MR. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation, as all of us know, is an amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1949, which was approved on June 20th of that year. Furthermore, all of us also know that the Reorganization Act of 1949 was enacted for the sole purpose of effectuating the Hoover Commission recommendations.

It might be well for us to review the record in reference to the Hoover Commission proposals. I have in my hand a report recently issued by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. This report indicates that in the past 20 months almost 50 per cent of the Hoover Commission recommendations have been effectuated. They have printed in the report a box score which is rather imposing. Needless to say, most of us would like to see a greater degree of progress where efficiency and economy would result, but even in that interim period there has been substantial result attained. This legislation before us today is for the purpose, at least the alleged purpose, of even greater economy and efficiency during the present emergency.

The Hoover Commission made about 380 recommendations. Under the present legislation without these amendments which are on the floor today nearly 50 per cent of those recommendations have been put into operation in a period of 20 months. It seems to me under the existing legislation we now have, which this bill will amend, we could still accomplish all reforms in
the executive branch of the government that would be necessary in a reasonably short time under any emergency situation.

I have examined the committee report and the committee hearings. I have failed to find any recommendation by the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report for the enactment of these amendments. If you will recall, in the last 18 months whenever any amendments to existing legislation or any reorganization plans were submitted concerning the Hoover recommendations the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report would appear and testify in favor of the legislative proposals or in favor of the reorganization plans.

MR. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. FORD. I yield.

MR. BURNSIDE. The gentleman from Michigan is well acquainted with Mr. McCormick of the Citizens' Committee?

MR. FORD. I am. I have in my hand the report by his group.

MR. BURNSIDE. He testified before the other body in favor of the bill S. 101 which is complementary legislation to this legislation which we are now considering.

MR. FORD. But there is nothing in this committee report and no testimony before this legislative committee of the House which would indicate that they were in favor of it.

MR. BURNSIDE. That question came up on last Thursday and I would like to give the gentleman the exact words. It is on page 60 of the report of the other body.
MR. FORD. I am glad to have that information.

MR. BURNSIDE. Here is the statement. This is Mr. McCormick.

MR. FORD. Was he testifying before them?

MR. BURNSIDE. Yes. This is the testimony:

"My name is Robert L. L. McCormick. Dr. Robert L. Johnson, Chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report requested that I present the Committee's views on §. 101 in my capacity as research director. His request to me, appendix A hereto, is submitted subject to your approval, Mr. Chairman, for the record. We very much appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your kind invitation to appear before this committee."

MR. FORD. If I may ask the gentleman a question, can the gentleman give me the substance of what the recommendation was rather than read the entire testimony at this time?

MR. BURNSIDE. He recommended the bill.

MR. FORD. In toto?

MR. BURNSIDE. The bill is practically the same bill except that the House bill first had 15 days and later the House accepted the 15 days as contained in the Senate bill.

MR. FORD. I am glad to have the information from the
gentlemen. However, information has been given to the effect that the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is not in favor of this bill, at least the Citizens' Committee does not approve unless certain changes are incorporated. I understand there are several proposals in reference to Sec. 302 which the Citizens' Committee advocates. The most important amendment advocated would be the addition of a new subparagraph to Sec. 303 to insure that all reorganization plans submitted, outside of those affecting the war effort, would be in conformity with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I might add at this point that if the Hoover Commission were reconstituted at this time, as I have advocated, recommendations concerning all phases of the federal government would be available for Presidential and Congressional action.

The Citizens' Committee has raised some question concerning other provisions in this bill. Sec. 304(b) seems unwise and Sec. 304(a) would seem too broad and gives the Executive Branch of the federal government too much latitude in the field of substantive law.

In conclusion the enactment of this bill is unnecessary. The Reorganization Act of 1949 has worked fairly well. The President can do practically everything under this law that he could do under the proposed changes. The principal difference lies in the time period of 18 days.
In view of the fact that approximately 20 per cent of the Hoover Commission proposals have been effaced under existing procedures and new Presidential Reorganization plans could be handled in the same way.

I see no need for amendment to present law. The enactment of these amendments would only give greater authority to President Truman and I doubt if the American public want Congress to abandon or turn over additional power to the White House under the present circumstances. If anything, Congress should seek to recapture some of its Constitutional prerogatives.