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And who created the bill as an agency to do this?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Well, you helped to do it—hand over your power to the President. I did not, I thank God. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Of course. That is the answer.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. SUMNERS of Texas], one of the ablest statesmen in this House and in this country, offered an amendment which, in effect, would say to the President and these bureaus and commissions, "You get up what you think is a good reorganization bill and send it up to Congress, but it can never become law until the representatives in the House and Senate elected by the American people vote to make it a law," that amendment was defeated by the administration. [Applause.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman is referring to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] which was under consideration. That amendment was declared by Mr. Hoover's Attorney General to be unconstitutional and was held as the reason for the invalidation of the Hoover act. That is the reason it was not accepted. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is not the reason it was rejected. The majority of my New Deal friends over here wanted to do the very thing they did do—strip themselves of their legislative, constitutional power and hand it over to the President. That was your reason; not some decision of a Democratic Attorney General under Herbert Hoover some years ago. [Applause.]

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Is it not a fact that the President would not submit his plan to Congress until Congress reversed the legislative procedure?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Absolutely.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WARREN. Before the gentleman proceeds—and this will not be taken out of his time—I think we have been very liberal, indeed. We have given the opposition far more than they themselves stated they wanted. We would like to know when the minority will be through. Can the gentleman from New York tell us?

Mr. TABER. So far as we know at the moment, this is our last speaker.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Just a moment. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Kentucky has yielded generously to Members on the Democratic side.

Mr. WARREN. I am not objecting; I am merely asking the question how much longer the gentleman cares to go on; that is all.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As I recall, the law which the gentleman advocated changed the rules of the House. That law guarantees the House 10 hours of debate.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no, indeed; it does not.

Mr. MICHENER. Not to exceed 10 hours.

Mr. WARREN. That is a different thing, not to exceed 10 hours; but we had a unanimous-consent agreement, including consent of the three members of the minority, that this bill would be discussed for 5 hours. The House has not put that agreement into effect. The minority desired 2½ hours. They have certainly had more than that amount of time. We are not complaining. I am merely asking the gentleman is this to be the last speech.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] is not complaining, but he is here saying that this thing should be rushed through. It seems to me that if this bill is as important as the gentleman says, if it is of the importance the President says it is, that democracy hangs upon it, it little behooves the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina to complain because some Members of the House perchance might want to talk 15 or 20 minutes about this thing upon which democracy itself hangs.

Mr. WARREN. I am not complaining. I am sure that when the gentleman from Kentucky shall have concluded his last 5 minutes he will have said all that is necessary on the question.

Mr. MICHENER. Maybe the gentleman from North Carolina thinks that when the gentleman from Kentucky has concluded his 5 minutes he will have said enough. Possibly he has already said enough to satisfy the distinguished proponent of the bill, but there are others here who think the matter important and who feel that we should be permitted at least to debate the bill.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. MICHENER. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from North Carolina said that this would not be taken out of anybody's time.

The CHAIRMAN. It is taken out of the time of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WARREN. Not at all. I yield sufficient time to the gentleman from Kentucky that he may proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No; it was not a matter of what the plan of somebody else might be. I know one thing, the Constitution gives you and me the right—and it is our duty—to legislate on the matter of reorganization. The Constitution nowhere gives such power to the President or to any bureaucrat. That power is lodged in the Congress of the United States.

The Democrats may have the majority to force this plan through, but, mark my words, a year from now you will find that you have not added to the efficiency of the Federal Government, that you have not reduced the cost of the Federal Government, for that is not in your plan, that is not in your minds. You do not know how to reduce taxes or expenses of Government. [Applause.] The American people have quit expecting anything from this administration except bills like this and the centralization of power and more power in the President and the bureaucrats against the will of the people. They are waiting until they can go to the polls in November 1940. There will then be a reorganization in this House, at the White House, and throughout this Government of ours. The Republicans will be in control. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, it must be evident to everyone that no votes will be changed by this debate; and those familiar with the situation realize, of course, that from the beginning there has never been any doubt that this Congress would permit the President's reorganization order to become law. The very fact that the Congress passed the reorganization bill of 1939 settled that matter definitely.

Whether we like to admit it or not, this matter, from which party politics should have been divorced, has resolved itself into more or less of a party matter, and when the vote comes I venture the prediction that it will be pretty much upon party lines. The Republicans generally, I think, can be expected to oppose the President's reorganization plan which is now before us, because they consider this particular plan or order to be the first step toward putting into effect the President's whole theory and philosophy of reorganization; and Republicans, as has already been demonstrated by their votes on the reorganization bills of 1938 and 1939, are generally opposed to that theory and philosophy, and they are also opposed to the motive which they believe to be behind the President's demand for reorganization.

This, I say, is generally true. There are a few exceptions, of course, as is evidenced by the fact that a few Republicans supported the 1939 reorganization bill, upon the authority of which the President has submitted this Executive order, known as reorganization plan No. I, and which will automatically become law unless the pending resolution to prevent it is adopted by the House and concurred in by the Senate.

The majority party, on the other hand, I think, can be counted upon to support the President's plan simply because it is the President's plan and because they have all along contended that the Congress is incapable of reorganizing the Government by law, and that the only way to accomplish reorganization is by Presidential order. So far as the President's plan or order is concerned, the majority party in the House has already announced that it is not even interested in the debate upon it. The majority leaders formally stated at the beginning that they intended to consume only 10 minutes in debate upon the resolution which is now before us.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is the gentleman authorized to say to the House that the vote will be along party lines and that this is a political question?

Mr. MOTT. I do not know in what sense the gentleman uses the word "authorized." I am speaking on my own responsibility, of course, and am venturing to predict what the vote will disclose.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thought so.

Mr. MOTT. What I say in debate is naturally an expression of my own opinion, as the gentleman knows, and his question, therefore, is pointless.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Certainly the gentleman does not want to intimate that all Members on the majority side are rubber stamps and will support anything the President might send down here?

Mr. MOTT. I imagine there will probably be a few votes from the more independent Members on the other side of the aisle. I hope there may be, but I would be greatly surprised if there were many. I do not think it is a question of the majority Members' being rubber stamps in this case. I think most of them are really of the opinion that the Congress is incapable of legislating on this subject and that our authority in that regard ought to be surrendered to the President.

It has been said here—and perhaps correctly—that this proposal of the President's seems to be popular throughout the country and that it has the preponderance of editorial support. That may be true, because neither the people nor the editors have had opportunity to study it. Even the Congress has not studied it. There have been no hearings in committee. No testimony has been taken, and, as I have said, the majority party does not even intend to debate it here on the floor of the House. It is obvious, therefore, if this reorganization plan has popular support, that support is not based upon any real study of the proposal.

Perhaps that is a good reason why a Member of the House who is opposed to the proposition should state for the record, at least, his reasons for opposing it, and that I wish to do here briefly.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the fundamental principle involved, I oppose this reorganization plan because, from as careful an analysis as I have been able to make, I have failed to discover any merit in it. I cannot see, in the first place, where economy will be effected. I cannot see where any efficiency in government will be effected. I have studied the various transfers and consolidations set forth in this Presidential order, and I do not find where any of those transfers or consolidations will eliminate a single useless or overlapping bureau. I find no evidence that a single dollar will be saved. I find no evidence that any of the personnel of any bureau, agency, or department will be reduced. All I am able to discover in this plan is the further concentration of authority in the President. I am convinced that that is the sole purpose of this plan, known as reorganization plan No. I, just as it was the sole purpose of the reorganization bill of 1939, which became law this year, and of the original reorganization bill of 1938, which was recommitted last year.

There may be a few good individual items in the plan. One or two transfers may make for efficient operation. I do not object to those particular transfers, but under the Reorganization Act I cannot have those unobjectionable things unless I agree to accept everything else in the plan, no matter how objectionable. I must accept this thing just as the President has written it. I cannot change a word or a syllable of it.

There are transfers here which obviously should never be made. It would take too long to enumerate all of them or even a part of them; but I am going to mention one glaring example of the unsoundness of this proposal. That is the transfer of the Bureau of Public Roads to a new set-up under this bill called the Public Works Agency.

The work of the Bureau of Public Roads has nothing to do with such public works as the W. P. A., or P. W. A., or any of those other emergency agencies which are lumped together in this plan to form the Public Works Agency. The Bureau of Public Roads now functions as an independent agency in the Department of Agriculture. It functions for the purpose of carrying out the established road policy of the United States, a policy established by the Congress of the United States and with which all the people of the United States are in agreement. To transfer it to this new set-up and to make it subservient to an Administrator of Public Works would change the whole road policy, and might even result in taking away from Congress the exclusive jurisdiction which it now has on the road policy of the United States.

I cannot discuss these particular items because I want to tell you, if I have time, what the more fundamental reasons are for my opposition to this reorganization plan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I opposed the first reorganization bill when it was introduced in Congress at the direction of the President in 1938. I opposed the second reorganization bill in the last Congress. I was of the opinion that at that time, and I think the majority of the people in the country were of similar opinion, that the original reorganization bill was probably the most dangerous proposal that has ever been made to the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] To my mind it was equally as dangerous as the Supreme Court bill. It was introduced in Congress at the same time as the Supreme Court bill, by the same people who wrote the Court bill, and as a part of the same scheme. That scheme was to centralize all governmental authority in the hands of the President of the United States. If the original reorganization bill had become law, and particularly if the two companion measures, the Supreme Court bill and the reorganization bill, had both become law, I think to a very large extent representative government in this country would have ceased to exist. Those bills did not become law because consideration of them was deferred long enough so that the people understood them, and they then

brought enough pressure upon their Representatives in Congress to cause defeat of the measures.

In the Seventy-fifth Congress another reorganization bill was introduced. I took occasion to observe in my remarks in debate on that bill that in my opinion there was no essential difference between the second reorganization bill and the first one. I am still of the opinion that the President under the reorganization bill which became law can do practically everything he could have done under the original reorganization bill had that bill become law.

What was the purpose of the first and second reorganization bills, and what is the real purpose of this plan which the President has submitted under authority of the reorganization bill of 1939? I believe the real purpose and the real object behind the plan now proposed by the President is to centralize as much authority in his hands as he possibly can. It has always been his object, and I believe that this plan will enable him to carry it out, to take away as much of the independence of the so-called independent agencies as the Reorganization Act will permit him to take; and I further believe that this plan No. I and the other plans which are to follow will take away practically all of that independence.

Now, when you transfer these so-called independent agencies, whether they be separate agencies or whether they have been placed in some of the departments, and when you transfer them to one of the new set-ups created under this Presidential order, you take away their independent status and character, because then instead of being independent they are to become subservient to the administrator which under this plan is to be placed over them. That is the vicious part of the plan, and it is my belief that it is the main purpose and object of the plan.

Mr. Chairman, when the Congress created these agencies it admittedly created them as independent agencies to carry out the will of the Congress in the administration of certain laws. Had the Congress desired these agencies to be executive agencies, it would have placed them under the jurisdiction and direction of the President of the United States. But the Congress did not do so. If the Congress now wishes to change the status and character of those agencies it should do so by statutory law. Under this plan, however, and without the consent of the Congress, the President changes, alters, or repeals the law of the Congress by Executive order, and he becomes in effect the actual administrator of all the independent agencies affected by the order.

This reorganization plan No. I would have been bad enough, even if in making the plan the President had adhered to the spirit of his limitations as provided in the reorganization bill. But the President did not confine himself to the limits of the bill in formulating and presenting this reorganization plan. I observed in the debate on the second reorganization bill that in my opinion that would be the case. I said the President if he pleased under that reorganization bill could really create a new department, in spite of the fact that the language of the reorganization bill prohibited him from doing that. That is precisely what he has done under this plan in three separate cases.

He has created, for example, actually a Department of Public Works, with all the power, all the authority, and all the jurisdiction that a new department of public works, headed by a secretary of public works, would have if the bill provided for such a department in so many words. It is not called a department of public works in this Presidential order, because to call it that would be in violation of the letter of the law. So it is called an Agency of Public Works. The head of that department is not called a secretary. He is called an Administrator. But it is a new department, nevertheless, and it violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

This particular subterfuge is typical of the whole of the reorganization plan. The plan is wrong because its purpose is to carry out an authority which is wrong and which the Congress should never have given to the President. Now is the time and this is the opportunity for the Congress to correct the mistake it made in passing the reorganization bill. The resolution now before us declaring that the Congress does not agree to reorganization plan No. I should be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman from New York concluded?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN], and then will ask that the Clerk read the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, on April 25, immediately after the President sent his message to the Congress, accompanied by reorganization plan No. I, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] took the floor and denounced the plan as bad. Because he said it was bad does not necessarily make it so. Immediately upon the conclusion of his statement on that day I took the floor and pronounced it good and said that the President had done a magnificent job. Because I said it was good does not make it good.

The difference, however, was this: The gentleman from New York was straining his ears to hear the message, and when he made the statement he had never even read the reorganization order itself, while I had had the advantage of knowing several days in advance just what was in the order and had had full time to study and analyze it. Since then any Member of the House who was sufficiently interested has had ample time to consider this whole question thoroughly.

As I previously stated during the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], this situation, calling up this matter today, is not of our making. The gentleman from New York did not wait 40 or 50 days from the time the order came in, but was so determinedly opposed to it that he immediately rushed in and offered the resolution to stop the reorganization plan. Under the very stringent rules to guarantee a vote and full expression by those who might be opposed to it, of course, this matter had to come up certainly between now and Monday.

I had hoped so much that we would reach some phase of the whole question of reorganization where it would not be treated solely as a partisan question, but the new leader of the minority, who has just preceded me, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT], presumably speaking for others in his party, has told us that it is a partisan question and that the Republicans will vote accordingly.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman heard me state very plainly, I am sure, that in making that statement I was speaking on my own responsibility and was stating my opinion.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. I also ventured the guess that my opinion would be found to be correct when the vote came. That is what I stated, but that is not what the gentleman quoted me as stating.

Mr. WARREN. I am afraid the gentleman's opinion is going to be correct.

Mr. MOTT. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question. Does not the gentleman agree with me that this vote will be upon party lines?

Mr. WARREN. I am not putting it upon party lines, I assure the gentleman; not at all.

Mr. MOTT. That is not answering my question.

Mr. WARREN. Nor did I make the vote when we passed this bill on party lines; nor did I appeal to the Democrats of this House until we had seen it made an almost entirely partisan issue on that side.

Since my time is limited, I cannot yield any more.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. WARREN. I cannot yield any more.

I criticize no one for his vote on any matter that arises here. I criticize no position that anyone may take on any matter of legislation. I am always willing to accord the same sincerity of purpose to any man or woman in this House that I would like to have accorded to me. But for years now we have all been prating about the necessity of governmental reorganization. We have recognized our inability to do it.

We have authorized the President to do it under certain restrictions and limitations and subject to our disapproval. He has acted with promptness and dispatch. It would be humanly impossible for the President or for any Member of Congress to write an order that would please everyone. There is no doubt some feature in the order now under consideration does not appeal to some Member of the House, and some of the features do not personally appeal to me, but the more I study this order as a whole the more I marvel at its basic reasoning and its desire to follow the mandate of Congress to promote efficiency and economy and to eliminate duplication and overlapping. It has met with widespread approval. The press of the country, regardless of party affiliation, students of government, business, and a large majority of the Congress have hailed it as a great forward step. Regardless of whether anyone disagrees with the method provided, surely a vote to overturn this order can only be construed as a vote against any form of Government reorganization whatever. The value of the order must be proven in the months to come after it goes into effect. Certainly the coordinator over each new agency must make an exhaustive study. Then we can best see what can be saved and what can be eliminated, and what efficiency we may secure. If it should develop that some regrouping or some transfer does not prove feasible, then it may be quickly changed by another order or by the Congress itself.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of a series of probably about five orders. It is my opinion that all of them will not be presented at this session. There are certain transfers and regroupings that in their very nature must have careful study, and the whole job should not be expected in a few weeks. The order now under consideration is a splendid start. It is entitled to our wholehearted support. When we get back here in January we will probably be in a position then to gage its full effects.

Mr. Chairman, I shall now yield the floor to the gentleman from Missouri so he may move that the Committee rise, and we will call the roll. Those who are in favor of this plan going into effect should vote "no" when we go back into the House. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 19

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. I, transmitted to Congress by the President on April 25, 1939.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report House Concurrent Resolution 19 back to the House with the recommendation that it not be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McGRANERY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 19, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it be not agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. TABER demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 128, nays 265, answered "present" 2, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—128

Allen, Ill.	Arends	Bender	Bradley, Mich.
Andersen, H. Carl	Austin	Blackney	Brewster
Andresen, A. H.	Ball	Bolles	Brown, Ohio
Angell	Bates, Mass.	Bolton	Carlson
Carter	Grant, Ind.	Lord	Sandager
Chiperfield	Griswold	McDowell	Schafer, Wis.
Church	Gross	Maas	Schiffler
Clason	Guyer, Kans.	Marshall	Seccombe
Clevenger	Gwynne	Martin, Iowa	Shafer, Mich.
Crawford	Hall	Martin, Mass.	Short
Crowther	Halleck	Mason	Simpson
Culkin	Harness	Michener	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Hawks	Monkiewicz	Smith, Ohio
Darrow	Heinke	Mott	Springer
Dirksen	Hess	Murray	Sumner, Ill.
Ditter	Hinshaw	O'Brien	Taber
Dondero	Hoffman	Oliver	Talle
Douglas	Holmes	Pierce, N. Y.	Taylor, Tenn.
Dowell	Jarrett	Pittenger	Thill
Dworshak	Jeffries	Plumley	Tibbott
Eaton, N. J.	Jenkins, Ohio	Powers	Tinkham
Elston	Jensen	Reed, Ill.	Treadway
Englebright	Johns	Reed, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Fenton	Johnson, Ill.	Rees, Kans.	Vorys, Ohio
Fish	Johnson, Ind.	Rich	Wheat
Ford, Leland M.	Jones, Ohio	Risk	Wigglesworth
Gamble	Keefe	Robsion, Ky.	Williams, Del.
Gartner	Kinzer	Rockefeller	Winter
Gifford	Lambertson	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolcott
Gilchrist	Landis	Rogers, Mass.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillie	LeCompte	Routzohn	Woodruff, Mich.
Graham	Lewis, Ohio	Rutherford	Youngdahl

NAYS—265

Allen, La.	Doxey	Kilday	Poage
Allen, Pa.	Drewry	Kirwan	Polk
Anderson, Calif.	Duncan	Kitchens	Rabaut
Anderson, Mo.	Dunn	Kleberg	Ramspeck
Andrews	Durham	Knutson	Randolph
Ashbrook	Eaton, Calif.	Kocialkowski	Rankin
Barden	Eberharter	Kramer	Rayburn
Barnes	Edmiston	Kunkel	Reece, Tenn.
Barry	Elliott	Lanham	Richards
Barton	Ellis	Larrabee	Robertson
Bates, Ky.	Engel	Lea	Robinson, Utah
Beam	Evans	Leavy	Rogers, Okla.
Beckworth	Faddis	Lemke	Romjue
Bell	Fay	Lesinski	Ryan
Bland	Fernandez	Lewis, Colo.	Sacks
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	Luce	Sasscer
Boehne	Flaherty	Ludlow	Satterfield
Boland	Flannery	McAndrews	Schaefer, Ill.
Boren	Folger	McArdle	Schuetz
Boykin	Ford, Miss.	McCormack	Schulte
Bradley, Pa.	Ford, Thomas F.	McGehee	Schwert
Brooks	Fries	McGranery	Scrugham
Brown, Ga.	Garrett	McKeough	Secrest
Bryson	Gathings	McLaughlin	Seger
Buckler, Minn.	Gavagan	McLean	Shanley
Buckley, N. Y.	Gearhart	McLeod	Sheppard
Burch	Gehrmann	McMillan, John L.	Smith, Conn.
Burgin	Gerlach	McMillan, Thos.S.	Smith, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Geyer, Calif.	Maciejewski	Smith, Va.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gibbs	Magnuson	Smith, Wash.
Byron	Gore	Mahon	Snyder
Caldwell	Gossett	Maloney	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Grant, Ala.	Mapes	South
Cannon, Mo.	Green	Marcantonio	Sparkman
Cartwright	Gregory	Martin, Colo.	Spence
Case, S. Dak.	Griffith	Martin, Ill.	Starnes, Ala.
Casey, Mass.	Hancock	Massingale	Steagall
Celler	Hare	May	Stefan
Chandler	Harrington	Merritt	Sutphin
Chapman	Hart	Miller	Sweeney
Clark	Harter, N. Y.	Mills, Ark.	Tarver
Claypool	Harter, Ohio	Mills, La.	Taylor, Colo.
Cochran	Havenner	Mitchell	Tenerowicz
Coffee, Nebr.	Hendricks	Monroney	Thomas, N. J.
Coffee, Wash.	Hennings	Moser	Thomas, Tex.
Cole, Md.	Hill	Mouton	Thomason
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Murdock, Ariz.	Tolan
Collins	Hook	Murdock, Utah	Vincent, Ky.
Colmer	Hope	Nelson	Vinson, Ga.
Connery	Houston	Nichols	Voorhis, Calif.
Cooley	Hull	Norrell	Vreeland
Cooper	Hunter	Norton	Wallgren
Costello	Izac	O'Connor	Walter
Cox	Jacobsen	O'Day	Warren
Creal	Jarman	O'Leary	Weaver
Crosser	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Neal	West
Crowe	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Toole	Whelchel
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	Owen	White, Ohio
Cummings	Jones, Tex.	Pace	Whittington
D'Alesandro	Kean	Parsons	Williams, Mo.
Darden	Kee	Patman	Wolverton, N. J.
Dempsey	Keller	Patrick	Wood
DeRouen	Kennedy, Martin	Patton	Woodrum, Va.
Dickstein	Kennedy, Md.	Pearson	Zimmerman
Dingell	Kennedy, Michael	Peterson, Ga.	
Disney	Keogh	Pfeifer	
Doughton	Kerr	Pierce, Oreg.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Alexander Thorkelson

NOT VOTING—35

Arnold	Burdick	Curley	Ferguson
Buck	Cluett	Delaney	Flannagan
Bulwinkle	Corbett	Dies	Fulmer

Hartley	McReynolds	Sabath	Sumners, Tex.
Healey	Mansfield	Shannon	Terry
Horton	Mundt	Sirovich	Wadsworth
Jenks, N. H.	Myers	Smith, W. Va.	Welch
Johnson, Okla.	Osmers	Stearns, N. H.	White, Idaho
Kelly	Peterson, Fla.	Sullivan	

So the concurrent resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Arnold with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Horton.
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Curley.
Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. Terry with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Myers with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Sirovich.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think if there is a man in public life who has been treated kindly by the press, including the columnists, I might qualify, and I am deeply grateful that that is the fact.

On last evening, speaking before the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Gastonia, N. C., I did not mention in my speech the names Republican, Democrat, and in no wise did I make any statement that might be considered as partisan or critical of any human being alive.

I have in my hand a dispatch from Gastonia, N. C., published in many of the papers because it came to them, from which I read the following:

RAYBURN told the annual junior chamber of commerce meeting that many Washington columnists spy and lie for sensational effect.

I did not use the word "spy" or "lie" in reference to columnists or anybody else. I did not utter one unkind word about a columnist or any other writer. So this statement emanating from Gastonia, N. C., is an infamous and diabolical distortion of the truth. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, to include a radio address to be delivered tonight over the National Broadcasting System by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and myself, and also in connection with my remarks on the subject of neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESERVOIRS ON THE GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill (H. R. 6078) to authorize the construction of reservoirs at Markhams Ferry and Fort Gibson on the Grand (Neosho) River for flood control and other purposes, introduced yesterday by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that I was absent from the Chamber on urgent departmental business and missed voting on the concurrent resolution. Had I been present I would have voted against the concurrent resolution and in favor of the reorganization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement given by General Tyler to the Flood Control Committee yesterday on the question of flood control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial on the Pulitzer prize.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a bill I introduced just now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on Friday next, after the regular order of business, and any special orders that have been entered, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from a friend of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article of national educational value concerning the National Capital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter addressed to Senator REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, by the publisher of the New York Inquirer. I am doing this with the Senator's permission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEATH OF THE SON OF HON. E. H. CRUMP, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House who served in the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses with my predecessor, Hon. E. H. Crump, of Memphis, will learn with keen regret of the tragic death of his son, John Crump, on yesterday evening in an airplane accident. I mentioned the sad occurrence to some of our colleagues who are friends of former Representative Crump and found that they knew nothing of it, and I thought that it would be appropriate to mention it on the floor so that those who would want to communicate with Mr. Crump could do so.

The young man was a passenger in an airplane that was in the act of landing at Grenada, Miss., where Mr. John Crump was to extend an invitation on behalf of the city of Memphis, and in trying to avoid running over some children who had crowded onto the field the plane turned over and took fire, and the three occupants were burned to death.

John Crump was a splendid young man, of fine character, of great promise in the business world, and popular through-

out the South. His father is one of the distinguished citizens of our country, and no man in the House while he was here was more highly regarded than the Honorable E. H. Crump. He and his family have the sympathy of us all in their overwhelming loss.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour I shall not address the House this evening, but ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of the legislative program for the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. CRAWFORD. On roll call No. 60 I am paired against the veterans' bill. I was not present on the floor of the House when the roll was called and I had not left any arrangement for a special or general pair.

I ask unanimous consent that the Journal and the RECORD may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD and the Journal will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] is recognized to address the House for 20 minutes.

TARIFF POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak with regard to the protective tariff on imports, an issue that is at this time interwoven with our foreign policies and of vital importance to every American citizen. The retention of our domestic markets is far more important to the welfare of the American people than is the attempted capture of ever-changing foreign markets. Our total exports last year, stimulated by war conditions and the purchases to sustain warfare, were approximately $3,000,000,000. Our gross national income was about $66,000,000,000. Therefore, our total collections from exports contributing to our national income were less than 4 percent of such national income.

Our tariff policies date to the founding of our Republic, and the first protective-tariff law was approved and signed by President George Washington July 4, 1789. This act was supported by Mr. Madison, afterward President of the United States, and was in its preamble declared to be "for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debt of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufacturers." Thus from the very inception of our Government it was recognized by the Congress and the President that "protection of manufacturers" was fundamentally essential to the industrial and economic life of the Republic. This law was passed by the unanimous vote of the Senate and by a majority in the ratio of more than 5 to 1 in the House of Representatives.

From the time of the adoption of the first tariff and the beginning of the War of 1812, 12 additional tariff acts were passed, which generally increased the rate of duty and added to the protective power of such tariffs. In his message of December 1795 to the Congress, President Washington said "our agriculture, commerce, and manufacture are prospering beyond former example," and again, "every part of the Union displaying indications of rapid and various improvement with burden so light as scarcely to be perceived." In his message of 1796, the Father of his Country urged upon Congress "the necessity of accelerating the establishment of certain useful manufactures by the intervention of legislative aid and protection."

In his first message delivered in December 1801, Thomas Jefferson congratulated Congress upon the revenues derived from tariff duties and suggested that "there is now reasonable ground for confidence that we may safely dispense with all internal taxes."

By reason of the embargo during the year 1812, and during the period ending in 1815, the country made great strides in its development. American manufacturers and agriculturists were in very prosperous condition. Until this time little or no controversy arose between the Democratic statesmen and the Whig statesmen regarding the tariff policies. From 1816 until 1824, due to various changes both in the internal policy and in the tariff protective policy, considerable distress was experienced. This led to a difference as to the causes of such distress. In 1828 a still more effective tariff measure was passed. Following this, a southern hostility began to develop against the protective-tariff policy, and Mr. Calhoun, then the great Democratic leader, who had been an original protectionist, and concluding that manufactures could not be established in the planting States in the South, and that free labor and slave labor could not be made to harmonize, advocated and was successful in having enacted into law in 1833 a tariff bill which provided, over a 10-year period, for a sliding scale downward. This resulted in disaster in 1837 and contributed largely to that outstanding panic, which resulted in forced sales of farms and other property throughout the country, with thousands of men out of work and thousands of others toiling for 25 cents a day or less, and accompanying distress among the people.

Our foreign policies for nearly 150 years and our domestic policy with respect to imports and exports and the protection of American agriculture, labor, and industry are fundamentally identified and correlated to such extent that the future policy and preservation of our Nation depend upon the strict and unbiased observance of these principles. I am firmly convinced that the adherence to our Constitution, to the foreign policy and conduct inaugurated and advised by President Washington, and the tariff policy which was enacted into law by the First Congress with the approval of President Washington are the keystones to a revival of American progress and prosperity. Abandon constitutional government by whatsoever method or device and in lieu thereof we inevitably cannot avoid dictatorship; forsake the advice of President Washington by meddling in the affairs of foreign nations and by entering into alliances and agreements with them, and we shall pay with the precious lives of our boys, not to mention the incalculable suffering and monetary losses; abolish our protective-tariff policy, under whatsoever guise, whether by substituting so-called reciprocal-trade treaties, establishing a barter or trade system, or in any other manner, and the inevitable result is widespread unemployment of men and women in industry and a paralysis and collapse of our agriculture.

Partly through the reciprocal-trade agreements and by reason of the fact that we have traded ourselves out of markets, comes the outstanding fact that our recovery in the family of nations affected by the world-wide condition of 1929 and 1930 is down to fourteenth, and in a large measure is due to the abandonment of our tried and proven protective-tariff policies, as well as of other innovations in our system of government not contemplated by the Constitution. There remains unemployed approximately 12,000,000 men and women, who, in part, are compelled to accept relief, or employment at the hands of the Government at low and un-American rates of pay. Such wages do not sustain a standard of living as is regarded necessary to maintain a free American citizen and family, neither does it create the volume of purchasing power essential to maintain a prosperous America.

The more quickly that we, as the representatives of the people, recognize these deficiencies and inaugurate proper, progressive, and protective methods that will result in the reemployment in private industry of the unemployed men and women at the American standard of wages, just so soon shall we bring back prosperity, contentment, and sound progress to our people. Equally so, just as soon shall we destroy the seed of discontent which breeds the "isms" that are so much discussed and so violently loathed by every patriotic American citizen. It might also be observed that so long as

we fail to recognize that unemployment and distress are the fertile soil which breeds discontent and fanciful panaceas in the minds of the people, that anything which promises betterment, notwithstanding how fanciful and impracticable, is blindly followed with the hope that such is the remedy. In America obnoxious "isms" are developed by reason of unemployment and distress, and not, as in most countries, by reason of religious and political persecutions. Our constitutional Government is the most equitable and just yet devised by the mind of man. Permanent employment at good wages, with the opportunity for leisure and recreation, and no "ism" yet conceived, finds favor and support among intelligent American workers.

One of the important immediate steps in our economic and political life, and one that will make a profound difference in our prosperity, is the immediate abolishment of the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements and the establishment, through proper orderly processes, of protective tariffs upon all competitive manufactured commodities and farm products. Unfortunately, the fundamental policy which actuated the negotiation and entering into the reciprocal-trade agreements is highly illusory and fanciful. Such being predicated upon the idealistic theory that the removal of the so-called trade barriers by the giving away of American markets to foreign manufactured goods and commodities and foreign-grown agricultural products and livestock, would promote and produce world-wide peace among nations.

For more than 3 years we have pursued such policies and urged the balance of civilized nations, with whom we transacted business, to sit at the table of peace while we bartered away much of our markets in exchange for their good will and peace. This policy was false and unsound and is well evidenced by the economic and military aggressions the world over. Ominous for several months is the threat of a world conflagration that threatens to ensue at any moment. Experts predicted that such will rapidly destroy the constructive efforts of mankind attained after 2,000 years of constant effort and labor. This is the situation that faces American industry, agriculture, and labor after having made gratuities of American jobs and markets to those dovelike nations.

Having this experience and acting as ordinary prudent men and women, and holding the light of such experience as our guide, it is high time for us to turn to our fundamental American practices, in that we shall make America safe and prosperous for American farmers, workers, and industry. The future of American institutions and ideals which are seriously and eminently threatened, by the practice of internationalism rather than nationalism, require, and it is a solemn duty of every patriotic liberty-loving American citizen, to reestablish and reaffirm his allegiance to our Constitution and the institutions promoted and fostered by such.

There exists today no sectional difference on the issue of protective tariff. Well meaning and intelligent thought discloses that such is just as important for the protection of the cotton grower of the South as for the wheat and corn growers of the West; the cattle and sheep men of Texas and Wyoming and the grape and potato growers of California and Maine; equally as important for the textile and shoe manufacturer of New York and Massachusetts as for the glass and pottery manufacturer of West Virginia, Ohio, and New Jersey.

Our men and women now unemployed must be placed in jobs. A protective tariff will in a large measure aid in that. We must stop the Messianic attitude toward the world and protect our Americans by providing these jobs and this encouragement and protection to agriculture and industry.

It would be superfluous for me to recite numerous figures intended to demonstrate the difference in wages paid in the United States and other countries, as well as the differences in other elements entering into the cost of manufactured and grown commodities. Such are easily available and doubtless you are familiar with them. Suffice it is for me to say that the American farmer and the American manufacturer cannot grow and produce commodities that can be sold at any profit, in competition with the same articles grown and manufactured in nearly every other country on earth. Compare the labor costs of a Japanese girl, employed in a cotton-textile plant where she is paid 2½ cents per hour, as against an American girl employed in the same type of plant and who receives not less than 25 cents per hour, and in many instances more. Recognizing labor cost as one of the important elements in all manufactured and grown commodities, it is quite easy for us to discover that under no imaginable circumstances can the American manufacturer compete with the manufacturer of Japan, England, Belgium, France, and other countries where raw materials are cheaper, labor costs a fraction of those of the United States, and transportation charges comparatively small.

A ton of steel can be shipped from Liverpool to New York or Montreal more cheaply than it can be sent by rail from Pittsburgh to New York. However, I shall not burden you with matters already known to you, or easily discovered by only a most casual examination. Are we going to abandon the present high standard of living of American workers after preserving and protecting such for 150 years, and force our workers to subsist upon wages comparable to those received in foreign nations, and accordingly so lower the purchasing power of the workers' income and thereby completely demoralize and collapse the American economic system? If so, to what lower standard must they go? Shall it be the low paid and meagerly supported peasant and factory laborer of Europe who subsist from year to year upon only the meager necessities of life, or shall it be to the still much lower standard of the Far East, where malnutrition is widespread and only the barest necessities are obtainable for a day's labor? I reply, most emphatically, no. The American standard of living with an abundance of necessities of life and with ample time for leisure and recreation has been established, tried, and proven, and is yet easily available and cannot be abandoned. To countenance such would be a crime against God and our civilization. The constitutional form of our Government has well proven its worth and solidity. The economic system of the United States under such will sustain its position if permitted to do so without interference and with encouragement, and likewise American labor, as a part of such, cannot be let down.

Divine Providence endowed this Nation with every conceivable resource for an abundant and contented life for its citizens. Today we possess all such gifts. Money and credit remain idle; millions of men and women are unemployed, and natural resources are plentiful. The regret is that these have been ill-managed by the constituted leaders of men. It is not too late for action. We still possess the remedies. It is our sworn duty to apply sound and progressive policies to aid and encourage our people. I do not claim the adoption of a sound protective tariff to be a complete remedy for all our economic ills; I do claim, however, that it is one of the most important essentials, and as such, will contribute much to restoring a prosperous condition in our Nation.

I represent the First West Virginia District, which is one of the most highly industrialized districts in the United States. Glassware, potteryware, steel, cotton, textiles, aluminum and enamelware, tin plate, zinc, and tobacco, as well as various other commodities are manufactured. Our prosperity and success depend upon the proper tariff protection. When such tariffs are low and nonrestrictive of imports thousands of men and women from these industries are laid off. It is this type of worker that constitutes the backbone of American civilization, and it is to them that I feel an obligation of providing adequate tariff protection and of recovering their positions which have, by the process of reciprocal-trade agreements, been transferred to foreign soil.

I have introduced bills, known as H. R. 3372 and H. R. 3373, respectively, the former proposing to refer the tariff question to the Committee on Ways and Means for study of our tariff problem with a view of making recommendations for new tariffs, and the latter having for its object the abolition of the existing reciprocal-trade agreements, which are now and have been since January 30, 1939, pending before the Committee on Ways and Means.

I implore you members of the Committee on Ways and Means to give to these measures your immediate and energetic support in order that the Members of the House of Representatives may have an opportunity to vote on them.

As the elected leaders of a great nation, endowed by divine Providence, with an abundance of all things necessary for a happy, peaceful, and prosperous land, it is our solemn duty, without bias or prejudice, to courageously provide by sound legislation the means whereby our people are restored to prosperity by restoring jobs to make them happy and contented. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLAYPOOL, for 2 days, on account of important business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 685. An act to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 2065. An act to provide for the regulation of the sale of certain securities in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, and the regulation of the trust indentures under which the same are issued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4492. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4492. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for printing and binding and stationery for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The meeting of the Roads Committee originally called for Tuesday, May 2, 1939, at 10 a. m., has been postponed until Thursday, May 4, 1939, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

The Committee on Labor will hold a hearing in the caucus room of the House Office Building at 10:30 a. m. Thursday, May 4, 1939, on proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

On Thursday, May 4, 1939, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4650, making electricians licensed officers; and H. R. 5130, merchant marine bill, 1939. Hearings will be held on sections 1, 3, 5 to 11. Sections 2, 4, and 12 will be heard at some later date.

On Wednesday, May 10, 1939, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4051, relating to hiring of seamen on Government vessels.

On Wednesday, May 31, 1939, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 4985, relating to fishery educational service in Bureau of Fisheries (CALDWELL); H. R. 5025, purchase and distribution of fish products (BLAND); and H. R. 5681, purchase and distribution of fish products (CALDWELL).

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Monday, May 8, 1939, at 10:30 a. m. to hold hearings on the project for the waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary on Tuesday, May 9, 1939, at 10 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 4587) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of pleading, practice, and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict or finding or plea of guilty. Room 346, House Office Building.

There will be a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on Wednesday, May 10, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 190, to make available to the Federal Government the facilities of the Council of State Governments, and for other purposes. Room 346, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

692. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1940, amounting to $500 for the Supreme Court of the United States (H. Doc. No. 278); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

693. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the United States Naval Academy laundry; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

694. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report in detail showing the expenditures made by the War Department in connection with the observance of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

695. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting chapter I and a section of chapter II of part 3 of the Securities and Exchange Commission's report on the study of investment trusts and investment companies made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 279); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

696. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 5, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Contentnea Creek, N. C., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, and Contentnea Creek, N. C., from a point near Wilson to its confluence with the Neuse River, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

697. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 5, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cannon River, Minn., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

698. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 5, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Chefuncte River and Bogue Falia, La., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4745. A bill relating to benefit assessments from condemnation proceedings for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of alleys or minor streets; without amendment (Rept. No. 532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. Senate Concurrent Resolution 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Special Committee on Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 960. A bill extending the classified executive civil service of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 1827. A bill to allow moving expenses to employees in the Railway Mail Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5801. A bill to grant permission for the construction, maintenance, and use of a certain underground conduit for electrical lines in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5939. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5625. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling, and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5357) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Waterton Oil, Land & Power Co., of Butte, Mont., against the United States; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (H. R. 5742) for the relief of Leon Frederick Ruggles; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 6127. A bill to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6128. A bill to amend section 601 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, to provide for an excise tax on eggs and egg products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 6129. A bill to restore to the widows of the Regular Establishment the marriage privileges taken away by the Economy Act; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6130. A bill to provide for mandatory or compulsory inspection and permissive or voluntary grading of fish, fishery products, fishery byproducts, shellfish, crustacea, seaweeds, and all other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life and the products and byproducts thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona:

H. R. 6131. A bill for the purpose of creating a Mines Finance Commission, defining its duties, establishing its salaries, defining and establishing its authority, defining the qualifications of its commissioners, providing for its operation and authorizing funds to carry on its purposes, and to encourage production of commercial and strategic minerals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 6132. A bill for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Corp. James Bethel Gresham in McLean County, Ky.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. IGLESIAS:

H. R. 6133 (by request). A bill to compensate certain Puerto Rican citizens of the United States for services rendered the United States in the World War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PIERCE of New York:

H. R. 6134. A bill to exempt from the tariff laws products of certain farms situated partly within the Dominion of Canada but owned and operated by natural citizens and residents of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 6135. A bill to regulate the times and places of holding court in Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON of California:

H. R. 6136. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1353; 34 U. S. C. 1122), so as to authorize an appropriation of $50,000 annually to aid in the maintenance and support of marine schools; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6137. A bill to establish the position of Under Secretary in the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6138. A bill providing that the United States Government and all of its departments and agencies and all Federal corporations shall be bound by the State statutes of limitations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 6139. A bill to authorize the construction of reservoirs at Markhams Ferry and Fort Gibson, on the Grand (Neosho) River for flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DUNN:

H. R. 6140. A bill to abolish chain-gang systems, dungeons, and inhuman treatment of prison inmates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEOD:

H. R. 6141. A bill for the relief of the depositors of the First National Bank, Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to old-age assistance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution providing for cancelation of loans made to farmers of Puerto Rico by the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission or its successor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution against the declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. Res. 179. Resolution withholding relief benefits from those engaging in un-American activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 to provide by law that dairy products be made a basic commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt House bill 4723, to correct the military record of Oberlin M. Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6142. A bill granting a pension to Emma Grogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 6143. A bill granting a pension to Ellen Soverign; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6144. A bill granting a pension to Chester Cornett; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 6145. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth L. Riley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6146. A bill granting a pension to George W. Grigsby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PIERCE of New York:

H. R. 6147. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha Vroman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6148. A bill for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2847. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of the Izaak Walton League of Albany, Wis., supporting the purposes of the Pittman-Robertson Act by setting aside the full amount of excise tax on sporting goods for conservation purposes only; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2848. By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York: Petition of the Norwood Democratic Club of Bronx, N. Y., favoring support of any neutrality act or bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2849. By Mr. DOWELL: Concurrent resolution by the House of Representatives of the Iowa Legislature, taken from the pages of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Iowa Legislature, showing record and passage by that body of House Concurrent Resolution 24, memorializing the Congress of the United States in the interest of the general welfare bill (H. R. 2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2850. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of 76 citizens of the Fourteenth District of Illinois; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2851. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the National Coal Association, Washington, D. C., concerning payroll taxes under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2852. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Local No. 169, New York City, opposing any changes in the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

2853. Also, petition of Local No. 816, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, New York City, urging support of the Starnes bill (H. R. 4576) and the Mead bill (S. 2063); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2854. Also, petition of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., concerning House bill 5643; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2855. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of C. H. Pearson & Son Hardwood Co., Inc., New York City, concerning aliens and relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2856. Also, petition of the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, Inc., favoring the passage of the Starnes bill (H. R. 4576); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2857. Also, petition of the American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y., concerning neutrality legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2858. Also petition of the Forty Plus of New England, Syracuse Chapter, Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Voorhis bill (H. R. 118 and S. 890); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2859. Also, petition of the Quality Products Co., Inc., New York City, concerning the cosmetic excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2860. Also, petition of the Motor Haulage Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning Senate bill 1526; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2861. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, relative to construction of railway connecting link along northern California coast; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2862. Also, resolution of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, relative to proposed legislation directing the allowance and payment of travel and other expenses to certain soldiers of the Spanish-American War in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2863. Also, resolution of the Democratic Central Committee, Fifty-second Assembly District, California, relative to the extension of radio station KFVD, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2864. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of the Twisp Valley Grange, urging the adoption of the Ludlow resolution to provide for a constitutional amendment to permit citizens to express themselves by ballot before Congress could make a declaration of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2865. By Mr. LUCE: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to issuance of special commemorative postage stamp in the honor of Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2866. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., New York City, urging favorable consideration of House bill 944, the Martin wool-labeling bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2867. Also, petition of the union label trades department of the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., urging consideration of the Schwartz-Martin wool-products labeling bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2868. Also, petition of the Motor Haulage Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of the Barbour bill (S. 1526); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2869. Also, petition of B. J. McKenna, manager, life, accident, and group departments of the Travelers Insurance Co., New York City, to curb our war trade with Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2870. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States relative to a special postage stamp in honor of Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2871. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of H. L. Franklin, secretary, Marion County Industrial Union Council, affiliated with Congress of Industrial Organizations, Fairmont, W. Va., favoring the following four-point program: Equality to the Negro people; to abolish Jim Crow segregation; the enactment of the Wagner antilynch bill; and enforcement of the

thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2872. By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of Alvah E. Hall and numerous other retail grocers, merchants, and farmers of the Muscle Shoals district in Alabama, supporting House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2873. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States relative to a special postage stamp in honor of Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2874. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Garfield, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Works Progress Administration lay-off necessitated because of limited funds and compulsory quota restrictions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2875. Also, petition of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, Larena, P. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to imposing additional tax of 2 cents per pound on Philippine coconut oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of lights, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, and with whom is no variableness, neither shadow that is cast by turning: Send out Thy light and Thy truth that they may lead us to a clearer understanding of the problems that confront us, with their everchanging meaning and their complicated worth.

Grant to our President such measure of Thy wisdom that, under his leadership, we may prove ourselves a people worthy of Thy choicest blessings as we yield ourselves wholly to Thy will.

May all who wait upon Thee here renew their strength; may they mount up with aspiration's wings that they may discern the truest way, the highest duty; may they run and not be weary, as the mighty rush of feeling interprets truth and goodness; and may they walk and not faint, as dream and rapture are carried out in the actualities of life, with duty no longer merely the stern daughter of Thy voice but their constant guide and inspiration on life's journey.

We ask it in the Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 2, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Harrison	McKellar
Ashurst	Clark, Mo.	Hatch	McNary
Austin	Connally	Hayden	Maloney
Bailey	Danaher	Hill	Mead
Bankhead	Donahey	Holman	Miller
Barbour	Downey	Holt	Minton
Barkley	Ellender	Hughes	Murray
Bilbo	Frazier	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Bone	George	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Borah	Gerry	King	Nye
Bulow	Gibson	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Burke	Gillette	Lee	Overton
Byrd	Glass	Lodge	Pepper
Byrnes	Green	Logan	Pittman
Capper	Guffey	Lucas	Radcliffe
Caraway	Gurney	Lundeen	Reed
Chavez	Hale	McCarran	Reynolds
Russell	Slattery	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Schwartz	Smathers	Townsend	Walsh
Schwellenbach	Smith	Truman	Wheeler
Sheppard	Taft	Tydings	White
Shipstead	Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wiley

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is detained because of a death in his family.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 2d instant,

The following message was received by the Secretary from the House of Representatives on May 3, 1939: That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4492) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 513) to provide for the promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Fred G. Leith.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Special Committee on Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Lofts & Son;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of L. M. Bell and M. M. Bell;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Nadine Sanders; and

S. 1515. An act for the relief of the Louisiana National Bank of Baton Rouge and the Hibernia Bank & Trust Co. of New Orleans.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1881. An act for the relief of Anne Boice;

H. R. 1882. An act for the relief of Otis M. Culver, Samuel E. Abbey, and Joseph Reger;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Marguerite Kuenzi;

H. R. 2044. An act for the relief of R. Dove and Laura J. Dove;

H. R. 2058. An act for the relief of Jessie Denning Van Eimeren, A. C. Van Eimeren, and Clara Adolph;

H. R. 2071. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 2097. An act for the relief of Homer C. Stroud;

H. R. 2345. An act for the relief of R. H. Gray;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Virgil Kuehl, a minor;

H. R. 2478. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Milling Co. and Wisconsin Telephone Co.;

H. R. 2583. An act for the relief of A. W. Evans;

H. R. 2687. An act for the relief of Elbert R. Miller;

H. R. 2695. An act for the relief of Kenneth B. Clark;

H. R. 2903. An act for the relief of Virginia Guthrie, Jake C. Aaron, and Thomas W. Carter, Jr.;

H. R. 2926. An act for the relief of Bernard Woodruff;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of Edgar Green;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Grace Rouse;

H. R. 3345. An act for the relief of the Ninety Six Oil Mill, of Ninety Six, S. C.;

H. R. 3541. An act for the relief of John Chastain and Mollie Chastain, his wife;

H. R. 3907. An act for the relief of William A. Reithel;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of Charles H. Parr;