

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, May 23, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, as we fare forth in Thy fear prosper us this day in our work. Even when our fellow men think they have cause for blame, may we care most for the approval of our own conscience and of Thee who seest our motives and knowest our hearts. We come in the solemnity of half-masted flags speaking of a personal and national tragedy.

In these perilous days, when servants of the state staggering under fearful burdens are constantly facing decisions that may affect the future of the Republic and the world, make our citizenship ever mindful of the terrific strain of public office, charitable in their judgments, sympathetic in their appraisals of those who without stint pour out their strength for the good of the commonwealth. Save us from bringing praise when it is too late, and from uninformed criticism which may savor of ingratitude and even of treachery. When day by day we have done faithfully the work Thou givest us to do, even though men may misjudge our aim, in quietness and in confidence may we leave the result to Thy unerring judgment. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 23, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 23, 1949:

S. 460. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; and

S. 461. An act to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

On May 24, 1949:

S. 663. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments; and

S. 812. An act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 714) to provide for comprehensive planning, for site ac-

quisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia; to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings; and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Mundt
Baldwin	Humphrey	Myers
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	O'Connor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Donnell	Kem	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Eaton	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Lodge	Stennis
Ferguson	Long	Taft
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McCarran	Thye
Gillette	McCarthy	Tydings
Graham	McFarland	Vandenberg
Green	McGrath	Watkins
Hayden	McKellar	Wherry
Hendrickson	McMahon	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Malone	Williams
Hill	Martin	Withers
Hoey	Morse	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEFFEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are detained on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained in the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a brief unanimous-consent request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator will withhold his request for a moment, the Chair will ask the Senate to permit Senators to present routine matters, before the Senator from Oregon proceeds, in order to avoid the presentation of such matters later.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me first state the nature of the request I am about to make. Yesterday, during the call of the calendar, Order No. 393, House bill 1754 when reached on the original call, was objected to. Later in the afternoon the Senator who made the objection, after having consulted the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who presented the report from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, withdrew his objection. Thereafter, at the request of the distinguished majority leader, the bill was taken up for consideration and passed.

A typographical error, which was in the bill as originally reported, was corrected, but then another error was made as to a date.

The bill has to do with the suspension of the requirement for doing assessment work upon mining claims. This work must be done to the amount of \$100 every year, and notice of the accomplishment of that work must be filed on or before 12 o'clock meridian on the first of July of each year. The typographical error consisted in the fact that the year 1949 was in the bill, instead of the year 1950. That typographical error was corrected. The additional error that was made, however, was on page 2, line 15, to change the year 1949 to 1950. That change should not have been made. So I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed, the vote by which the amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time, the vote on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, and the vote agreeing to the amendment of

the Senator from Illinois on page 2, line 15, be reconsidered, so that the committee amendment may be corrected in this particular.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, the committee amendment now being before the Senate, I ask that on page 2, line 15, the amendment changing the date from "1949" to "1950" be disagreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is rejected; and without objection, the committee amendment, as heretofore amended, is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now ask that the committee amendment, as amended, be engrossed, and that the bill be read the third time.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Oregon for having yielded to me.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; 43 U. S. C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to modify the classification of items subject to tax as luxuries

"Whereas the present operation of the Federal law taxing luxuries is such that it violates the basic principle of the equality of all citizens in that it inequitably imposes upon great portions of the population taxes upon items designated luxuries by the Federal act but which are in fact utter necessities; and

"Whereas these inequities fall with particular severity upon the people of the western portion of the United States in the imposition of a luxury tax upon all forms of public transportation and communication in an area of great distances where such transportation and communication are not a luxury but are essential to the conduct of business and the taxing of them indiscriminately as luxuries works such a hardship upon small business in particular that it is in fact ruinous and many are being forced out of business, causing a decline in the national income as a whole and resulting in increased unemployment and serious economic loss to the communities where these small business firms otherwise would thrive; and

"Whereas in like manner a luxury tax on legitimate business in time of peace is inequitable to large portions of the population by robbing them of their normal means of livelihood, as musicians, waiters, actors, actresses, and other persons of special training and talents who are unemployed as a result of the 20-percent luxury tax on theaters, night clubs, hotel dining rooms, cafes, and theatrical entertainment which is forcing many such establishments to close their doors or to abandon the music and entertainment portions of their normal service; and

"Whereas the indiscriminate taxing of necessities as luxuries also works a hardship and inequity upon women, especially women earning their own livelihood, in requiring them to pay a 20-percent luxury tax upon such necessities as low-cost handbags, luggage, cosmetics, fur coats, and similar articles as necessary to their life and occupation as any other article of clothing; and

"Whereas these misnamed luxury taxes also extend to many articles, such as baby oils, necessary in the care of infants, thus throwing a disproportionate burden upon young families, especially those of the many veterans whose normal family development was delayed by their sacrifices in the armed services of the Nation, which young men have not yet had time to achieve the higher brackets of income and therefore suffer under a tax which takes for necessities from those least able to pay; and

"Whereas much of this hardship and inequity could be relieved by a proper classification and designation of such items by price or similar classification so that the luxury tax could be levied only upon those articles which are in fact luxuries or of luxury quality: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of California hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact immediately legislation to relieve articles necessary to ordinary business and livelihood from the imposition of luxury taxes, to ameliorate at once the hardships upon those in low-income brackets, upon women, and upon small business by the present onerous and inequitable Federal luxury tax; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Taxation in each House of Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 25

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to install a system of flood control with facilities for the production of power on the Virgin River in the States of Nevada and Arizona

"Whereas the State of Nevada contains large areas of land held by the Federal Gov-

ernment, which land is exempt from taxation for flood control and irrigation and power purposes; and

"Whereas the farming area served by the Virgin River in the State of Nevada is subjected to periodic floods which destroy valuable crops and farm land and which result in a tremendous and needless loss of property; and

"Whereas thousands of acres of valuable farm land in the States of Nevada and Arizona will be developed through the installation of a dam on the Virgin River that will afford millions of gallons of water for irrigation during the growing season; and

"Whereas such a project, in addition to supplying flood control and water for irrigation, will make available to power users in the States of Nevada and Arizona additional blocks of power so that industry may be attracted to this area, and so that power produced at Boulder Dam may be sold to power users in the industrial area of southern California; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of Nevada that the Federal Government should provide a dam on the Virgin River for flood control, irrigation, and power purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to provide a dam on the Virgin River in Mohave County, Ariz.; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States, and to each house of the Legislature of the State of Arizona.

"PETER A. BURKE,

"Speaker of the Assembly.

"CLIFF JONES,

"President of the Senate.

"Approved March 29, 1949.

"VAIL PITTMAN,

"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 30

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to give due and favorable consideration to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission

"Whereas during the last generation the enormous expenses of Federal governmental activities has created a condition of confusion and overlapping in the divisions of the administrative authority which has placed upon the President of these United States an ever increasing burden and has resulted in increased costs and inefficient administration; and

"Whereas pursuant to Public Law 162, enacted by the Eightieth Congress, there was created a commission known as the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which public law was on July 7, 1947, approved by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and

"Whereas pursuant to said Public Law 162, there was appointed a bipartisan group of representative and distinguished citizens of our country who had had experience in governmental affairs, which group made an exhaustive and unbiased examination into the administration of the agencies of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the said Commission has filed a detailed report of its findings and its conclusions therefrom together with its recommendations covering the matter; and

"Whereas it appears to the members of the Michigan Legislature that the said findings,

conclusions, and recommendations constitute a cohesive and efficient program which will be of great benefit to the peoples of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature respectfully request the Congress of the United States to give due and favorable consideration to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to the end that the said recommendations may be adopted by the Congress of these United States and the President of the United States be directed hereby to effectuate the provisions of such recommendations; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"Adopted by the senate, May 3, 1949.

"Adopted by the house, May 6, 1949."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 19

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact legislation relative to socialized medicine

"Whereas the physician-patient relationship, with the freedom of choice enjoyed by the American people in the selection of a physician in whom they have confidence, has long been recognized as part of the philosophy of democracy of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature respectfully urge the Congress of the United States not to adopt legislation relative to socialized medicine; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"Adopted by the senate, March 28, 1949.

"Adopted by the house, May 6, 1949."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 45

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation enabling the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue flood-control bonds

"Whereas damages were suffered by owners to real and personal property by reason of the flood and floodwaters from streams in the city of Honolulu in early 1949; and

"Whereas it is necessary to improve, construct, better, extend, and maintain projects or undertakings for the control of and protection against flood and floodwaters; and

"Whereas the limitations on bonded indebtedness as set forth in the Hawaiian Organic Act and the Revised Laws of Hawaii limit the city and county in the issuance of bonds to finance such public improvement: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, requested through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii to enact legislation which will enable the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act, or any laws of the Territory of Hawaii or of any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, to authorize the board of supervisors of the city and county

of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of \$1,200,000 to acquire, construct, reconstruct, improve, better, extend, and maintain projects or undertakings for the control of and protection against flood and floodwaters, including the power to drain and rehabilitate lands already flooded in the city of Honolulu, and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested and urged, through said Delegate to Congress, to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue flood-control bonds

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, any provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act, of any laws of the Territory of Hawaii, or of any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, may authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of \$1,200,000 to acquire, construct, reconstruct, improve, better, extend, and maintain projects or undertakings for the control of and protection against flood and floodwaters, including the power to drain and rehabilitate lands already flooded in the city of Honolulu.

"SEC. 2. The bonds or obligations herein authorized to be issued shall be coupon in form, shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 5 percent per annum, and shall mature serially over a period of not to exceed 30 years, with or without the privilege of prior redemption as the board of supervisors may by resolution determine. If sold to the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, said bonds or obligations may be sold at private sale at not less than par and accrued interest to the date of such sale. No election shall be necessary to authorize such bonds or other obligations, which may bear such date or dates, may be payable at such place or places, and may carry such registration privileges as to either principal and interest or as to principal only, as the treasurer of said city and county of Honolulu, with the approval of the board of supervisors thereof, may provide. Except where inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of chapter 117 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, shall apply to bonds and other obligations used under this act. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Act 273 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949, pertaining to the issuance of flood-control bonds, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed subject to the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of such Territorial legislation by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii from time to time to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by such legislation and for the disposition of unexpended moneys realized from the sale of said bonds."

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

Three resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution petitioning the President of the United States to afford the people of the Virgin Islands an opportunity to recommend appointees for the positions of Governor, Government Secretary, and other high-ranking officials of the Government of the Virgin Islands

"Whereas under the provisions of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands the President of the United States is charged with the re-

sponsibility of appointing a Governor and Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, under the terms of the said organic act, is also required to appoint an Administrator for St. Croix, an Administrator for St. John, a Commissioner of Finance, and other executive and administrative officers; and

"Whereas while the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have conscientiously performed their functions, nevertheless, they have been deprived of the well-matured and deliberately formed will of the people; and

"Whereas the will of the people of the Virgin Islands could be obtained if the principles of the senatorial courtesy are made operative with respect to Virgin Islands appointments, and action resulting therefrom would result in a fair and liberal policy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, and it is hereby resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in session assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, petitioned to grant to the people of the Virgin Islands, through their Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, an opportunity to recommend appointees for the positions of Governor, Government Secretary, Administrator for St. Croix, Administrator for St. John, and Commissioner of Finance, until such time as the people are granted the right to elect such officials; that the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands be given a reasonable time in which to make such recommendations before final action is taken either by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Interior; and be it further

"Resolved, and it is hereby further resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President and Members of the United States Senate, and that copies thereof be transmitted to the Secretary, the Department of the Interior, the Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Insular Possessions.

"Thus passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands on May 4, 1949.

"Witness our hands and the seal of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands this 4th day of May A. D. 1949.

*"WALTER I. M. HODGE,
Chairman.
ALPHONSO S. FORBES,
Secretary."*

"Resolution protesting against the methods used by the Department of the Interior in formulating the legislative program for the Virgin Islands without giving the people an opportunity to participate therein

"Whereas the Department of the Interior will shortly present to the Eighty-first Congress for its consideration a so-called Virgin Island legislative program which undoubtedly will affect the social, economic, and political life of the people of the Virgin Islands; and

"Whereas neither the people of the Virgin Islands nor their duly elected representatives have been given an opportunity to participate in formulating this program; and

"Whereas the people of the Virgin Islands are recognized as politically matured to participate more fully in the formation of plans dealing with their social, economic, and political status: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (and it is hereby resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in session assembled), That said body protests and does hereby record its protest against the methods used by the Department of the Interior to formulate a legislative program for the Virgin Islands without giving the representatives of the people an opportunity to express their views as being arbitrary and

not in conformity with the conception of democratic operation; and be it further

"Resolved, and it is hereby further resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

"Thus passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands on May 4, 1949.

"Witness our hands and the seal of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands this 4th day of May A. D. 1949.

*"WALTER I. M. HODGE,
"Chairman.
"ALPHONSO S. FORBES,
"Secretary."*

"Resolution petitioning the Eighty-first Congress to notify the Virgin Islands Legislative Assembly when Virgin Islands matters are to be discussed by that body

"Whereas it has been authoritatively learned that congressional committees of the Eighty-first Congress of the United States are writing amendments to the Virgin Islands constitution; and

"Whereas while the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands recognizes the fact that the Eighty-first Congress is not bound by constitutional requirements to act in deference to the will of the people of the Virgin Islands, nevertheless, it feels confident in its belief that the friendly and sympathetic attitude which is characteristic of the Eighty-first Congress will motivate it to grant the request of the Virgin Islands people; and

"Whereas the Virgin Islands people desire to be given the opportunity to appear and be heard before any amendment is made to their organic act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, and it is hereby resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in session assembled, That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and is hereby petitioned to afford to the Virgin Islands people, through their legislative assembly, an opportunity to participate in the process of amending the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands and to voice their opinion on all matters which will affect the Virgin Islands and their people; and be it further

"Resolved, and it is hereby further resolved, That the several committees of the Eighty-first Congress concerned with Virgin Islands matters be and are hereby petitioned to advise the Virgin Islands Legislative Assembly in due course of time when Virgin Islands matters will receive the attention of such committees; and it is further

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate; Speaker of the House of Representatives; majority leaders of the Senate and House; chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; chairman of the House Public Lands Committee; chairmen of the Appropriations Committees; chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the President of the United States; the Department of the Interior; the Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions; the Governor of the Virgin Islands; chairman of the Democratic National Committee; chairman of the Republican National Committee; and the chairman of the Insular Democratic Committee of the Virgin Islands.

"Thus passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands on May 4, 1949.

"Witness our hands and the seal of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands this 4th day of May A. D., 1949.

*"WALTER I. M. HODGE,
"Chairman.
"ALPHONSO S. FORBES,
"Secretary."*

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Daviess County World War II Veterans' Association, Inc., of Owensboro, Ky., signed by William T. Pendleton, Jr., president, relating to pensions for World War I veterans, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, of New York, N. Y., relating to the convention on prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, from the board of directors of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, of New York, N. Y., signed by Arthur H. Ruggles, president, relating to the program of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the members of the Bordeaux Seventh-day Adventist Church, of Bordeaux, Tenn., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1415, to improve the calendar now in use by making it perpetual; to retain the number of 12 months; to equalize the quarters of the year so that days of the week and dates always agree, each quarter to have 91 days or 13 weeks or 3 months equivalent to the season and every month to have 28 weekdays plus Sundays; to begin years and weeks on the first day of the week, Sunday; to fix holidays; to give the calendar comparability, not for a year but for centuries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Raymond C. Mason Post, No. 6351, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Oak Ridge, Tenn., relating to the discharge of David E. Lillenthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of McKeesport, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Bar Association of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., relating to communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by George J. O'Bryan, chairman of the Lexington (Ky.) Army Advisory Committee, relating to the removal of subversive elements from Government offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the American Dental Assistants Association, Inc.; the American Dental Hygienists' Association of Washington, D. C.; the American Veterinary Medical Association of Chicago, Ill.; the Dallas (Tex.) Executive Committee of the Baylor University Board of Trustees; the Georgia Dental Hygienists' Association of Atlanta, Ga.; the Louisville (Ky.) District Dental Assistants Society; the Michigan State Dental Hygienists' Association of Detroit, Mich.; the New Jersey Optometric Association of Asbury Park, N. J.; the Welborn Memorial Baptist Hospital, and the Nebraska State Medical Association of Lincoln, Nebr., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact the 75-cent-minimum-wage bill

"Whereas a large number of persons engaged in industry are receiving compensation much lower than 75 cents an hour; and

"Whereas the high cost of living makes such compensation inadequate for adequate support of such workers and their families; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact speedily a law providing that the minimum rate of compensation shall be 75 cents per hour; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A resolution adopted by the Upper Mississippi Grain Shippers' Association, at Burlington, Iowa, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 211, to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended, without amendment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—
RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF
McKEESPORT, PA.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of McKeesport, Pa., May 18, 1949, relating to the proposed observance of October 11 each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day. The resolution is signed by Charles A. Kincaid, mayor of McKeesport, and Clifford W. Flegal, Sr., the city clerk. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 5584

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Resolved by the city of McKeesport, in council assembled, That—

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died of wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas various States of the Union, through legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial

Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of McKeesport, Allegheny County, Pa., That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS—RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL (MINN.) TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the St. Paul, Minn., Trades and Labor Assembly, relating to the extension of social-security benefits, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on further coverage of employees under the Social Security Act

Whereas social security has demonstrated its merit not only to the employees covered but also to the general economy of the country; and

Whereas there are thousands of workers who are not now covered by the act, such as farm workers, household workers, employees of nonprofit institutions, such as hospitals, educational institutions, etc., employees of Federal, State, and local governments and the self-employed; and

Whereas all of these employees must be provided for in their declining years if they are unable to provide for themselves; this situation brings about the condition where workers in covered employment help to provide for themselves in their declining years, and are also compelled to provide for non-covered workers through taxation; and

Whereas workers shift from one occupation to another, even in Government employment, which most people think is a permanent lifetime job; and

Whereas every time they shift from covered to noncovered employment their credits to benefits are interrupted and it seriously affects the amount they will receive upon reaching retirement age; and

Whereas many of the Government employees have independent pension plans and for that reason they are apprehensive as to what will happen to their independent plan if they were automatically brought under the Social Security System; and

Whereas in covered employment many industries had prior to the passage (and in some cases subsequent to the passage) of social security, adopted pension plans in addition to social security; and

Whereas we feel that all employees regardless where they are presently employed and coming under an independent pension plan, have a keen interest in the continuation or alteration of such a plan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we endorse and encourage the passage of amendments to the Social Security Act to bring all people enumerated above under the act. Provided, however, that in cases where private or individual pension plans now exist, that no alteration can be made unless the majority of those so covered in each plan vote in favor of such alterations.

Therefore, we urge that the amount of benefits be increased and that the age limit for men be reduced to 60 years and the age limit of women be reduced to 55 years.

ST. PAUL TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY.

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 13, 1949.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John Dewey Hickerson, of Texas, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 1918. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint contracting officers to make contracts in amounts not exceeding \$5,000; and

S. 1919. A bill to provide for the admission of pay patients to the Home for the Aged and Infirm; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1920. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1921. A bill for the relief of Tecfilo Magliocchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1922. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Atlas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1923. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to travel expense allowances for Government employee witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1924. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Walter See; and

S. 1925. A bill for the relief of Pejsach Lederman and his wife and daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1926. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1927. A bill to provide for flight experience for certain students in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1928. A bill to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Anna Samudovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to increase the representation of the several States in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. DOUGLAS), submitted amendments intended to be proposed by

them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1843) to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense: to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill his enlarged responsibility; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1843, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPARKMAN BEFORE NATIONAL PUBLIC HOUSING CONFERENCE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator SPARKMAN before the eighteenth annual meeting of the National Public Housing Conference, at Washington, D. C., on May 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

A VERY GREAT TRAGEDY OF OUR TIMES—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Very Great Tragedy of Our Times," by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times, May 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S WELFARE BUDGET AND ELIMINATION OF SUBSIDIES—LETTER FROM WARREN E. WALKER

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to him by Warren E. Walker, of Wichita, Kans., urging elimination of subsidies of all kinds, and opposing some of the President's welfare budget, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEAK UP FOR DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY ULRIC M. GWYNN, JR.

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Speak Up for Democracy," delivered by Ulric M. Gwynn, Jr., vice president of the North Dakota Junior Chamber of Commerce, entered in competition as a part of a national Speak Up for Democracy speech contest sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE—EDITORIAL BY E. T. LEECH

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Old and Evil Scheme Seeks To End Our Liberty," written by E. T. Leech, editor of the Pittsburgh Press, and published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESENT CRIME PICTURE—ARTICLE BY J. POPE DYER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the Present Crime Picture, delivered by J. Pope Dyer, head of the social science department, Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn., to the student body at chapel, April 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GREAT LAKES SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we of the Middle West had hoped that long before this the Senate and, yes, the House of

Representatives would have before them, on the basis of favorable committee reports, legislation to complete the long-deferred Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. Unfortunately, this has not occurred because, I regret to say, the administration has lagged completely in its obligations to the American people. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement which I have prepared regarding this matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, CHAIRMAN, IN EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, OF SEAWAY SUBCOMMITTEE

LET THE ADMINISTRATION ACT AND QUIT STALLING ON SEAWAY LEGISLATION

I challenge the administration to get busy in the fight for the Great Lakes seaway. The people of the Middle West are sore and sick about the continued disgraceful stalling by the administration on seaway legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. For 5 months now, since the start of the Congress, we have patiently awaited the green light from the administration to push hard for a new bill, but the administration, which is supposedly committed to the seaway, has been asleep at the switch. It has given the seaway priority. It has ignored seaway inquiries and requests. It has always given token support and lip service to the seaway, but in the 5 months of my pleading for action and support about all that the administration has done is to yawn and then go back to sleep.

FULL DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT NECESSARY

Since the Democrats control both Houses of the Congress, it was apparent to the Republican minority that we must get Democratic support and cosponsorship in the Congress as well as heavy support in the Government agencies (even before we reintroduce a seaway bill) if this bill were to have any chance of success. We Republicans were not interested merely in token introduction of a seaway bill and then allowing it to die for lack of support. We are sick and disgusted over those who pay lip service to the seaway and yet are unwilling to lift a hand for it.

LIMITED SUCCESS THIS SESSION POSSIBLE

It has become obvious that it is too late in the first session to expect more than favorable action by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on a seaway bill, once it is introduced on the Senate side. We will, however, have an up-hill fight to attain even that limited objective. Of course, in spite of the administration's stalling, we will be fighting hard for passage of the seaway bill in both Houses of the Congress during the second session which will presumably open next January. The people of the Middle West and of the Nation should however be informed that the administration has done a miserable job of stalling and subterfuge thus far. I use these words very advisedly. The seaway has never been a partisan matter, but administration tactics have left me no alternative but to denounce their partisan approach.

FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE IRON-ORE SHORTAGE

As a vital part of the seaway study, I suggested months ago to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is supposed to be investigating shortage of national resources, that it investigate the critical subject of the exhaustion of the Mesabi Iron Range (one of the principal reasons why we must get the seaway enacted). After weeks of delay, that committee responded by a silly acknowledgment which said nothing, meant nothing, and did nothing.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S PUSSYFOOTING

I have urged the State Department repeatedly to mobilize the same sort of force and vigor that it has mobilized for the North Atlantic Pact and other administration pet projects in support of the seaway bill. We all recognize the importance of world collective security. But the people of Wisconsin also recognize that we are pumping hundreds of millions of dollars overseas to build hydroelectric and similar projects, while the administration has not lifted so much as a pinkie to have this Congress support a self-liquidating loan for the completion of this long-deferred Great Lakes seaway and power project.

TRUMAN'S DIRECTIVES SABOTAGED BY UNDERLINGS

President Truman has repeatedly indicated his full support of the seaway and I have no criticism whatsoever of him on this point. However, his directives have been sabotaged by the indifference, the lethargy, the apathy, of his alleged supporters who perpetually protest that they are "too busy" with other things to take up the seaway. I have held conference after conference in my office and on the Senate floor in trying to lay plans for the seaway battle, but the administration has continued to yawn and yawn. I call upon the administration, therefore and challenge it to fulfill its promise and to start to get busy on this vital front. The Middle West refuses to be further hoodwinked and double-crossed by administration alibis and excuses.

OLEOMARGARINE PRICES—EDITORIAL FROM CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Monday, May 16, 1949, by John C. Davis, entitled "Added Color Raises Price."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDED COLOR RAISES PRICE—SOME FACTS PICKED AT RANDOM ON THE MARGARINE-BUTTER TANGLE

(By John C. Davis)

If and when the margarine interests get the right to color their product yellow, the housewife in whose name the lawmakers will have granted the privilege, will find that it isn't only the vegetable table spread that glistens. She will find that her money, in the coffers of the companies, will have a golden glow.

That the margarine makers will extract a rather handsome pound of flesh from the pocketbook is indicated in a recent survey made of comparative retail prices of the yellow-colored and uncolored product in nine cities in as many States. The difference in price between the artificially colored and uncolored product was 21.8 cents a pound. Subtracting the 10-cent Federal tax and the 1-cent cost of wrapping and packaging in quarter pounds leaves 10.8 cents the housewife is paying for the privilege of having the manufacturer squeeze the yellow compound into the fat.

PAY ADDITIONAL

Considering that the yellow color adds nothing to the nutritional value of the product and that the manufacturing cost of adding the color in volume production runs 30 cents a ton, the 10.8 cents additional the housewife will pay for the colored product is a handsome slice. Russell Fifer, secretary of the American Butter Institute, concedes that this spread will probably be reduced as soon as the margarine people get the swing of mass production—and recover some of the expenditure made in waging the legislative battle to get the yellow-coloring privilege.

There is, and always has been, a foreign element in this butter-margarine battle little appreciated by the general public. It is the use of imported vegetable fats in the manufacture of margarine. Prior to the war about 90 percent of the fat used in making the product was imported coconut oil. When the war cut off this supply the manufacturers turned to domestic cottonseed and soybean oils. With the war over, the question arises as to whether or not the imported oil will again replace the domestic product. Manufacturers waging the battle to color their product in the traditional hue of butter say not.

Whether or not the cheaper coconut oil will replace the domestic cottonseed and soybean oil is a matter of opinion, but a recent development in the manufacturing ranks may have some bearing on the issue.

Recently, Lever Bros., American subsidiary of Unilever, Ltd., London, England, purchased the Jelke Co. of New Jersey. Jelke has long been a leader in the margarine field and the Lever move is a step toward advancing the Unilever margarine operations in the United States. That Unilever should eye the American market, the world's best, is natural. Few folks realize it, but the British outfit is the world's largest in the margarine field, making today about 40 percent of the world's total production. It goes without saying that they are using the cheap coconut oil in their production.

A naive observer viewing the movement of both of Unilever's giant feet into Uncle Sam's puddle would be pardoned for inquiring whether the company intended the use of coconut oil in the product manufactured to supply our market.

ANOTHER PHASE

There is another phase of this margarine-butter battle recently given a trial run on which the public should know the facts. It is the charge by the butter people that if margarine manufacturers are given the right to color their product in perfect imitation of butter—it will be sold to the public as butter. This is a charge that the margarine people deny and point out that their proposed law giving them the right to color, both in the National Congress and various State legislatures, strictly prohibits such practice.

The State of Arkansas has enacted such a law. A recent survey was made of 100 restaurants in 9 cities in that State and the record, as the late Al Smith was wont to point out, is revealing. In the 100 eating places, not one stated that it was serving margarine. In 66 of the 100 margarine was served as butter and 6 of the 66 stated in their menus that butter was being served.

The above facts were gathered by Russell Fifer and could be attacked as biased and not unprejudiced. They have been so attacked—but, more interesting to the public is the fact that their truth was not challenged.

There is a side light to the margarine-butter battle in which the latter is struggling to hold exclusive right to its traditional yellow color. Recently, Lever Bros. won a 10-year court battle to the exclusive right to the color red in a cake of soap. The winning argument was that their use of red was traditional—just how traditional is butter's right to the color of yellow?

No one argues the right of margarine to be freed from the discriminatory State and Federal taxes that have been levied against it through the years. But, as shown above, there is at least room for a difference of opinion as to whether it should be given the right to butter's traditional yellow. It could, as it seems to have done in Arkansas, lead to some public fraud.

The real issue, however, one with large economic implications to the farmers of the United States of America, is the question of whether or not domestic oils would continue

as the margarine base. Only the manufacturers know whether they plan to replace with imported coconut oil. A direct answer, accompanied by convincing assurances, would go far toward clearing the muddy skies in this battle of table fats for the housewives' gold.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN asked and obtained consent that Mr. KNOWLAND be excused from attendance at the session of the Senate today.

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week.

Mr. JENNER asked and obtained consent to be absent from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from Wednesday through Friday of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia to meet this afternoon for the consideration of Senate bill 1703.

Mr. NEELY asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to hold hearings on Senate bill 1031 while the Senate is in session.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1843) to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense; to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill the enlarged responsibility; and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to present a series of five amendments to the pending bill, Senate bill 1843. At the outset, let me make perfectly clear my position on this entire matter of unification of the armed services. I am for it, and I have been for it ever since it came to a head back in 1944.

When the National Security Act of 1947 was enacted I felt that it fell far short of the mark, but I was content to give it a chance. From the day it became law I watched its operation with intense interest. It soon became painfully apparent that this compromise with reality was not working. We need look back only to the situation as it existed in April of last year to confirm the truth of that statement, for at that time public dissatisfaction with the results of this law was clearly evident in the daily comments of the press and radio. At that time the situation was deteriorating so rapidly that on April 20, 1948, I introduced a bill, Senate bill 2523, which proposed to amend the 1947 act by greatly strengthening the powers of the Secretary of Defense and clarifying his authority and responsibility.

That bill lay in committee without action for the remainder of the session. In the meantime our progress toward unification continued to flounder along under the completely unworkable provisions of the 1947 act.

Fortunately for the Nation, we had as our first Secretary of Defense a man with the most remarkable ability, as well as an incomparable sense of public duty. But even his matchless talents could not forge into this instrument the precision and the strength necessary to effect the conversion of our sprawling military establishment into a machine geared to cope with the military realities of a modern world.

In speaking of the late Secretary of Defense, Mr. President, I feel that today the United States Senate is engaged in the solemn task of erecting a great monument to him. That monument should be the perfecting on the floor of the United States Senate of a unification bill which will carry out the hopes and aspirations of a great fallen leader.

There is no question about the fact that the Nation is greatly shocked and grieved, from coast to coast, over the tragic loss of James Forrestal. There is nothing I can add by way of tribute to the beautiful and sincere words which were spoken by a group of my colleagues on the floor of the Senate yesterday. But in memory of James Forrestal I would put in the Record today a reassertion of his faith in freedom, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee time and again I have seen James Forrestal fight for the safeguards of freedom and for the principles of democracy which make this Nation strong.

I recall one instance which I think is the most fitting tribute I can pay to the statesmanship of James Forrestal. Many months ago, James Forrestal appeared before an executive session of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate. There were present in the room with him all the leaders of the Military Establishment. Our committee was confronted with a combination of recommendations on the part of those military leaders for a military budget which added up to a little more than \$21,000,000,000. At that time we were considering a national budget of approximately \$40,000,000,000. I shall never forget either the expression on James Forrestal's face or the fearless words of leadership which he spoke on that occasion. After the addition was completed and a member of the committee pointed out that the total amount was more than \$21,000,000,000, one of the high military officers in the room expressed the view that although it was more than \$21,000,000,000, it would cost us many times \$21,000,000,000 if we had to go to war to protect freedom in the world.

James Forrestal, with a clear-eyed look, faced that military official and said "But the paradox of this proposal is that if we proceed to make it a peacetime budget on the basis of your argument that it would cost more than \$21,000,000,000 to win a fight for freedom in case of war, I say to you that we would lose freedom here at home while engaged in a fight to preserve freedom in the world."

I think it is due James Forrestal to say today, because so much misinformation is abroad in regard to his position concerning the amount of appropriations for the military budget, that not only on that occasion, but on several other occasions,

I heard James Forrestal in executive sessions of the Armed Services Committee make perfectly clear to the leaders of our Military Establishment that any such appropriations as they were recommending, getting up into figures above \$20,000,000,000, could not possibly be maintained in the United States for long if at the same time we were to maintain a free economy.

I think it is due Jim Forrestal also to point out that in the presence of the members of the Armed Services Committee on many occasions he warned the officials of the Military Establishment that there rests upon them the obligation to preserve the maximum peacetime economy in the operation of the Military Establishment if we are to preserve a free-enterprise system. Any criticisms or any representations to the effect that James Forrestal believed in an unnecessarily high military budget cannot be squared with his oft-repeated testimony before the Armed Services Committee. He was well aware of the fact that there is a need for the elimination of great waste in the operation of the Military Establishment. I am satisfied in my own thinking, from what I have heard him express from his own lips both before the committee and in private conversation, that James Forrestal knew that there was need for a unification act which would vest in the Secretary of Defense the authority and the power and the jurisdiction to bring about the large savings that can be brought about by any Secretary of Defense who has the will to do so. However, no Secretary of Defense can do the job that needs to be done unless the Congress of the United States has the will and the courage and the statesmanship to give him a unification act which vests in him the authority he needs in order to bring about the great savings which each member of the Armed Services Committee, I am satisfied, knows in his own conscience can be made.

So, Mr. President, in erecting this monument today, as I feel we are, to James Forrestal, I hope it will be a monument that truly honors him. I hope it will be in the form of a unification act which gives to his successor the power and jurisdiction and authority which the Congress of the United States in 1947 should have given to Mr. Forrestal. I mean no unkindness, Mr. President, but I am simply making a statement of what I believe to be a fact, namely, that if we had given the Secretary of Defense in 1947 the unification bill which we should have given him, he would have been able to do the job which I know in his heart and mind he was struggling to do, and he would have completed the job, to his everlasting credit. He would have been of great assistance in protecting the economy of his country; and his tragic death, which we mourn today, perhaps would not have occurred.

So, Mr. President, with those words in regard to a public servant for whom I had the greatest of respect, and in whom I had placed the greatest of confidence, I proceed now to discuss certain amendments which I think essential if we are to enact, in the form of this bill, legislation which will truly unify the armed

services and give due honor to James Forrestal.

I referred to the unification bill which I first introduced on April 20, 1948, then known as Senate bill 2523. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that at the time I introduced that bill, I made a brief statement in which I pointed out that the law then on the statute books provided for unification in name only, but not in fact, and that we had not given the Secretary of Defense the authority which he must have if he is to accomplish the purpose of true unification.

It was very typical of James Forrestal, Mr. President, that he called me on the telephone the next day, and said to me, "Wayne"—and, Mr. President, I think I quote him almost verbatim; certainly I quote him according to the best of my recollection—"Wayne, I have read your bill and I have read your speech. I do not wish to give you the impression that I agree with everything in your bill or in your speech, but I think you have performed a valuable service in making the speech and introducing the bill, and I want to say to you that your bill, taken as a whole, is a great improvement over the existing law."

That was the view which James Forrestal expressed to me the day after the introduction of Senate bill 2523.

Mr. President, he had a keen sense of humor. I said to him then, "Well, Jim, I understand that if I come down to the Pentagon Building today, I had better bring a civilian bodyguard with me."

He laughed, and said, "Wayne, if you need a military bodyguard, I will send one to bring you down here, because I want to sit down with you and discuss some of the provisions of your bill."

A few days later that discussion was held. I do not say here today that if James Forrestal were alive he would put his stamp of approval on each and every amendment which I shall submit. Nevertheless I do say that I am satisfied in my own heart, conscience, and mind that I shall not offer a single amendment today which would not carry out at least the objectives and desires of the former Secretary of Defense, insofar as vesting in the Secretary of Defense additional powers which I submit the Tydings bill fails to give to the Secretary of Defense to the degree necessary if we are to have effective unification.

On January 5 of this year, I reintroduced my bill of April 20, 1947, which then became known as Senate bill 108, in the Eighty-first Congress. The bill was referred to the Secretary of Defense for comment, on January 6. Since that time and throughout the hearings on the pending measure, my bill, Senate bill 108, has led a very quiet life, indeed. Why it has never received formal consideration and why, on the other hand, the Senate Committee on Armed Services has gone to such pains to draft a bill which contains so much of the philosophy of Senate bill 108, is scarcely pertinent to this discussion.

What is pertinent, however, is that in our handling of Senate bill 1843, the Tydings bill, we do not repeat the same mistakes which were made in the 1947 act, and that we do not perpetuate the atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty

which beclouds the authority and responsibility of our civilian and military leaders, on whose shoulders we place the responsibility for the security of our Nation. Those are the things that are important, Mr. President, in the debate now taking place in the Senate.

I think Senate bill 1843, the Tydings bill, fails in five important and practical instances, and I feel that my amendments to correct those weaknesses deserve the serious consideration of the Senate of the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland yesterday in his opening statement in the debate on the pending bill was entirely right when he said that, although the vote in the Armed Services Committee was 12 to 1 to report the pending bill, nevertheless all 13 members of the committee are of one mind in their belief that greater unification of our armed services is necessary. He was quite right when he pointed out that the junior Senator from Oregon was the dissenter in the committee and refused to vote for the Tydings bill, because of the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon honestly believes that the Tydings bill does not go far enough in unifying the armed services, particularly in respect to the fact that in my opinion, it does not vest in the Secretary of Defense, the administrative authority and jurisdiction he needs, if we are to effectuate true unification.

To begin with, on page 4, line 14, the bill undertakes with considerable apparent zeal to direct the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary steps "to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, research, and personnel." This is a splendid directive, Mr. President. If realistically applied in the field of procurement alone, it would contribute immeasurably to the efficiency and the economy of our Military Establishment. But I detect the familiar signs of doubt and compromise, as I pursue the text further; for instead of placing a period after the word "proper" in line 19, the language proceeds to vitiate the good of the preceding provision for the next eight lines contain so many alleged safeguards that the Secretary of Defense again finds himself in a complete quandary as to what the law really means. Instead of giving him a clear and courageous directive we are again placing him in a position where he can be attacked by an overzealous subordinate official.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland, in his opening statement on the pending bill yesterday afternoon, referred to a conversation which he had in an executive session of the Armed Services Committee yesterday morning with the new Secretary of Defense, a distinguished leader in our country, Mr. Louis Johnson. He correctly quoted the Secretary of Defense to the effect that the Secretary of Defense said that unification legislation, on his list, has the top position of priority. In other words, the present Secretary of Defense expressed to the committee yesterday his view, after a few short weeks in the office, that a new unification bill is at the

top of his list, so far as the greatest need of the Military Establishment at the present moment is concerned. However, I do not want any Member of the Senate to infer from what the Senator from Maryland said yesterday in regard to the conversation he had before our committee yesterday morning with the Secretary of Defense that the Secretary of Defense at that meeting said the Tydings bill has the position of top priority on his list of needs for the Military Establishment. I recognized, while the committee was hearing the statement of the Secretary of Defense, that unless that point were made perfectly clear there might be a misinterpretation of the statement, and that it might be subject to representation that the Secretary of Defense believes this particular bill is the best bill that can be obtained, or that should be obtained, and that this particular bill is the one which should be passed in all of its sections. That is not what he said, Mr. President, and I made very certain to satisfy myself at that meeting as to exactly what the Secretary's position was in regard to the Tydings bill and in respect to whether in his opinion it is in need of amendment. So I said—and I shall let the transcript speak for itself, but I think the transcript will show that what I am about to say is a very accurate report of what the Secretary of Defense said in reply to a question I put to him—"Mr. Secretary, you know I am opposed to the unification bill that will be debated this afternoon in the Senate because, in my opinion, it does not go far enough with unification. Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I want to ask you, without any desire to embarrass you, whether in your opinion the bill could be greatly improved by substantial amendments." He said, "Yes; I think it could be improved." I said, "Mr. Chairman, I will rest at this point because I do not wish to embarrass the Secretary, in view of the fact that this committee has reported a so-called unification bill to the floor of the Senate, but I do intend to offer perfecting amendments on the floor of the Senate."

I think a case could be made for recommitting the bill on the basis of the statement of the Secretary of Defense before the Armed Services Committee yesterday morning. If the Secretary of Defense is willing to admit, as he did yesterday, that this bill can be improved by substantial amendments, I think the Armed Services Committee owes it to this Senate to discuss such amendments with the Secretary of Defense. I think the Armed Services Committee owes it to the Senate to tell the Senate just why it is not recommending specific amendments which the Secretary of Defense apparently thinks would improve this bill. In his answer to my question yesterday the Secretary of Defense satisfied me that I am fully justified in making this fight for amendments which will give the Secretary of Defense greater authority to unify the armed services.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Was that statement on the record, or off the record?

Mr. MORSE. I think it was on the record. We can check. A reporter was present. Some of the statements yesterday morning were put on the record, some were off the record. The Secretary of Defense spoke part of the time on the record, part of the time off the record. But I shall be glad to check to see whether his statement is on the record. I shall be glad to ask my colleagues on the committee to "take the stand," so to speak, as my own witnesses in regard to the report I have given the Senate as to the position taken yesterday by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. LODGE. I noticed the Senator's very telling reference to the phrase beginning with the word "but" in line 19, on page 4, and I wanted to ask the Senator whether he recalled that Secretary Johnson had requested the insertion of that language.

Mr. MORSE. I understand he did recommend it.

Mr. LODGE. Did he request the insertion of this phraseology, limiting him so that he could not transfer personnel?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; in the original bill.

Mr. LODGE. Is that on the record?

Mr. MORSE. It is in the original bill, and the original bill was defended before the committee by the Secretary of Defense in respect to that particular section.

Mr. LODGE. The original bill did not contain the words "or to make transfers of military personnel from one military department to another." That was inserted later.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; that was inserted later. But, as I recall—and the Senator from Massachusetts can refresh my memory—when the Senator from Massachusetts sat with our committee and discussed portions of the bill, I think he at that time brought out the very weakness in the bill he is bringing out now, which opinion I completely share with the Senator from Massachusetts. It was to my disappointment at that time that the Secretary of Defense, in his testimony before the committee, did not accept the point of view which the Senator from Massachusetts and I have shared on this subject.

Mr. LODGE. I must say it is a very profound disappointment to me. I heard the statement made yesterday, and I asked the Senator from Maryland if he could direct me to any words in the record in which the Secretary of Defense definitely stated, over his signature, that he favored a limitation which would prohibit him from making transfers of personnel from one department to another, and, yesterday, the Senator from Maryland was unable to do so. So I gave the Secretary of Defense the benefit of the doubt and assumed he was not trying to put limitations in the bill which would make it impossible for him to have real unification. But the Senator from Oregon indicates the Secretary of Defense is in favor of this limitation.

Mr. MORSE. I do not propose to speak for the Secretary of Defense. That is why I have been very careful to make my quotation only of what actually transpired before the Armed Services Committee yesterday morning, because I did not want in any way to embarrass

the Secretary of Defense nor purport to speak for him. I did not press my examination yesterday morning when I asked him if, in his opinion, the present bill could be greatly improved by substantial amendments, and he replied that, in his opinion, it could.

On the point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts let me say that I have in my hand a copy of the original bill as it was submitted to the committee. It is the first draft of the bill—

Mr. LODGE. Is that Senate bill 1269?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. On page 4, line 20, thereof, this language is found:

But this shall not be construed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to reassign the combatant functions assigned to the military departments by section 205 (e), 206 (b), 208 (c), and 208 (f) hereof.

It was by understanding, and it is now my understanding, that this bill was sent to the committee by the Secretary of Defense with his approval. I take it for granted that the Secretary of Defense approved the bill only after accepting what I imagine were a great many compromises which he felt he had to accept to get any bill at all. I have a hunch that he accepted this particular language, apparently, as, shall I say, an acceptable compromise so far as he was concerned, but it is not acceptable so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Am I not correct in my belief that in the committee bill the following words were added to the original committee print: "or to make transfers of military personnel from one military department to another or to make details or assignments of military personnel in a matter substantially to affect or change such assigned combatant functions."

Am I not correct in my belief that that is an additional provision written by the committee?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, again, it is my understanding that the language he quotes was an addition to the bill. It was another compromise which I believe had to be made to bring about satisfactory agreements within the Military Establishment. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Defense, in order to reach as much agreement as was possible within the Military Establishment, also accepted that compromise.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator aware that yesterday afternoon I asked the Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the committee, what the reason was for that language, and the Senator from Maryland said, in substance, that it was put in for the reason that unless the language were in the bill, the committee could not get the necessary votes to report the bill. I asked the Senator from Maryland if he could not give me some substantive reasons for inserting that language, and he simply repeated the assertion that he could not get the bill out of the committee without it, because

there were people who controlled votes, and the bill could not be reported unless it contained that language. So that brought me to the conclusion that if he could not find any arguments for it on its merits, it had no merits, and was incorporated in the bill simply to placate certain vested interests.

What does the Senator from Oregon say about that?

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts knows that I have complete confidence in the motivation of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. I do not share their view as to certain matters of judgment. Therefore I would rather put it this way, that the chairman of the committee found that in the judgment of a majority of his colleagues on the committee he could not get the necessary votes to report the bill unless he put in the bill at this point what I think is very unfortunate language and which I think is one of the greatest barriers to true unification of the armed services.

I want to project that situation in the Armed Services Committee to the Pentagon Building, because we must also try to understand the position not only of the Senator from Maryland as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, but we must also consider the position of the Secretary of Defense who is somewhat of a chairman of the Military Establishment in the Pentagon Building.

I think the pressure and drive for this sort of language not only manifested itself within the committee, but I take it for granted—and, again, I certainly do not speak for the Secretary of Defense—that it was also exerted upon the Secretary of Defense. I am inclined to believe it represents one of the concessions he had to make in order to present to the committee the maximum amount of cooperation and esprit de corps on the part of the Military Establishment in the Pentagon Building.

I am sure I do not have to tell the Senator from Massachusetts how those matters work, because he is so much more familiar with military affairs—and that is why I have such great confidence in his judgment—than is the junior Senator from Oregon. I know I do not have to tell him of the tremendous military pressures which can be brought to bear upon either the Secretary of Defense or the judgment of Members of the Senate when they are considering legislation affecting the Military Establishment.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Oregon is very generous in his references to me. As a matter of fact, I have no personal experience of the military at the dizzy heights of the top levels in the Pentagon Building, but I do know that mistakes made in this bill will be paid for in the blood of our sons, and I do know that war has to be conducted on a basis on which prompt decisions can be made, and we should not set up a debating society or a system of checks and balances.

Yesterday I tried to find out from the Senator from Maryland and from the Senator from Oregon why it is that some people want this joker in the bill. I

am choosing my words very carefully. It is a military atrocity. That is what it is.

What is the real reason which motivates the men who are in favor of it? I think we should be able to find out some time. I asked the question very loudly yesterday, and I am asking it very loudly today. It can be heard by the gentlemen of the press and the public in the galleries. I want to see if we can find out what is the substantial reason for putting a provision into the bill which will make it very difficult to get economies in time of peace and will destroy fluidity in connection with putting men where they are most needed in time of war.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot answer the question for any member of the committee except myself. I cannot answer the question for the Secretary of Defense, but I can give the Senator the benefit of my judgment for whatever it may be worth. My judgment, may I say, is that I am satisfied that vested interests within the Military Establishment succeeded in persuading members of the committee to the point of view that unless this language were put into the bill civilians rather than the military would be directing a war.

The only argument I have heard that has received any considerable stress and emphasis in the committee is to the effect that this language is needed if the military is going to conduct any possible war. It is up to the military, runs the argument, to determine in what branch of the service the men should be and what the organizations of combat forces should be. Further, it is argued that the military should not be put in the position where there is a division of command, so to speak, between a civilian head and Chiefs of Staff, where the civilian head has the authority to direct the transfer of combatant personnel. That is the argument I have heard in the committee, and I wish to say I think it is a fallacious and unsound argument. I never was impressed with it, because I think it of the utmost importance that our future wars, if, unfortunately, any should occur, should be conducted through a civilian Secretary of Defense, a man in whom we have confidence, with Under Secretaries of Defense in whom we have confidence assisting him. These civilian Secretaries of Defense should be unhandicapped, as far as the policy of unification is concerned, by the sort of restrictions this particular language imposes on them, for reasons which I shall bring out very shortly in my formal remarks. Obviously, they will follow the combat tactics and recommendations of the Joint Chiefs but they will be able to avoid the wastes and mistakes that a lack of unification cost us in the last war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is not the reason this bill is here today, and we are now forced to try to do something more about unification—for, at present, we do not have an effective, efficient unification—the fact

that when we passed the existing law some 2 years ago, we put into it too many things, such as those embodied in the language to which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Massachusetts have addressed themselves?

Mr. MORSE. I have already pointed that out. We are engaged in this debate today because we did not do a good enough job in 1947, and what I fear is that unless we adopt some amendments to the bill we are not going to do a good enough job in 1949.

Mr. HILL. In 1947 there was too much compromise, compromise, compromise, instead of doing the job. Is not that true?

Mr. MORSE. That is my judgment.

Mr. HILL. And we are confronted to a very large extent with the same situation today. Will we really do the job? Will we really give the country an effective and efficient unification? Or will we merely take a little bite at it, so to speak, and come back 2 years from now and try to do it all over again? Heaven only knows what the ill consequences will be, what price we will pay for not acting adequately and properly at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Again, Mr. President, I want to be exceedingly fair to my colleagues on the committee. I attribute to them no motivations but the best. I simply disagree with their main conclusion when they report this bill favorably to the Senate, because I believe, as the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, it contains too many compromises, which will not result in true unification.

I wish to be just as fair to the Secretary of Defense. I desire to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I do not think he can find a word in the transcript of the record in which the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, has put his affirmative stamp of approval on this particular language. But it is also true that there is nothing in the record showing that the Secretary of Defense has expressed any disapproval of this particular language.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Then the Senator believes that the Secretary did not ask to have this language put in the bill. Is that true?

Mr. MORSE. I know of no proof that he asked to have the language put in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. But he may have said he would not object if it were?

Mr. MORSE. My own judgment is that you have just pointed out exactly the position in which the Secretary of Defense found himself. He is going to take this bill, he is willing to accept the bill, but he thinks it could be improved by substantial amendments. That is why I related to the Senate the conversation with the Secretary of Defense yesterday morning in committee, to which the Senator from Maryland has already referred, when the Secretary of Defense, in answer to a question which I put to him yesterday, made perfectly clear that he believed the pending bill could be strengthened by further amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The statement was made yesterday, I think, that Secretary Johnson had requested this language. The Senator knows of nothing in the record to support that contention, does he?

Mr. MORSE. I know of no proof of that, but it may have been said in my absence.

Mr. President, I was saying that instead of giving the Secretary of Defense a clear and courageous directive, we are again placing him in a position where he can be attacked by any overly jealous subordinate official. If anyone thinks I am exaggerating this point, I would have him consider the language of the bill. The text of the bill says that the Secretary shall effect such consolidations in, among other things, transportation, as will eliminate duplication, but this shall not be construed to reassign the combat functions assigned to the Army by section 205 (e). Section 205 (e) deals with the Army, and prescribes that the Army shall include, among other things, such water transport as may be organic therein.

Here is the point I seek to make: We all know that the Secretary of Defense has long recognized the wastefulness of having a large cargo fleet operated by the Army, whereas the Navy is the logical service to operate water-borne transport. But under the limitations written into the pending bill, can we not imagine the legal and political battle which the Secretary will have on his hands if he so much as transfers one Liberty ship from the Army to the Navy?

Mr. President, I think I have made the point. I do not desire to dwell on it too long, but I reemphasize it, only to the extent of saying that it is one specific example which shows, as I read the Tydings bill, how we handcuff the Secretary of Defense in carrying out true unification. We restrict him in increasing the efficiency of the operation of the Military Establishment, and in effecting needed economy. I say we ought to leave it to the Secretary of Defense, who is not going to operate in a vacuum, who is not going to render his decisions without consultation not only with the military leaders of the Military Establishment, but with the civilian assistants appointed to his staff to decide what needs to be done to unify the armed services.

Mr. President, I want the Secretary of Defense empowered under this unification bill to bring an end, if he decides the facts warrant such a decision, to what I think is a wasteful duplication of water transport within the Military Establishment. I want him to be given the power, if after a study of the facts he decides that such an order should be issued, to transfer water transport from the Army to the Navy.

Mr. President, I simply do not see how it is possible to effectuate the economy and bring about the military efficiencies which are necessary under a true unification bill if we leave this particular language in the bill.

One of the amendments I shall offer shortly leaves no room for doubt that Members of the Senate will be given an opportunity to vote on the issue whether or not they want to give the Secretary

of Defense the power and jurisdiction to render decisions, or whether they want him to be hog-tied by the brass in the Pentagon Building.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator is telling the Senate is that if we do not give him the power to which the Senator has referred, we then defeat one of the signal purposes of unification.

Mr. MORSE. Unless we give him the power it is a mockery. It verges, I may say to the Senator from Alabama, on misleading the public into thinking they are getting something which in fact they are not getting.

Now, Mr. President, let us take the limitation on the top of page 5, wherein it is stated that this authority to effect consolidation shall not be construed to permit the Secretary—note the language—

To make details * * * of military personnel in a manner substantially to affect * * * combatant functions.

As a practical matter has this any real meaning, and does it do anything but becloud the issue? Let us talk about it in terms of a hypothetical. If the Secretary details 500 naval aviators for 12 months duty with the B-36 bombers of the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force so that they will learn this type of warfare and this type of equipment, I think, under this language, he would be subject to endless charges that he is trying to swallow up either naval aviation or the Air Force. But in reality, I think, there would be many circumstances such as this that would indicate he would be doing a very wise thing by such a detailing of personnel to special assignments and missions. Why not give him the authority to do it? Why surround him with all these hedges and fences of jurisdictional restriction?

Now, Mr. President, it probably will be argued that the amendment which I am offering endangers the existence of some existing military establishments such as the Army, the Air Forces, or Navy with its Marine Corps.

It may be argued that the amendment I am proposing decreases the control of Congress over the Military Establishment. I say there is no basis in fact for such an argument. I say that such an argument is based on special pleading in support of some vested interest within the Military Establishment. It represents the unfounded contention of some groups within the military which is fearful that unification might force it to operate on a more efficient and economical basis by way of resulting cuts in duplication and waste.

When the argument is made against my amendment, as I am sure it will be, that the amendment seeks to empower the Secretary of Defense to abolish the existing branches of the Military Establishment I would have the Members of the Senate remember that when an officer is commissioned in the Military Establishment he is commissioned in the Army, in the Air Forces, or in the Navy including the Marine Corps. He is commissioned upon the recommendation of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy,

and Air Forces, and confirmed by the Senate.

The Secretary of Defense is given no authority under my amendment to make a captain of Marines a captain of Infantry in the Army. He is given no authority to make an admiral in the Navy a general in the Army. The existing organizations of the Army, Air Forces, and Navy, including the Marines, would be continued. But the Secretary of Defense in the interest of unification, in the interest of efficiency, and in the interest of economy should have the right to detail men from naval aviation, for example, to the Air Forces for a special mission or for special training and vice versa.

The Secretary of Defense should be given the authority, for example, to say, by way of order that certain duplicating functions now existing should be eliminated by one branch of the service. That is unification, Mr. President.

Now, we either mean to unify the armed forces or we do not. There is no unification possible if we continue to preserve every jurisdictional claim of every existing division, department, or segment of the Army, Air Forces, and Navy as they presently operate. I think it is an argument of imagination to say that under my amendment a Secretary of Defense might attempt, by reassignment or by detailing personnel for special missions from one branch of the service to another, to abolish the Marine Corps or the Navy or any other branch of the services.

What do the proponents of this argument think that the President of the United States or the Congress would be doing if any Secretary of Defense attempted any such course of action? What do they think the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate would be doing? The Secretary of Defense cannot act in a vacuum nor can he act in secrecy in connection with such matters as these. Further, I say, Mr. President, he cannot act in the interest of unification either unless we give him the jurisdiction which my amendment gives to him to work out greater economy and efficiency within the Army, Air Forces, Navy, and Marine Corps by eliminating existing duplication and waste.

That is the issue, Mr. President. I warn Members of the Senate not to be diverted from it by all the rattling of ghosts and imaginative scarecrows that are going to be advanced in argument during the course of this debate by those who want to protect the existing no trespassing signs which the Army, Air Forces, and Navy, including the Marines, have tacked up figuratively over their offices in the Pentagon Building.

I think the issue is simple. Is the Congress of the United States going to place its confidence in the civilians appointed to these high positions in the Military Establishment, in the offices of Secretary of Defense and Under Secretary of Defense, or is the Congress going to take the position, as it did under the old unification bill, and as I say it would still be doing under the Tydings bill, that handcuffs should be placed on the wrists of the Secretary of Defense in the form of vetoes as represented by such language as I have just cited?

I want to free the Secretary of Defense so that he can make decisions in the Pentagon Building. After he has listened to the arguments and the evidence the brass can present to him—and I mean no disrespect to military officers by the use of that colloquialism—after he has listened to military officers in the armed establishment, after they have had their opportunity to make their case, I want the Secretary of Defense and his staff to have the power to detail personnel on special missions and assignments and eliminate duplication and waste in order to promote efficiency in the armed establishment, and economy, too. I shall have something more to say about economy a little later.

On the point I have just made I wish I could turn to the exact language in the transcript, but I will quote it from memory, and then let the transcript speak for itself. I refer to the testimony of Robert Patterson, former Secretary of War, during the closing years of the war. He appeared before the Armed Services Committee not so long ago, and we discussed with him the matter of division of authority during the last war between what was then a 2-headed Military Establishment, namely, a Secretary of Navy and a Secretary of War. As I have said on another occasion on the floor of the Senate, I have the greatest of confidence in the judgment, in the ability and the devotion to public trust and service of Robert Patterson. What did he tell us? In effect, he said this:

I would hate to guess the millions and millions of dollars that went down the drain in waste during the war as the direct result of a 2-headed administration of the Military Establishment.

I shall secure his exact language and shall insert it at this point in my remarks, but it is my distinct recollection that what I have said is a fairly accurate quotation of what Mr. Patterson said before the committee. In fact I think he said billions rather than millions of dollars were wasted.

I emphasize at this point that the problem he was talking about, namely, a two-headed administration of the armed establishment in the prosecution of the war at the top level, resulting in millions and millions of dollars of waste, runs right down through the entire Military Establishment. To whatever extent in this bill we perpetuate that division of administrative authority, we are going to perpetuate duplication and waste in the Military Establishment. The language I am talking about in the Tydings bill at this point in my speech is language which I say guarantees a division of command, guarantees a division of authority, assures us of a perpetuation of duplication, with inevitable waste resulting therefrom.

Mr. President, unless the Secretary of Defense, to use the two examples I have cited, is given the final authority, unless on the facts he can render a decision transferring water transportation from the Army to the Navy, for example, or detailing for special training or missions naval aviators from the Navy to the aviation forces of this country, the result will be a duplication of function, duplication of training, duplication of expense

and resulting waste. I think we ought to come to grips with this problem.

Mr. President, let my former language in regard to the quotation from Mr. Patterson stand. I have just been handed the copy of the hearings. On page 149 we have the testimony of Mr. Robert Patterson, the former Secretary of War. Speaking about duplication of administration, this is what the former Secretary of War said:

And it is no exaggeration to say that in World War II the cost in duplication, competition, and disjointed effort directly traceable to the two-headed system ran to billions and billions of dollars. A sizable part of the tremendous public debt that the taxpayers of the United States are now bearing is due to that division of authority and responsibility between the War Department and the Navy Department.

In editing his remarks, which is a witness' right so long as he does not change the meaning of his point, the Secretary eliminated one figure of speech which he used in his testimony when he referred to this huge waste going "down the drain." However, in my judgment, his edited remarks are even stronger than my recollection of them. I repeat:

It is no exaggeration that in World War II the cost in duplication, competition, and disjointed efforts directly traceable to the two-headed system ran to billions and billions of dollars. A sizable part of the tremendous public debt that the taxpayers of the United States are now bearing is due to that division of authority and responsibility between the War Department and the Navy Department.

Bob Patterson has no vested interest in this matter. Bob Patterson has left behind him a glorious record of public service and patriotic performance of the duty of Secretary of War. Bob Patterson pleads today with the American people and the Congress only for a unification bill which will eliminate the duplication and the competition which during the war cost us unnecessarily billions upon billions of dollars.

Does the bill now before the Senate do it? I submit that it does not, because it does not cut a straight line through the red tape of divided authority and administration, and duplication in the Pentagon Building. It does not free the hands and mind of the Secretary of Defense. It does not give him the authority to make decisions necessary to eliminate the type of waste about which Bob Patterson spoke, because the very language of the bill which I have quoted shows that we are continuing the division of authority and functions which built up this great waste.

I wish I did not have to offer criticism as strong as that, but I am going to be true to what I consider to be my trust in this position. I am satisfied that the bill which is before us does not go far enough, because this type of duplication and division of authority is continued in the bill. If we want to make the type of savings which the former Secretary of War has mentioned, I say that the bill needs to be substantially amended so as to divest the officials of the Military Establishment itself—and I speak of the Army, Aviation, and Naval authorities in high command—of the final authority, which should be vested in the office of the Sec-

retary of Defense. We cannot fight the next war, if we should have to fight one, on the basis of the techniques and tactics of the last war.

It is one of the weaknesses of human nature that if we permit men to operate under legislation which authorizes duplication in its very language, which protects them in their vested interests within the Military Establishment, and which does not authorize the Secretary of Defense to overrule them, they are going to build up their own little military jurisdictions and job empires within the Pentagon Building. That is what happened in the last war, to such a degree that we have the testimony which I have cited from the former Secretary of War himself. Other Members of the Senate may ignore that testimony if they wish, but I shall not. I shall insist upon offering amendments which in my opinion will correct the type of abuses to which the former Secretary of War referred. As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out a while ago, we cannot correct those abuses if in legislation we deny to the Secretary of Defense the power to detail personnel in the interest of efficiency and economy.

I therefore feel that the present wording of the bill places the Secretary of Defense in an impossible position. My amendment proposes to strike from this paragraph everything after the word "proper" in line 19. I submit, as a practical legislative matter, that unless that is done we might just as well strike out all the paragraph, beginning in line 14 on page 4, because the language preserves the so-called safeguards. Safeguards of what, Mr. President? Safeguards of the existing vested military jurisdiction in the military forces themselves, the Navy, the Army, and the Air Forces. Can we call that unification? At best it is only a truce between the conflicting forces in the Pentagon Building until they can get the next huge appropriation.

I would rather have this bill debated on the floor of the Senate after we have the report from the Appropriations Committee on the armed services appropriation bill for the next year. I wish to be realistic. I will tell the Senate why I would rather have the debate come then. I think the arguments on my amendments would carry much greater weight after the Senate is asked to consider military appropriations because when Members of the Senate come to grips with what that budget is going to be if the proposals coming from the Pentagon Building are anywhere near approved, Members of the Senate will see the importance of eliminating the type of division in command and duplication of authority which my amendment seeks to eliminate.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to make a personal statement. I realize the delicacy of my position in this matter, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee I have not been a member of the armed forces in time of war. Senators know politics. There are those who always like to substitute argument by personal abuse and smear for argument on the merits and facts of an issue. I understand that in some

quarters criticism is being heaped upon me because I purport to make suggestions for the improvement of the bill, even though I have never served in the armed forces of my country in time of war. The record is clear that it certainly was my desire to do so, and the record is clear that for a period of years I held a Reserve commission in the Reserve of the Army.

I see the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] in the Chamber. He knows that during the last war I sought to serve in the armed forces, but the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, directed me to perform the service which he felt I could best perform. When I discussed the matter with the Commander in Chief on one occasion, he said, "Wayne, I will not accept a resignation from you, to go into the armed forces, because your place is on the War Labor Board, and that is where you can best serve your country."

Mr. President, I make that personal reference in the midst of this speech because I always think it best to engage in rebuttal in advance. The fact that I did not serve in the armed forces during the last war has in no way lessened my interest in the problems of the Military Establishment. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, I have devoted myself to intensive study of the problems of the armed forces and of the various problems which are presented by this bill.

I wish to say to the Military Establishment that I can always be counted upon to vote the last dollar needed to keep the Nation secure; and all they have to show me is evidence which supports their contentions. However, Mr. President, I am not going to vote to the armed forces a single dollar which is not needed. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I shall constantly check the Military Establishment in its tendency to use fear arguments, so frequently spread across the land, in an attempt to justify military expenditures which in fact are not needed, in the amounts requested, to meet the security needs of the Nation. That is why earlier in my remarks today I took the liberty of calling attention to the warning the late Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, gave to the leaders of the Military Establishment, when, in our committee, he warned them that we could not continue for long to spend almost half our national budget, as was then proposed—over \$21,000,000,000, more than half of our then national budget—for the Military Establishment. I say from this desk today to the Military Establishment that a patriotic obligation rests upon the shoulders of our military leaders to come forward at this session of Congress with a budget proposal which will reduce to the minimum all waste and duplication within the armed services. Those are the things which I believe run up the bill several billion dollars higher than it need be. Again I refer to my principal witness, the former Secretary of War himself, Mr. Patterson, who said as much in his testimony before the committee.

Mr. President, I now offer and send to the desk, for printing, my first amendment, which reads as follows:

On page 4, in line 19, beginning with the second comma, strike out all down to and including the word "functions" on page 5, in line 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in offering that amendment, I conclude my discussion of that particular proposal by simply saying that the amendment offers the Members of the Senate an opportunity to stand up and be counted on the question of whether they really wish to take effective steps in eliminating duplication, competition, and waste within the Military Establishment.

A second example of temporizing occurs on page 8 of the bill, in the provisions relating to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I personally favor a single Chief of Staff, and so provided in my bill. But I am willing to settle for a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs if we shall agree not to make a complete figurehead out of him.

Mr. President, I am confronted here with the practical problem of answering the question, "When should one compromise?"

I wish to say that I much prefer the section in my own bill which sets up a single Chief of Staff, but I know there is not a chance of getting such an amendment through the Senate. There is a chance that this amendment will be adopted by the Senate, and I think we can make the amendment work. The amendment which I now offer, regarding the Chief of Staff problem, will make it possible to accomplish most of the things which I had hoped to accomplish under a single Chief of Staff. Senate bill 1843 in its present form simply makes a figurehead out of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I say that because, on page 8, in line 10, we see the completely astonishing statement that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff "shall have no vote."

To me that is a fundamental change in the concept of the Joint Chiefs, for it introduces a wholly new idea, namely, that the Joint Chiefs constitute a voting body. Contrary to the entirely erroneous impression which I have heard expressed, the Joint Chiefs are not and never have been an instrument which transacts its business by voting. The same is true of the Security Council and the War Council. I note that Senate bill 1843 very wisely makes the Vice President a member of the President's Security Council, but it does not hedge by saying that he shall have no vote. That is proper, because the Security Council is an agency which assists the President, who has the power of decision. It is not a voting organization.

Similarly, Senate bill 1843 very wisely places the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs on the War Council, but again nothing is said about any voting privilege. That is correct, because the War Council advises the Secretary of Defense, who has the full power of decision, supposedly. However, I wonder if that is the real intention. I wonder if the true intention

is not to write into the bill some language in regard to voting power, denying voting power to the chairman of the joint chiefs, thereby impliedly—mark this, Mr. President—thereby impliedly seeking to restrict the power of decision of the Secretary of Defense. Either he has the power of decision or he has not. Are we to surround him with joint chiefs who, by implication in the bill, shall have the power to vote, except the chairman, and then, when they cast a vote on some issue, place the Secretary of Defense in a position where, if he wants to make a decision he thinks is essential for the effective operation of the Military Establishment, he must overrule a vote of the joint chiefs; which vote could not be participated in by the chairman? I do not think it makes much sense. I think the joint chiefs should be advisory; or, if we are to require a vote, let us do it directly, and let us give the chairman also the power to vote. But why this hybrid? What is the motivation behind this by-bird proposal? Mr. President, I will tell you what my fear is. It is that this is more language put in the bill with the motive, over the long haul, of hamstringing the Secretary of Defense when the "brass" organizes against him in regard to some issue. In neither of these vitally important councils can the responsible head shirk his responsibility behind an implied claim that he was "outvoted." So why should we introduce this thought into the operations of the joint chiefs? They operate, and have always operated, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense. They recommend courses of action to him, and they may, or may not, be in unanimous agreement on the details of their recommendations. What difference does it make if they are not in agreement? Suppose they are, or are not: The responsibility to render a decision on the issue should be in the Secretary of Defense. He should seek the consultation and advice of the joint chiefs; but he should not be restricted even by this interesting psychological barrier which I think the language imposes upon him.

Let us be practical about it. There can be little doubt that the bill indirectly but by necessary implication authorizes the Joint Chiefs to vote because the language specifically prohibits the chairman from voting. The only conclusion I can reach is that, by implication, the others have authority to vote, but, interestingly enough, the bill does not give it to them directly in so many words. Let us suppose the Secretary of Defense lays a matter before the Joint Chiefs, and they make a recommendation to him, notifying him that the vote was such and such. Mr. President, will not the fact of the vote be a psychological barrier to him? If he really thinks that their vote ought to be overruled, will not the vote create a problem for him? Will it not create a problem for him right here on the floor of the United States Senate, Mr. President? Can we not hear the speeches now? The first time the Secretary of Defense overrules the Chiefs of Staff—that is, those allowed to vote—who have voted contrary to the decision reached by the Secretary of Defense, can we not hear

the speeches? I can; because the Pentagon Building has many lines into the floor of the Senate and the House. Of course the implied authority to vote raises a barrier. It is an unfair barrier to impose upon a public servant to whom a trust is given such as the one we grant to the Secretary of Defense.

Or let us take another hypothetical case. Suppose the Joint Chiefs vote unanimously in support of a certain issue, and we have a Secretary of Defense who would rather not face the particular fight that overruling them might create in the Congress—because, after all, he must pick his fights; he cannot fight on every issue. But suppose he still sincerely believes that he ought to overrule them—are we not putting the Secretary of Defense in a very compromising position? Are we not being very unfair to him by the language of the pending bill? I think we are. I think we ought to say directly and unequivocally that the decision shall rest with the Secretary of Defense, imposing upon him only the obligation to consult and seek the advice of the Joint Chiefs.

Thus, Mr. President, to say that the Chairman has no vote implies that the others do, and it implies that this vote shall be the Secretary's mandate. In practice that is the way it will be interpreted in the Pentagon Building. Just wait and see if that does not prove to be the case. If we let this bill go through, with the language of this section included, it is going to be only a matter of a short time before the partisan proponents of different divisions of the Military Establishment are going to say, "That creates a mandate upon the Secretary of Defense."

I submit that this provision is completely at variance with the facts, is an extremely dangerous concept, and should be stricken from the bill. Indeed, if it were to remain in the bill, I can see how, if some grave mistake were made by the military, one or more of the Joint Chiefs could with perfect logic disclaim any responsibility on the basis of his voting record. And, to make matters worse, the Chairman would disclaim all responsibility, on the ground that he had no vote at all, and, therefore, no effective voice in the dealings of our high military councils. It takes no military expert, Mr. President, to see how impossible it is going to be to get dignity and responsibility in our top military command on such a basis.

Furthermore, the bill provides that the Chairman shall serve for a period of 2 years, with one reappointment possible in time of peace. Here again we are safeguarding ourselves into an untenable position. No Chairman, in the short space of 2 years, can develop to a point where he has served long enough in this high position to justify his stepping aside if we want the maximum of efficiency in developing military defense policies. True, he may be reappointed, but this involves again the delicate interservice rivalries and the work of pressure groups to a point where a really capable man would decline in the first place to accept a job which in effect requires running for reelection every second year. None of us is so naive as to

think there is no such thing as politics in the Military Establishment. I, therefore, feel that his tour of duty should be for a period of 4 years in the first instance, and have so recommended in my amendment.

A third weakening restriction is placed on the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs by the proviso which begins at the bottom of page 8. This proviso states that the Chairman shall not, by virtue of his office, exercise military command over the Joint Chiefs or the services. I submit that when we add this restriction to the one which gives him no voice in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs, we have a figurehead of the most classic pattern.

Moreover, what possible military command could the Chairman exercise over anyone? Existing law clearly states what shall be the chain of command from the President down to the lowest recruit, and under no conceivable circumstances could the Chairman usurp any of this authority, unless, of course, he chose to seize the power of the military, in which circumstance I do not believe the weakening proviso contained in the bill would be much of a deterrent. All this proviso does is to diminish the stature of the Chairman by throwing a meaningless safeguard into the bill, and I have recommended that it be stricken.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I congratulate the Senator on the fine grasp which he has shown of these very important considerations. I think no bill which we shall have before us in this session, or in many sessions to come, will mean more in terms of the lives of our young manhood than will this bill. It is very interesting, to me, that the Senator has made these compelling arguments and has indicated the very grave fallacies in the bill, and that no Senator has risen on the floor to disprove a single one of his criticisms. If the Senator has the same experience I had yesterday, he will point out his criticisms and no Senator will rise to explain where we are wrong and give us a good, substantive reason for the weak points in the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment.

I deeply appreciate the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts. I wish to say to him that I am simply expressing one man's opinion in presenting these points of view. I am motivated, as are my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, according to their viewpoint, only by a desire to have the best possible unification bill that can be presented. I feel that these amendments will greatly improve the bill, and I offer them to the Senate because I am satisfied they will improve the bill very much.

I now yield to my good friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to say in connection with this particular provision of the bill that when it was under discussion in the committee I was one of the members who asked what seemed to me to be searching ques-

tions with reference to it. In the first place, I may say, Mr. President, that, so far as the definition of the duties of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is concerned, I believe the definition of his position, as described in the bill, is one on which all of the Chiefs of Staff of the three services agreed, and one which, if I remember correctly, the Secretary of Defense also recommended.

In the discussions in the committee I questioned the wisdom of mentioning the word "vote" in this particular connection. I questioned the wisdom, if there were to be any votes, of providing that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be deprived of a vote. However, as it was argued in the committee, it was pointed out that if the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were to have a vote, the effect on many occasions might be completely to stalemate the decision of the three Chiefs of Staff who, under this provision of the bill, comprise the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

One of the things pointed out on many occasions to the committee, which held extended hearings and discussions on this bill, was that it was essential in warfare that oftentimes a decision be made and that a stalemate be broken.

That, Mr. President, was the argument for this particular provision of the bill. It was the opinion of the junior Senator from Connecticut that it would be better not to mention the matter of voting in this particular connection, with the hope that when it became apparent in the discussions of the three Chiefs of Staff that the majority opinion was the other way, the one in the minority would defer as a matter of agreement. However, eminent military authorities pointed out that there were occasions during the last war when we were almost stalemated by inability to arrive at a decision; and a high military authority, whom I do not want to quote at this time because I might quote him incorrectly, but who is one of the most famous of our military leaders, made the statement that he could conceive of a situation in which a decision, even though it might be an incorrect one, would be better than no decision at all; that it would be better to arrive at some conclusion so that an impasse could be broken, even though it might be demonstrated later that the conclusion was wrong, rather than to have a stalemate continued.

That, Mr. President, is why the committee felt the best way to resolve the situation was to include this provision in the bill, namely, that there would be a Joint Chiefs of Staff consisting of the three Chiefs of Staff; that there would be a chairman who would preside; that the chairman would be, in effect, the administrative officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that he would, in effect, be the liaison officer between the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President of the United States.

In the discussion, as I remember it, it was also stated that it was the understanding of the committee that if upon any occasion one of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff himself desired to go directly to the Secretary of Defense or directly to the President of the United

States to express his opinion, he was privileged, under this particular provision, so to do.

I may say, Mr. President, that this was one of the provisions which created lengthy discussions. As the junior Senator from Connecticut remembers, it was one in which the committee was as unanimous as it was on any other provision of the bill.

I thank my friend from Oregon for permitting me to make that observation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to allow the Senator from Connecticut to make his observation; but, if I am ever going to finish my speech this afternoon, I shall have to yield only for questions. I am sure my good friend from Connecticut will not take any offense whatsoever at that comment, because in this particular instance, I think he has been very helpful in making a statement which joins the issue on which I now want to comment.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does the Senator from Oregon recall the history of the opening days of the War Between the States, when, as I remember, General Winfield Scott was the Chief of Staff of the Army? Does the Senator from Oregon recall that at that particular time, for several months, the activities of the armed forces of the United States were practically brought to a standstill because the general who was then the chief of staff, a man with a preeminent reputation in the United States as a military man, was ill and incapable of fulfilling his duties, and yet it seemed almost impossible to get him out of that position and to acquire new leadership? In the mind of the junior Senator from Connecticut, it seemed desirable, in connection with the length of term of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, that there be a limitation.

We made express provision that in time of war the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff could serve more than a term of two years, but we felt very strongly that an occasion might arise when we might find ourselves in the situation of being unable to remove the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and substitute perhaps a more able or active officer, from whatever branch of the service he might be, in order to bring about a more effective administration of this vitally important organization within the armed forces of the United States.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for permitting me to make this comment on the question of the length of the term.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to answer the Senator from Connecticut first.

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has stated my understanding of the military history in regard to the Civil War incident to which he referred. But that is entirely irrelevant to the problem before the Senate.

I think it illustrates about as well as I can illustrate it the point of view which characterizes so much of the thinking at the Pentagon Building. They are talking and thinking in terms of organization and tactics and policies of past wars. Here we are dealing with a unification bill which seeks to set up a new system of administering the Armed Forces of the United States.

We are endeavoring to pass legislation which will avoid the mistakes and wastes incident to divided command and authority which has characterized our Military Establishment in past wars. With that task before us the Senator from Connecticut cites a Civil War incident in which the Chief of Staff of the Army was ill for a period of time incapable of fulfilling his duties and not replaced by new leadership. I ask you Mr. President, what does that incident have to do with my amendment? Absolutely nothing. The bill itself on page 8, starting with line 14, says, "The chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the Regular officers of the Armed Services to serve at the pleasure of the President for a term of 2 years." There is not the slightest possibility under the language of the bill of any such Civil War incident, which the Senator from Connecticut cites, being repeated under the bill or under my amendment, because both the bill and my amendment provide that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

In the Civil War to which the Senator from Connecticut referred, we did not have a Secretary of Defense. If we had had a Secretary of Defense under the terms of my amendment the type of stalemate to which the Senator from Connecticut referred could not have existed. It cannot exist now if we will only give to the Secretary of Defense the power of decision he needs, unharmed by the restrictions he is supporting in this bill.

The Senator from Connecticut has outlined this issue just as clearly as I think it can be outlined. The issue is whether or not we are going along with the bill which the Senator from Connecticut supports, which bill contains such language as I am now objecting to, and which handcuffs the Secretary of Defense, and gives to the Joint Chiefs authority which they should not have if we are to bring about true unification.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. No; I am going to finish the reply, then I will let the Senator answer.

The Senator talks about voting. The point is that the pending bill does not in direct, forthright language, give to the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the power to vote. It merely denies the power to vote to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Do they have the right to vote or do they not have the right to vote? We get the answer in the bill only by implication.

As I see it, the issue is very simple, so far as this section is concerned. I want the language so unequivocally clear that

the power of the Joint Chiefs shall be limited entirely to advice and consultation, not to decision. I am opposed to letting them render indirect decisions in the sense of giving them the implied right to render decisions by voting on various proposals. This indirect authorization for the Joint Chiefs to vote and then use their votes to embarrass the Secretary of Defense when he disagrees with them should be stricken from the bill. I know of no better way to weaken the Secretary of Defense and hinder unification than this clever provision that seems to give to the other members of the Joint Chiefs the right to vote on various proposals by denying the right to vote to the chairman.

Mr. President, it gets right back to what I have been pleading for throughout these remarks, namely, that we must make up our minds whether we are going to give authority to the Secretary of Defense and his civilian staff to unify the armed forces—yes or no. If we try to restrict that authority by protecting the jurisdiction of the various vested interests of the Pentagon Building, we will build no such type of monument to the memory of James Forrestal as I asked for at the beginning of my address today. We will draft only another bill that proposes unification by way of hindrance rather than by way of help to the Secretary of Defense.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. First, Mr. President, let me call the attention of my distinguished friend from Oregon to the language at the top of page 4, beginning in the middle of the fourth line, which reads as follows:

The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national security. Under the direction of the President, he shall be responsible for exercising direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense, including the performance of the following duties.

Then the duties are listed in considerable detail. The question I would ask of the Senator is this: Can we by an act of the Congress take away the constitutional authority of the President of the United States to be the Commander in Chief of the armed forces in peace and in war?

Mr. MORSE. Of course not, and there is not a syllable or a word I have spoken which indicates any such proposal. But we do have the authority to give to the Secretary of Defense the jurisdiction for which I am asking, subject to the superior authority of the Commander in Chief. What the Senator from Connecticut is doing is voting for a bill which seeks to make the Secretary of Defense the President's No. 1 officer in regard to operating the Military Establishment, but then would harry him, impede him, restrict him, by the type of language which I have been protesting all afternoon, and in regard to which I shall offer certain amendments.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me go one step further. As I conceive the office of Secretary of Defense, it is a position to carry out the executive authority pro-

vided for in the Constitution for the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation. Quite obviously the President of the United States is not going to be able to make every decision with reference to the armed forces. Quite obviously the Secretary of Defense is not going to be able to make every decision with reference to the armed forces. Quite obviously, it seems to the junior Senator from Connecticut, decisions which involve matters of policy and strategy which are not on the highest level, must be decided somewhere, and under the pending bill such decisions are going to be made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is the purpose of setting up the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization under the bill.

It seems to me that under the bill the Secretary of Defense has adequate authority. As a matter of fact, one of the fundamental criticisms which has been advanced against the bill is that he has too much authority, and in an effort to limit his authority somewhat, the committee felt it wise to insert a provision in the bill to the effect that with reference to the components and the functions and the missions of the three branches of the armed services, the Secretary of Defense could not make a fundamental change, the thinking being that such a decision should be made on a higher level than that of an appointive officer, that it should be made in the Congress of the United States, and be made upon the recommendation of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, it seems to me, as I have studied the bill, that is the chief limitation of power on the Secretary of Defense, and that under the provisions of the bill he may have even too broad powers. In fact, there are many who think that that is so under the provisions of the bill.

It seems to me wise for us to go forward with this piece of legislation as we did with the one 2 years ago, testing it out in the school of experience to determine whether or not it is going to be effective.

I would never stand for a bill which would give to the Secretary of Defense the authority the President of the United States has. I would not stand for a bill which would give to the Secretary of Defense the power to determine what the components and the functions and the missions of the armed services of the United States should be.

Mr. President, I believe that the defense of our country must rest, like an old-fashioned milk stool on three sturdy legs. There it must rest. It may be that from one time to another we may want to put more emphasis on the Air Force, we may want to put more emphasis on the Army, or we may want to put more emphasis upon the Navy. But those must be the three legs upon which our defense must rest in the changing conditions and circumstances and instruments of modern warfare. That is the purpose of the bill. It seems to me that in all other functions with reference to the administration of the armed services the Secretary of Defense has broad powers, in fact broader powers than many of those who

appeared before the committee were readily willing to give him. So I am glad of this opportunity to answer thus briefly the particular argument that the Secretary of Defense does not have broad powers, because under the provisions of the bill it seems to me he does.

I thank my friend the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to reply to the Senator from Connecticut first.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in connection with the Senator's remarks, I should like to call attention to a couple of words from the committee report. The statement is there made that the bill retains the system of checks and balances. How can we have checks and balances if we are going to have the Secretary of Defense free to do the job he ought to do in directing the affairs of our armed services?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, may I reply?

Mr. LODGE. On page 8, section 6, the third sentence, let me read a brief excerpt:

The committee would point out that the War Council is one of the most important checks and balances in the Military Establishment.

It seems to me that that lets the cat out of the bag. That shows that this is not a bill primarily interested in unification plus responsibility, and giving our young manhood in the service the right to which they are entitled, that is, to clear, competent and prompt direction at the top; but this is a bill which will, unfortunately, foster a great deal of separatism, which is the thing we ought to get away from.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to answer my good friend from Connecticut and then I shall make another comment. Although I thoroughly enjoy exchanging points of view with the Senator from Connecticut, this exchange can go on at great length, and eventually I want to complete my discussion of the five amendments.

I may say to my good friend from Connecticut that if he had been kicked off a three-legged milk stool as frequently as I have in my life he would not place as much confidence in that type of support for maintaining balanced posture as he seems to in his discussion this afternoon. In using that figure of speech the Senator from Connecticut, I think, has made perfectly clear his basic thinking on this bill, with which I am in complete disagreement. I am in complete disagreement with the idea that we are going to maintain, as I think the Senator from Connecticut indirectly confesses he wants to maintain, a sort of independent autonomy on the part of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force as three legs of equal length and strength supporting our Military Establishment. I think he is drawing this issue clearer than I can draw it myself. We are either going to place the power to control and direct the three forces of our armed services in the

Secretary of Defense, or we are going to perpetuate the type of duplication and drives for departmental power that presently characterize their wasteful administration. The idea that they must be maintained on an equal basis as legs to a three-legged stool is a mistaken concept if we want economy and efficiency.

I do not know what the Senator from Connecticut means when he says that he does not propose to give to the Secretary of Defense the constitutional power of the President of the United States. There is not a word the junior Senator from Oregon has said that even implies that he seeks to restrict the power of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. I am not proposing any constitutional amendment. But I would restrict the power of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force insofar as their military leadership is concerned in determining administrative policy. That is what I am seeking, Mr. President. The Senator from Connecticut is not going to divert me from that objective one single inch by talking about giving too much power to the Secretary of Defense.

What does he mean by too much power? The very bill he is voting for in the very section I am discussing at the present time gives to the Secretary of Defense the power of decision after the Joint Chiefs have apparently voted, under the implied authority contained in the provision the Senator has allowed to come into the bill. The Senator from Connecticut made a mistake, I think, when he permitted others to persuade him to let the provision remain in the bill, because the effect is to hamstring the Secretary of Defense. The provision gives a psychologically restrictive power to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that will embarrass the Secretary of Defense. I repeat to the Senator from Connecticut: He puts the Secretary of Defense in the position where he either has to overrule the votes of the Joint Chiefs when he is satisfied on the facts that their recommendation is wrong, or he opens the Secretary of Defense to the type of criticism and attack which is going to come from the Halls of Congress from supporters of certain vested interests in the Military Establishment whenever the Secretary of Defense goes against them.

I want to free him. Let me make this point in my speech. I want to free today, I want to emancipate today, the Secretary of Defense from the politics of the Pentagon Building. Unless the Secretary of Defense is made free of the political pressures of the Pentagon Building, unless he is put in the position where he can judge the recommendations of his Joint Chiefs on the record as they make the record before him and can then take his decision to the Commander in Chief for final approval or modification, we simply cannot have unification of the armed services. I care not what language the Senator from Connecticut tries to use to rationalize this division of authority. Divide the authority, Mr. President, and there will be no unification. There will be only a drive for power in the Pentagon Building. We have had it since 1947.

The Senator from Connecticut gives us the familiar argument on the floor of

the Senate, "Well, let us try this. We can always change it." Mr. President, that argument has been used very often on the floor of the Senate in asking support for legislation which ought to be modified and perfected before we vote. I have heard that argument many times. I heard it back in 1947, not only in connection with this legislation, but in connection with other major pieces of legislation, including the Taft-Hartley law. I am not going to run away from what I think is our responsibility here to perfect the unification bill today, and I say that the Senator from Connecticut should join with me in eliminating from the bill this particular language in regard to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

So that I may finish this part of my argument before I yield to the Senator from Connecticut, I now offer as my second proposal the following amendment:

On page 8, line 10, strike out "shall have no vote but"; on page 8, line 17, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four"; and on page 8, line 25, beginning with the colon, strike out all down to and including the word "services" on page 9, line 2.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I appreciate that my friend has yielded to me to ask what I hope will be construed as a question, although it may be a rather long one, preceded by a statement.

Under the Constitution of the United States the Congress is given the authority to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy. I should like to ask my friend if he believes that the bill should be broad enough so the Secretary of Defense would have the authority by direct order, or by indirection, to abolish the Army, to abolish the Navy, to abolish the Air Force, or after the Congress has made appropriations for them, so to deal with those appropriations that the effectiveness of any one of those three or any two of those three branches of the service would be impotent? Should such authority rest in one man, who is an appointee of the President?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I most respectfully point out that implied in the Senator's question is an attempt to put words in my mouth. There is nothing in the amendments to the bill for which I stand that takes away in the slightest degree whatsoever the powers of Congress under the Constitution. Under my amendments to the bill I would not give one single power of the Congress to the Secretary of Defense. But, where is the relevancy in the argument that because I propose such amendments as I have submitted in amendments Nos. 1 and 2, I am interfering in the slightest degree with the powers of the Commander in Chief under the Constitution or the power of the Congress in respect to the Military Establishment? The Senator from Connecticut must meet

me on this issue, namely, do my amendments in any way interfere with the power of the Congress or the President?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment.

I submit that the Senator from Connecticut is apparently arguing—whether he is willing to recognize it or not I do not know—that under the Constitution of the United States the existing powers of the military heads of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force cannot be restricted along the lines I propose. His argument falls to the floor like a house of cards, because no such constitutional right vests in the military heads of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

The Senator from Connecticut wants to know if I would be willing to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer military personnel. The answer is an unequivocal "Yes" if we want unification; "Yes" if we want economy; "Yes" if we want efficiency; "No" if we want to perpetuate the type of triple-headed administration at the Pentagon Building which is mulcting the American people of billions of dollars in unnecessary, wasteful expenditure in the operation of the Military Establishment.

When I say transfer military personnel I do not mean transfer an officer from a captain in the Marines to a captain in the Army or from admiral in the Navy to general in the Air Force. I have already pointed out in this speech that by transfer I mean that the Secretary of Defense should be authorized to detail men from one service to another in order to perform special missions or obtain special training.

Congress controls how many officers there shall be in the Navy, including the Marines, in the Army, and in the Air Force. Congress, by law, controls how many men and women there shall be in the ranks of the Army, Navy, including the Marines, and the Air Force. There is not a single word in my amendment which gives to the Secretary of Defense the authority to increase or decrease the number of officers and men in any branch of the service as designated by Congress. There is no danger, under my amendment, of the type of transfer which the Senator from Connecticut has in mind, namely, a transfer which would permit the Secretary of Defense to abolish any one of the three branches of the service, including the Marines, or change them from members of one service to members of another service.

However, I say yes to the Senator's question if he means, should the Secretary of Defense have the authority to assign men to special details in connection with a service whose uniform they do not wear? Thus, if naval aviators are detailed to the Air Force they don't cease to be naval aviators under my amendment and vice versa.

I have heard a great deal about economy from the other side of the aisle, and from this side of the aisle. The place to economize is in the matter of waste in the administration of Government. I am offering an opportunity to economize to the extent of billions of dollars, if the Senate will not accept the argument of the Senator from Con-

necticut that in some way somehow, we must preserve undisturbed the present jurisdictional powers of the military heads of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. As I see it, that is what his argument reduces itself to.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment.

I am for giving power to the Secretary of Defense. I welcome the support of the Senator from Connecticut.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the Senator has answered my question. If we pursue to its logical conclusion the point he makes and give to the Secretary of Defense, for example, the unlimited power to transfer personnel, and the appropriations which go with it, from one department to another, then we give to the Secretary of Defense authority to abolish the Air Corps, the Army, or the Navy, whichever he thinks at the time should be abolished. That is an issue on which I am glad to meet my friend from Oregon, because I am one who firmly believes that a decision on that level—as to whether we shall have an Army and how big it shall be, whether we shall have a Navy, and how big it shall be, whether we shall have an Air Force and how big it shall be, and what the respective functions and missions of those separate branches of the service should be—is a decision which rests with the Congress and the President of the United States, and should rest with them alone.

I am not willing to put in the bill a provision which would give to a single man, who is an appointee of the President, the authority to change the fundamental organization of the defense of the country. If he believes that it should be changed, let him come to the Congress and say so. Let him ask for appropriations to accomplish that object.

So far as I am concerned, I believe that the defense of the United States will continue to rest in the future, as it has in the past, upon those three branches of the armed services. I am willing to concede that the Secretary of Defense shall have the broad authority and power to coordinate those services, but I want to stop at that line, and that is the line where the bill stops. As a matter of policy and as a matter of our own future safety, I think that is the line where it ought to stop. That is the line set forth in the bill.

Under the terms of the bill the Secretary of Defense has ample enumerated powers to accomplish everything the junior Senator from Oregon, as well as the junior Senator from Connecticut, want to see accomplished. But the junior Senator from Connecticut would never support a bill which would make it possible for one man to change the major fundamental organization of the defense of the Nation. I still believe that we need an Army. I still believe that we need a Navy. I still believe that we need an Air Force. I shall always believe that the coordination of those three services is the thing which can successfully accomplish the defense of this country. I am not willing to see one destroyed at

the expense of another because at a particular moment or at a particular stage in the development of weapons one man thinks we ought to do away with two of the services to the advantage of the third.

Let me add that I think it is a proud thing to say that we have three branches of the service, each one of which believes that it alone could successfully defend the United States. I would not think that a Chief of Staff, an Army officer, a Navy officer, or an Air Corps officer was worthy of his commission unless he believed that his branch of the service alone was adequate to take care of the defense of the United States. That is the kind of esprit de corps we want to maintain and preserve. However, I am not one who believes that that is so. I am not one who believes that we ever ought to place full and complete confidence in any one of these branches of the armed forces. I believe that there will be times when we shall want to place more emphasis on the Air Corps, and perhaps less upon the Navy, perhaps more or less emphasis on the Army, depending upon the development of weapons and the particular enemy with which we have to grapple. But I would never support a bill which gave authority to one man to abolish any one of these branches of the service or to make any fundamental changes in the organization of the service as provided by the Congress of the United States.

I thank my friend for yielding to me in order to make this statement.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like first to reply to my good friend from Connecticut, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The Senator from Connecticut has drawn the issue; but I say most respectfully that in drawing the issue he has completely misstated it, because in his statement of the issue he has inserted one false assumption after another. Let us run through those false assumptions.

In the first place, the revisions of the bill proposed by the junior Senator from Oregon do not put the Secretary of Defense in a position where he is not subject to the control of the Congress of the United States. The Senator from Connecticut knows that to be so. The Senator from Connecticut knows that the bill, even as proposed to be amended by the Senator from Oregon, provides also for an Under Secretary of the Navy, an Under Secretary of the Army, and an Under Secretary of the Air Force. The whole structure of the bill, as proposed by the junior Senator from Oregon, continues those three great branches of the service, including within the Navy the great Marine Corps. But what the Senator from Oregon is pleading for is that the military heads of those services shall be subject to the administrative decisions of the Secretary of Defense.

The Senator from Connecticut, if he wishes to do so, can argue until doomsday on the basis of the false assumption that the Senator from Oregon is seeking to support a bill which permits of the abolition of one of the three armed services. However, that simply does not happen to be a fact.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield as soon as I finish this statement.

I say that assumption simply is not based on fact, because the provisions of the bill which I am supporting will continue those services. But this is where the Senator from Connecticut and I differ: I do not see that there is anything sacrosanct in the Army or in the Navy or in the Air Force that should guarantee to any of them the right to continue some particular function if the Secretary of Defense or the Commander in Chief of the United States decides that in the interest of efficiency, the elimination of duplication, or in order to promote economy, there should be a transfer of a particular function or a detaching of personnel of one service to another service to perform a special mission.

Furthermore, I wish to say that I do not know of a better example which I could cite on the floor of the Senate of the use of the "fear" argument than the argument just made by the Senator from Connecticut when he tried to read into this provision of mine in respect to the Secretary of Defense an authority on the part of the Secretary of Defense to abolish the Army or the Navy or the Air Force. Such an argument of reducing to the absurd simply does not make good sense. No Secretary of Defense, by the widest stretch of the imagination, would possibly go to the absurd extreme which the fear expressed by the Senator from Connecticut would seek to arouse in us. But, as I said earlier in my speech, a Secretary of Defense might decide that water transportation should be transferred from the Army to the Navy; and if the facts supported him, he should have the power to do so. He might decide that 500 naval aviators should be transferred from the Navy to the Air Force for training on B-36's; and if the facts supported him, he should have the power to do so. However, they would remain as naval aviators.

Mr. KEM and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. Since I have just replied to the Senator from Connecticut, and because I wish to be exceedingly fair to him, I yield first to him.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator. (At this point Mr. KEM asked permission to interrupt Mr. MORSE, who yielded, and colloquy ensued, which appears after the following "subsequently said" statement by Mr. BALDWIN:)

Mr. BALDWIN subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wonder whether, by unanimous consent, what I have to say now could be inserted before the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I am going to attempt to answer something in the RECORD that should at least meet the argument of my distinguished friend from Oregon, who is one of the best arguers I have ever heard anywhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the reason I spoke as I did was because the junior Senator from Oregon had made the point that the Secretary of Defense did not have adequate power under the pending bill, and it was the purpose of the junior Senator from Connecticut to attempt to draw the line at which the committee felt that the power of the Secretary of Defense should stop, a line beyond which it should not be extended. The committee, in drafting the bill, on page 4, has given to the Secretary of Defense tremendously broad powers. For example:

Under the direction of the President, he shall be responsible for exercising direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense, including the performance of the following duties—

(1) Establishment of policies and programs for the Department of Defense;

(2) Exercise of direction, authority, and control over the affairs of the Department of Defense;

(3) Taking of appropriate steps, including such coordination, transfers, and consolidations as may be necessary, to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, research, and personnel, and in such other fields, as he may deem proper, but this shall not be construed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to reassign the combatant functions assigned to the military departments by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof or to make transfers of military personnel from one military department to another or to make details or assignments of military personnel in a manner substantially to affect or change such assigned combatant functions.

Coming to the question of the assignment of water transportation to the Navy, or something of that kind, it seems to me the power is in the Navy to accomplish that, so long as the thing done does not essentially or substantially affect the combatant function assigned to the different branches of the service under the bill. The bill gives to the Secretary of Defense the power to detail officers and enlisted personnel from one department to another, but not in such great numbers as to defeat the combatant functions and purposes as defined in this particular bill. That it seems to me is where the line should be drawn. If some future Congress finds that it wants to give to one man the authority to change the entire set-up of the national defense, it can then do so; but the junior Senator from Connecticut would never vote for any such provision as that, because he believes that under the Constitution and under our whole system, by wisdom and experience it is demonstrated that decisions on that level must be made here, and must be made by the President of the United States. The junior Senator from Connecticut submits that under the terms and provisions of the bill, the criticism of my friend from Oregon is not well founded for the Secretary of Defense has ever so much broader powers than he was given under the bill passed 2 years ago, and he has under the provisions of this bill ample power and authority to accomplish the savings and to do the things necessary to increase efficiency which both the junior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Connecticut believe

very sincerely should be done and accomplished.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has now put me into a position calling for repetition, and I am not going to repeat myself. He has just made an argument which I think I completely answered when I presented my first amendment. I completely deny his premise. When he says the bill gives the Secretary of Defense all the authority he needs, I deny it. I say the so-called safeguards of the bill which he now cites with approval are the very things that prevent the Secretary of Defense from doing the one thing we ought to empower him to do, namely to unify the armed forces. That is what the bill is all about. His assumption that if we adopt my amendment No. 1—in defense of which I spoke at length earlier this afternoon, and I shall not repeat the argument—we interfere with congressional power over the armed forces simply is not so, Mr. President. My amendment does not restrict by one iota the powers of the Congress. But the amendment enlarges the powers of the Secretary of Defense, so he can knock some heads together at the Pentagon Building. I submit the argument of the Senator from Connecticut reduces itself to the premise that he apparently wants to preserve unto the military officials the authority to go about their independent ways without any effective restrictions being imposed upon them by the Secretary of Defense. That is the issue between us. I have made my point upon it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have only a short question which I wish to ask of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Very well; I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon, who has studied this bill very carefully, whether he has any difficulty in regard to the meaning of section 210, as proposed to be amended by this bill?

Mr. MORSE. On what page, please?

Mr. KEM. On page 7 of the bill. That section creates a War Council, composed of the heads of certain departments, along with the Secretary of National Defense, and provides that the War Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of particular policy, and so forth.

Mr. MORSE. It simply puts the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs on the War Council; that is all it does.

Mr. KEM. Does it continue this language, which I find a little unusual:

There shall be within the Department of Defense a War Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision.

Does that mean that the other members of the War Council will sit with him as more or less window dressing, but in the end the Secretary of Defense will announce the decision?

Mr. MORSE. It would be purely advisory, which is the present situation.

Mr. KEM. Is that a desirable situation?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is a desirable situation, if someone finally is to make a decision, after everyone has had a "say" and after everyone has had a

chance to advance his facts and arguments.

We must proceed on the assumption that the Secretary of Defense will be controlled by the facts and will give thorough consideration to the positions taken by his advisers.

Mr. KEM. I agree entirely with the Senator from Oregon on that point.

If that is the correct interpretation—certainly it is the one I would give to the language—I wonder why it was found necessary to use 50 or 75 words to write that provision, because the Secretary of Defense could call those persons, who would be under him, to his office on any occasion and could counsel and advise with them, and it would be the customary and usual course for him to do so. So why go to the trouble and take the space in the bill to provide for setting up a war council, which admittedly is not a deliberative body at all, because in the final analysis the Secretary of Defense will make the decisions solely on his own responsibility.

Do I make my position in the matter clear?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I think the point is very clearly made.

My reply is that the language referred to by the Senator is included at that point in the bill in order to make certain that the Secretary of Defense will take the necessary steps to obtain the advice and counsel of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. That is the purpose as I understand it.

Furthermore, let me say frankly that it is another example of a fear existing on the part of persons who have long exercised power, which now is going to be somewhat curtailed, that they are to be stripped entirely of their "say". In this instance the bill carefully provides that their "say" shall be advisory.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Oregon find in the bill any language requiring any meetings of the War Council?

Mr. MORSE. There is none. No such language is to be found in this bill, and none is to be found in the 1947 act.

Mr. KEM. Then it could hardly be said that it is made mandatory upon the Secretary of Defense to take counsel of the other members of the War Council, if he is not required to call them together on any stated occasions or on any occasions at all. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. However, there, again, I think we have to rely upon the exercise of good faith, and I think we have to rely upon a clear expression of the intent of the Congress that he shall seek the advice and counsel of his so-called War Council.

Mr. KEM. That is why I arose—to ask the Senator from Oregon, who has a gift of precise and definite expression, himself, whether in his opinion the draftsman of this bill has clearly and precisely expressed that idea, or whether the language used is more or less nebulous, so far as stating exactly what the War Council is and what its purpose is and what its function is and whether it is to meet, if ever, and for what purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to be perfectly fair to the draftsman of

this bill. Of course I am directing my attention to what I consider to be its major weaknesses. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that I think the language of the bill in respect to a great many details could be improved but I think the draftsman was confronted with the task of reconciling some of the compromises in the bill. This particular section is one which has been in operation for 2 years. I am advised that Secretary of Defense Forrestal had frequent meetings of this Council. He did carry out what I think is the manifest intention of Congress in connection with this section; and I have every reason to believe that his successors will do likewise. But I have no objection to more definitive language in the section, so as to make it perfectly clear that the Secretary of Defense on matters of major decision shall call his Council into meeting for advice and discussion, prior to rendering a decision.

Mr. KEM. Let me say finally that the impression which I receive from the section is that it is rather reminiscent of the statement of the Frenchman that "language is sometimes used to conceal thoughts."

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Let me say that the Council is the "cabinet"—I use the word in quotation marks—of the Secretary of Defense. To use the cabinet analogy, let me say that of course we do not require meetings of the President's Cabinet, but we know that a wise President has frequent meetings of his Cabinet.

Mr. KEM. Is there statutory authority for any meetings of the Cabinet?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. My reference to the Cabinet is merely an argument by analogy.

Mr. KEM. That is exactly what I had in mind. For that sort of meeting, it is unnecessary to provide statutory authority, and if that is all it is, then it is surplusage. For my own part, I regret that such a provision should be inserted in the bill. From my point of view it lacks the definiteness which should characterize an act of Congress.

Mr. MORSE. I can only give the Senator from Missouri my hunch as to why it was put in, in the first place, in 1947. Then, as now, there was great fear among the military leaders of the Army, the Air Forces, and the Navy, that their advice and consultation would not be sought, and that their influence would be greatly weakened in the determination of policy. I have a hunch that the language was put in, in the first place, to placate that fear. The fear has proved under experience not to be well-founded, because as I say the meetings have actually been held. On the other hand, I want to make certain, and I am perfectly willing to make certain, that the decisions of the Secretary of Defense shall be based upon the facts presented to him by the spokesmen for the respective services. I have no objection to an amendment being adopted that would include mandatory language, if the Senator desires to offer such an amendment.

Mr. KEM. The Senator will agree, will he not, that under the present provision the Secretary of Defense can act with or without consultation, with equal legality?

Mr. MORSE. That is right. Mr. President, I now proceed with the discussion of my third amendment, which deals with the size of the Joint Staff. This staff is the working group of the Secretary of Defense, and of the Joint Chiefs in their capacity as assistants to the Secretary. The bill places upon the Secretary, and through him, the Joint Chiefs, responsibilities of the greatest magnitude. We intrust these officials with the security of our Nation. We give them billions of dollars to spend annually. We look to them to win wars. Yet we say that their staff shall be limited to 210 officers. I submit that such a limitation is both niggardly and at the same time wasteful. How was the figure arrived at? Why not 213, or 207? We all know that it was simply pulled out of the hat, and has not the slightest relationship to the amount of work to be done, or the responsibilities to be shouldered. Further, such a limitation is completely unnecessary. The Chief of each military department resists to his utmost the sending of extra officers to the Joint Staff, because it constitutes a drain on his top-flight personnel that he can ill afford.

Each chief has his own responsibilities, and he needs every officer of ability to man his own service. So he tends to resist detailing excessive numbers to the Joint Staff. Yet by fixing this unnecessary limitation we make it unlawful for the Secretary to meet sudden demands for more personnel when local emergencies occur, and we jeopardize the nerve center of our whole structure. In no other service do we restrict the number of officers who can be placed on staff and planning agencies to meet emergencies, and it is most unwise to do it for the Joint Staff, where inadequate personnel is reflected in poor performance throughout all three services. I have therefore recommended that this limitation be removed, and that we depend on the Secretary to settle this problem as the interests of our national security dictate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me read the amendment and submit it, and then I shall yield.

I send my third amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed. It reads as follows:

On page 10, lines 11 and 12, strike out "to consist of not to exceed 210 officers and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. In order to perfect the RECORD, I point out that on yesterday, in response to a question from me, the senior Senator from Maryland, chairman of the committee, said, on page 6759 of the RECORD:

I think the Senator from Massachusetts and I see eye to eye on that proposition.

Later, on page 6760, he said:

I should be glad to have the Senator offer an amendment to strike out the 210. While I would feel in duty bound not to support

the amendment, I would not be displeased—and I hope I am not equivocating—if it were adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Massachusetts like to join with me in my amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to.

When the Senator from Maryland refuses to place a limit on the number of officers in the Army General Staff, in the Navy General Staff, and the Air Force General Staff, and we insist on putting a limitation on the Joint Staff, it looks as though with reference to unification, we were a little ashamed of ourselves about a limitation on the armed services as a whole.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

In the preparation of the bill and in the drafting of the administrative pattern which is set forth in it, let us not forget that we are building for years and years to come, so far as the military organization is concerned. Certainly here in the Senate we should consider very carefully the advice of the great present-day leaders of our Military Establishment which has been given to the committee and to the Secretary of Defense in the preparation of the bill. But let us be realists about it, too. They are human beings, and they must constantly be watched for special pleading. They must be carefully watched now, in the year 1949, for recommendations which unconsciously set forth their special interest in perpetuating a great deal of the status quo. I say that most respectfully to the great leaders of our Military Establishment. The opposition to the amendment which has just been offered reflects that very thing. It reflects the fear that the military leaders of the individual departments have that we are going to establish machinery which will limit them to a degree to which they, in their period of service, do not like to be limited, in operating the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. When we look at the long-time job which confronts us in connection with this bill we should be thinking of General X, General Y, and Admiral Z who will be in charge of the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy in the years to come. We must be willing, it seems to me, to stand up against the persuasive special pleading of present-day military leaders who, I think, must take their fair share of responsibility for the fact that in 1947 we did not do a good enough job with the unification bill because of the influence they exerted in placing restrictions in that bill which so limited the Secretary of Defense that he could not possibly carry out the great objectives of true unification. Likewise, I say most respectfully, in connection with the present bill, I am satisfied that present-day leaders of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force have influenced too greatly the wording of the bill, because they see the problems—and I say this in a most friendly way—in connection with the vested interests in their own departments in the Pentagon Building. So I am willing to take the position that although we should consider their advice and suggestions, we have to answer the question: Are we going to give the Secretary of Defense the au-

thority that he needs to unify the armed services, unhampered by the type of restrictions which the Senator from Connecticut has testified on the floor of the Senate this afternoon he is willing to perpetuate in this bill?

That is the issue between us; and I am unalterably opposed to the position on that issue taken by my good friend from Connecticut.

Mr. President, my fourth amendment is with respect to the Munitions Board. I feel that its operations are seriously hampered by the fact that the Chairman does not have the power of decision. This was first brought to my attention by Mr. Eberstadt, and I agree with him. The duties of the Munitions Board are spread across a very broad field through nine different categories. The Chairman of the Board is essentially the Under Secretary of Defense for Procurement—a field in which I feel a far greater degree of centralized authority is needed. A glance at the duties of the Board, which begin near the bottom of page 11 and run to the top of page 13 of the bill, shows that the nerve center of our procurement and industrial planning for war, as well as peace, is located in the Munitions Board. Yet, this body has no responsible head. Its responsibility is diffused, and this diffusion is complicated by the fact that the other members of the Board are Under Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries who serve on the Board as a sort of additional duty. Further, their tenure of office is generally not very long. This combination produces a very loose organization, which is charged with staggering responsibilities. Neither the Secretary nor the President has a single individual to whom he can look to assume the full responsibility for sound procurement or realistic industrial planning. I therefore propose that this glaring weakness in the present structure be strengthened by fixing this responsibility where it obviously belongs—in the Chairman of the Munitions Board as an agent of the Secretary of Defense.

Further, I feel that Senate bill 1843 fails definitely to assign these procurement and industrial planning responsibilities to any tangible group. The present text of the bill locates these functions in the Munitions Board only indirectly, as the wording of lines 11 to 18 of page 11 of the bill indicates. These functions are vital to our economy as well as to our military security, and their performance should follow a pattern over the years, rather than the whim of an individual secretary. They require a vast amount of organization and specialization, and should have as much permanence as it is possible to give them. Further, they should be very closely tied in with the strategic and logistic plans of the Joint Chiefs. The wording of the bill does this only by implication.

I therefore recommend that the bill be amended by substituting for lines 11 to 18, on page 11 of the bill, the following:

It shall be the duty of the Board, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and in support of strategic and logistic plans prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide for—

And from there on I would retain the nine duties of the Board as they appear in the present text.

Mr. President, I offer that amendment, send it to the desk, and ask that it be printed as my amendment No. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my fifth and last amendment contains three pages. What it does is to drop the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air to Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, and Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force. The change requires numerous changes throughout the bill wherever the old term "Secretary" occurs, hence the length of the amendment.

Mr. President, I have spoken at some length on this suggestion before. It was this proposal, and my proposal in connection with amendment No. 1, which made it perfectly clear to me in the early stages of our hearings on the pending bill that I could never see eye to eye with a majority of the committee, because amendment 1 and amendment 5 I think are basic to true unification.

When the Armed Services Committee made perfectly clear that it was not going to adopt the principles and policies inherent in my amendment No. 1 and amendment No. 5, I recognized that there was very little contribution I could possibly make to the committee's work on the bill, because unless we could agree on what I think to be two of the most basic steps in unification, I was naturally not interested in seeking to perfect a bill which in my opinion would not do a good job.

Now, because I have so clearly stated my position in the Record on this point, I wish to say just a word about the amendment which seeks to do away with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, and substitute therefor an Under Secretary of Defense for each one of those departments of the Military Establishment.

I think the amendment has great merit in it, that it has great psychological merit in it, because, as I see it, the real, first job, and I repeat, the most important first job, that has to be done in the Pentagon Building is to get men to accept the thinking that we have unified the services. It is a psychological job which needs to be done. We must eliminate those matters of form which have grown up in the military establishment on the basis of which there is a tendency for holders of title to usurp power.

If we retain in the bill a Secretary of the Navy, a Secretary of the Army, and a Secretary of the Air Forces, I say that psychologically we are defeating the whole purpose of unification. The amendment is in accordance with the principle of the Hoover Commission recommendation.

Mr. President, I digress just long enough at this point, since I have mentioned the Hoover Commission, to say

that I think one of the great strengths of the report of the Hoover Commission is to be found in the fact that former President Hoover has cut through the red tape of form, and gone straight to substance in all of his recommendations. Thus with respect to this matter I wish to get away from as much of the tinsel and the title which make unification difficult of accomplishment as is possible. Tinsel and title in the Pentagon building have been among the chief contributing factors to the break-down of the unification law of 1947.

The argument has been made on the floor of the Senate that the titles are necessary in order to give the offices the prestige which they must have in order to attract men of sufficient competency to head up the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force civilian offices. I just deny that. I say it is an argument without merit. I shall never take the position that a call to patriotic public service is dependent, so far as the acceptance of the call is concerned, upon tinsel and title.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I have heard part of the Senator's contribution to the debate, which has been very able, but unfortunately I did not hear all he said. I should like to ask the Senator if it is his firm opinion that the bill as now written, including the paragraphs on pages 3 and 4, would not bring about a unification of the armed services to such an extent that the Secretary of Defense would have full authority to determine what the objectives of the national defense organization of our country are and to provide the machinery to reach the objectives.

Mr. MORSE. If I thought so, I would support the bill, and I would not offer amendment No. 1. My amendment No. 1 seeks to modify most of what I think are the major weaknesses of the provisions starting in line 19, page 4.

Mr. MALONE. That is what I had reference to. The language beginning on page 3 seems to give the Secretary of National Defense the necessary authority in one breath, and then beginning with line 19, page 4, to which the Senator has already referred, following the word "but," pulls the punch, and the Secretary of Defense would remain just about as powerless as he is now.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree, and my amendment No. 1 seeks to strike all the language after the word "proper" on page 4, line 19.

Mr. MALONE. I make the statement, Mr. President, and it is my firm opinion, that the bill we passed last year killed Jim Forrestal. In my opinion none of us understood that it did not provide for unification of the services. The bill was passed in 1947; I know we wanted unification. I was for unification, and I voted for the bill reported to the Senate, but we found later that it provided almost definitely that the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Air, could go to the President of the United States, and pay no attention to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. And they did.

Mr. MALONE. They did. Therefore Jim Forrestal was given an impossible job, and with his conscience and with his integrity, he literally worried himself to death.

What are we going to do? We have just seen a new Secretary appointed—a big, husky, perfect physical specimen of a man, with plenty of experience and plenty of guts. I made that statement on the Senate floor following his confirmation by the Senate. I am for him, and I am going to be for him just as long as he keeps those tugs tight, and keeps the reins in his hands, and works to establish two things—one, the objectives of a defense organization for this Nation; and, two, how to reach the objective in an emergency.

I was in the field artillery in the First World War, and had considerable experience in the last war as special consultant to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, in Alaska, the Aleutians, New Caledonia, Australia, New Guinea, and the South Seas generally. However, I do not know what we need to do the job, and I am venturing the opinion that no Member of this body does know; therefore we must have someone in complete charge whose job it is to tell us.

Then what are we going to do? Kill Louis Johnson with the same kind of legislation? We can do it, I will say to the junior Senator from Oregon, because Louis Johnson is conscientious and has the will to do the job.

It seems to me that no Senator can know what is necessary for national defense, what the objective is, or how to reach it, unless he himself were appointed Secretary of Defense and spent all his time as such Secretary, and since that is impossible we must have such from one authoritative source.

I say to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon that I am for his amendment, and I hope that the Senate of the United States will not duplicate what we did in 1947 when we passed a bill which was supposed to provide for unification but in fact divided the services so that no one could supervise the job.

In this bill are mentioned certain functions and certain organizations which the Secretary of Defense cannot touch, when as a matter of fact, by the very wording of the paragraph following the word "but" on page 4, line 19, the items mentioned following that word pull every tooth out of the head of the Secretary of Defense when it comes to unification. From reading that language, unless there is language modifying that paragraph some place else in the bill, which I have been unable to find, in my opinion he cannot possibly do the job that we say in the first part of the paragraph he must do.

I think that we are right here and now proposing to pass on one of the most important pieces of legislation that will confront this body this session. We have presumably been building up our national defense to offset the aims of a certain intractable nation ever since World War II. We know that that nation has unification to say the least. Having that knowledge, let us not handicap those we put in top responsible military positions. I am for Louis Johnson as Secretary of National Defense as long as he is in there

trying to do a real job—a job that has needed doing since the close of World War I. He works 20 hours a day. I am in a position to know that. Now if we pull the legislative foundation out from under him—and leave him in the same position that we placed Jim Forrestal, and worry him to death as we did Jim Forrestal, trying to do a job that we ourselves have made impossible, then the Senate and the Congress of the United States can take the blame.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Nevada very much for the contribution he has made to my discussion of particularly the first amendment. I do not think the Senator was present when at the beginning of my remarks today I said we have an opportunity to build a great monument to Jim Forrestal in the form of a unification bill that is a unification bill in fact. I respectfully suggested that the bill recommended by the committee would not be a deserving monument to Jim Forrestal, for the reason the Senator from Nevada has so well pointed out, which is, that it purports to give the Secretary of Defense unifying powers, but it so fences him in with restrictions that it is bound to harass and worry and impede him so that I see no possibility of any Secretary of Defense, the present one, or Secretaries of Defense to come, giving to the American people the type of efficiency, the type of effectiveness, the type of economy which they are entitled to expect from their armed services if the security of the Nation is to be preserved.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Unfortunately I missed part of the debate yesterday, but I read the RECORD. I saw a reference made to securing votes by modifying the bill; that votes on the Senate floor to pass the bill could only be secured in that manner. Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States has reached the point where, in order to secure votes to pass a unification bill to protect the people of this country, to protect the boys and girls of the Nation whom we are drafting and have been drafting for the past year into the armed services, and whom we will draft immediately in the case of emergencies, then I say that is the greatest condemnation of this body that could possibly be pronounced on the Senate floor.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, I was commenting on my fifth amendment, which establishes an Under Secretary of Defense for Air, an Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, and an Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, for the present Secretaries of those branches of service. I had made my first point in support of my amendment, namely, that if we are going to have unification in fact, we must take away the title that goes with these offices. I say by means of their titles alone, these officials by way of jurisdictional accretion, day by day and month by month and year by year tend to take unto themselves more and more prerogatives and more and more implied authority.

I wish some time some student of political science would write a treatise, Mr. President, on what I am satisfied is a direct relationship between the title that is given to an office and the building up of implied authority that seems to just ooze out of the title, until finally, like spreading molten lava, we have the official holding the title exercising an implied authority that never was intended when the office was set up. I say, Mr. President, that our Federal Government is permeated by what I call government by implication through titles. There is the psychological tendency on the part of people, both in the military services, in the civilian branch of government, in the Congress, and among our people generally, to assume that if Mr. X is Secretary of the Army, or Secretary of the Air Force, or Secretary of the Navy, why he just must have the power to do what he seeks to do.

That is not a matter of fancy, Mr. President. If we will but look we can see government by implication working every day all through our Federal set-up. I want to take these titles away from the Secretaries of the Army and the Navy and the Air Forces, so that we can serve clear notice on the holders of the offices and their staffs and upon the people within the armed services, and upon the people in the country, that when they deal with them they are dealing with Under Secretaries of Defense. I think this fifth amendment alone is absolutely essential if we are to implant in the minds of the personnel of the armed services and in the thinking of the American people the thought that we are adopting a program of unification in fact. Let us make it both in fact and in name. When we have an Under Secretary of Defense for the Navy, an Under Secretary of Defense for the Air Force, and an Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, we have unification both in fact and in name. We have unification stemming up to the head man, the Secretary of Defense, and we have cut out a great source of jurisdictional red tape which develops by the accretion of implied power around a title.

The Hoover Commission agrees with me, if I correctly read the language of its report. I do not mean that it necessarily agrees with my arguments, but it agrees with my recommendation. This is what the Hoover Commission report says:

That the service secretaries be deprived of their privilege of appeal over the head of the Secretary of Defense; that they be directly and exclusively responsible to him; that the Secretary of Defense be the sole agent reporting to the President; that the service secretaries, to clarify their positions, be designated the Under Secretaries for Army, Navy, and Air Force.

I have not read a single one of the Hoover Commission reports which has not cut through form to substance. Although there may be some details of the Hoover Commission reports which are deserving of modification, I do not believe that there are many, and I certainly do not believe that this particular recommendation is one of them. Thus I am happy to go along with this recommen-

dation of the Hoover Commission, as I expect to go along with practically all the others, because I can say that as of today I know of not a single recommendation of the Hoover Commission for the reorganization of the Government which has been made that I shall not support, unless some Senator on the floor of the Senate or some committee can present facts which I have missed in my analysis of the reports.

Thus I urge the most careful consideration, and the favorable consideration of the Senate, of my fifth amendment, which gives us Under Secretaries of Defense of the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force. I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. In closing, I wish to say that I always feel that one cannot impress his sincerity upon people by merely asserting it. But because I know that some of the things I have said this afternoon in argument will not be appreciated by certain vested interests in the Military Establishment, and because I know that the positions I have taken this afternoon on some issues will unquestionably have their political repercussions also, so far as I am concerned, I close this argument by saying to all, friend and foe alike, that as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate I have been motivated by but one desire, and that is to work for the best possible unification system for our armed forces. I believe, out of the sincerity of that motivation, that the five amendments which I have submitted would result in a greatly improved bill.

I agree with the junior Senator from Massachusetts that the obligation which is ours in connection with this piece of legislation is of sacred importance, because we must recognize now, before it is too late, that we are dealing with the lives of American boys. In my judgment, we are dealing with the potential danger of tremendous loss of life to millions of our citizens across the country should we be plunged into a third holocaust. Therefore, I say that we must rise above any immediate selfish interests of any vested group in our Military Establishment and take counsel with our own consciences, and satisfy ourselves this time, as we did not in 1947—and we paid a tremendous price for our dereliction of duty in 1947—that we are adopting a unification bill which will give to the American people the best possible protection to their national security that can be given to them by way of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the junior Senator from Oregon that his first amendment shall be the pending question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, Mr. President. I offer my first amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 19, after the word "proper" and the

comma, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "functions" on page 5, line 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will not lose the floor.

The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ives	Murray
Brewster	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Byrd	Kefauver	Pepper
Capehart	Langer	Robertson
Chapman	Lodge	Russell
Donnell	Long	Sparkman
Douglas	Lucas	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McClellan	Thye
Graham	McFarland	Vandenberg
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	Young
Hoey	Morse	
Holland	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. SALTONSTALL answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must inform the Senator from Georgia that the request will have to be put in the form of a motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be so instructed. I may say this is the first time I have ever known of any matter in the Senate that a Senator could do on motion, that he could not do by unanimous consent. But I move that the Sergeant at Arms be so instructed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to give unanimous consent, a quorum is required.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Chair state the motion? I do not think any of us know what we are voting on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will restate his motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. My motion was that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am for it.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. KERR, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. KILGORE and Mr. WILEY also entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is now present.

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia appeared yesterday before the Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to a pending bill entitled "Consolidated Appropriation Bill." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD my statement before the committee on that occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION BILL—SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, MONDAY, MAY 23, 1949

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, for the record, my name is HARRY F. BYRD, Member of the United States Senate from Virginia.

I am here to advocate a favorable report by your Committee on Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 "providing for the consolidation of the general appropriation bills."

With Senators BUTLER, BRIDGES, O'CONOR, KNOWLAND, GILLETTE, FERGUSON, and WHERRY, I am a sponsor of this resolution, and I wish at the outset to express my appreciation for the opportunity to appear before your committee in behalf of this resolution.

HISTORY

The history of this proposal dates back to the Seventy-ninth Congress, when Senator BUTLER and I introduced a resolution designed to reach this general objective. We knew the first measure was imperfect, but it served to stimulate thought on the subject.

Meanwhile we enacted the Legislative Reorganization Act requiring a legislative budget in terms of expenditures which brought sharply into focus the difference between appropriations and expenditures—one of the most confusing factors in the consideration of fiscal legislation. Dispelling this confusion is one of the problems this resolution, like its predecessors, seeks to reach.

With some perfecting changes, the resolution was reintroduced by Senator BUTLER and me in the Eightieth Congress when it took the designation of Senate Concurrent Resolution 6.

A Rules and Administration Subcommittee including Senator WHERRY, as chairman, Senator HAYDEN and Senator IVES held exhaustive hearings on the proposal after which the bill was amended to conform with technical suggestions made by the Government's three fiscal agencies, the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 last year was unanimously reported by that subcommittee. Subsequently it was reported by the full committee without a dissenting vote. Unfortunately the Congress was adjourned before the resolution could be reached on the Senate Calendar.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 now before this committee is identical with the revised Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 of the last session of Congress which was given the unanimous approval of both the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and its subcommittee. It may be significant to note at this point that the chairman of last year's subcommittee is now a sponsor of the resolution.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government of the United States is the biggest financial operation on earth and nothing is as economically important to as many people as the fiscal situation of this country. Yet, we attempt to finance vast domestic and world programs, projects and policies through legislative processes in which it is impossible to know whether Federal income and outgo are in balance until months after we have enacted the budget when the Bureau of the Budget puts the pieces together and makes the best estimate it can on the basis of the legislative history of a dozen or more appropriation bills.

Actually, under present procedure neither Congress nor the American public has an opportunity intelligently to analyze fiscal legislation. Most of the difficulty in comprehending budgetary action arises from confusing language and archaic procedure. In these days of multiyear programs, projects, and policies, an appropriation enacted in a year in which revenue is high may be spent in a year when revenue is low.

For instance, in the coming fiscal year 1950 we shall be spending some money we appropriated or authorized for expenditure last year and, perhaps, some we appropriated 2 years ago. By the same token, some of the appropriations we are enacting now may not actually be spent until fiscal year 1951, or later.

This situation is an important factor for consideration in the current moves to reduce current appropriations. Reducing appropriations which we are enacting now may not necessarily result in expenditure reduction in fiscal year 1950. The proposals to reduce appropriations do not reduce the amount of money available for expenditure in 1950 which is being carried over from appropriations in previous years. At the same time it is probable that at least 5 percent, and probably more, of all the appropriations bills we are enacting now will not be spent in fiscal year 1950. Thus, if all the cuts proposed in current appropriations bills were applied to that part of the funds which is to be carried over for expenditure in subsequent years, there would be no effect on expenditures in the coming year.

Thus we see there may be a vast difference between appropriations and expenditures in a given fiscal year. But, spending legislation is always considered in terms of appropriations, while revenue must be comparable to expenditures—not appropriations. There is no readily available facility for either Congress or the public to translate current and previous appropriations into terms of annual expenditures either by items or by totals. Deficits are determined by expenditures against revenue—not appropriations against revenue—in a fiscal year.

As Congress now passes spending bills under the present procedure it has no idea as to what the over-all total of either appropriations or expenditures will be. Under the system, the President submits a budget message requesting appropriations and revenue, and after that the budget picture is never seen again as a whole until after it has become the law of the land.

Congress breaks down the appropriation side of the budget message into a dozen or more bills each dealing with a group of activities. Each bill is handled separately by a different subcommittee in each House of Con-

gress. They are brought in one by one for passage over a period of 6 months. They are not accompanied by an expenditure estimate. There is no way of telling what total appropriations or expenditures may be, and there is no way to compare the effect of action on the appropriation bills with the revenue situation.

It is impossible to consider the relative merit, importance, or cost of all appropriation items in view of the fiscal situation as a whole. The bills are passed as separate and unrelated pieces.

THE SITUATION

It is now conceded that our fiscal situation is serious. It is my opinion that it will grow worse before it gets better. I know of no Member of Congress who is satisfied with the information available to him with respect to appropriation bills. Under our procedure responsible officials, Members of Congress, and even members of the Appropriation Committees, sincerely differ by billions of dollars in their estimates of the budget total which we approve. In most instances all of their estimates are wrong.

With money available for expenditure authorized in nearly a dozen different kinds of appropriations, authorizations, debt transactions, etc.—some of which do not even appear annually in the regular appropriation bills—intelligent estimates are impossible in the existing conditions—the principal characteristics of which are absence of complete information, lack of adequate facilities for arriving at intelligent conclusions, obsolete procedure, archaic language, and utter confusion.

Even if all the funds we appropriate were accounted for annually in the appropriation bills which come before us, calculating the total through a dozen or more unrelated bills brought in over the duration of a whole session of Congress approaches the impossible.

And even if we could keep account of the appropriations we do not have the facilities for translating appropriations into annual expenditures. And, it is expenditures which must be calculated if we are to determine whether there is to be a deficit or surplus.

Even an expenditure calculation is virtually useless so long as it must be made separately on a dozen or more bills over a period of 6 months or more. It is the total expenditure which must be kept in balance with the revenue estimate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18

Mr. Chairman, the objective of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 now under consideration by your committee is to bring some order out of the fiscal legislation chaos just briefly described. The sponsors of the resolution do not contend that it is a complete cure-all, or a perfect panacea. But they do submit that its adoption would be a long step forward toward a much needed reform in our legislative process with respect to fiscal legislation. They contend that it would afford much more intelligent consideration of action on fiscal matters—and that is needed especially now at a time when our very best judgment on such matters is a critical requirement. They contend further that adoption of the resolution would result in simplification of budgetary action which is highly desirable for the benefit of the public, the executive branch, and the legislative branch, as well.

GENERAL SUMMARY

Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 would provide for a consolidated appropriation bill which not only would bring together into one law all major appropriations, but also would, in effect, control annual expenditures through legal limitations written into the same law on the amount of each appropriation which could be obligated in the ensuing year.

In addition committee reports at each stage of the legislative procedure would translate appropriations into terms of annual expenditures, including funds available from appropriations of prior years. These reports would show also the amounts being appropriated for expenditure in future years. They would be in indisputable tabular form, and each amendment would be registered not only against the item involved, but also in the total. This would keep both appropriations and expenditures current with the legislative process on a blow-by-blow basis, and develop information necessary to coordinate expenditures with revenue estimates.

Such reform would eliminate most of the sources of existing fiscal confusion, and it would be accomplished by a simple amendment to congressional rules governing consideration of appropriation bills. Under this resolution there would be no occasion for estimating what Congress has done about appropriations or expenditures. It would be in the law—in simple language—in black and white.

Until such a reform is accomplished, in my opinion, there can never be an accurate estimate of deficit or surplus. We are in urgent need of such a foolproof estimate at this very moment.

POLICY

The policy underlying this resolution is to amend the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to accomplish the following broad objectives:

First, the simplification and clarification of Federal appropriation bills; and

Second, to enable Congress to legislate intelligently and effectively toward a balance between expenditures and revenue by means of considering all major appropriation legislation in one bill and by extending legislative control over annual expenditures through statutory limitations on annual obligations.

PURPOSES

To recap the purposes of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, they are:

First, consolidation of all general appropriation measures into one general consolidated appropriation bill;

Second, statutory limitations on obligations against appropriations which would have the effect of controlling expenditures and keeping them within the revenue; and

Third, show by means of an informative table in the reports of the respective Appropriations Committees and conference committees on appropriations an itemized estimate of annual expenditures.

ANALYSIS

For the information of the committee, the resolution may be analyzed in more detail, as follows:

1. The resolution is in the nature of an amendment to the joint rule of the Senate and House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

2. The resolution would be effective with the beginning of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, next January.

3. The first principal purpose of the resolution would be to provide for the consolidation of all appropriations in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act.

4. Under terms of the resolution the consolidated appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each corresponding to 1 of the 12 or more regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted, and it would permit consideration of the consolidated bill by titles at the subcommittee stage without interruption of the present subcommittee organization of the respective Appropriations Committees. And there is

nothing in the resolution to prevent the various subcommittee chairmen from handling their title on the floors of the respective Houses.

5. Nothing in the resolution would preclude necessary deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills in addition to the consolidated bill, but a reduction in the number of such bills probably would result.

6. The resolution, in addition to the consolidated appropriation bill, supplemental, and deficiency bills, provides specifically for private act appropriation bills and for appropriation rescission bills.

7. The second principal purpose of the resolution is to fix within the general consolidated appropriation bill, supplemental and deficiency bills, limitations on funds available for obligation during the ensuing fiscal year, and to show what funds are available for obligation in subsequent years. The language in the resolution to accomplish this purpose has been worked out with the assistance of representatives of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office who are here today. And I hope they will have an opportunity to state their approval of the language.

8. In connection with these limitations on obligations, the committee's attention is invited to the fact that the limitations are not to be—

(a) construed to prohibit entering into over-all contracts which would extend beyond the year, providing the contracts do not allow for delivery of property or services during the ensuing year in excess of the limitation on obligations for the year.

(b) are not to be construed to be applicable to appropriations for payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General.

(c) the limitations are not to be construed to be applicable to appropriations for payment of judgments.

(d) they are not to be construed to be applicable to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress.

(e) the limitations are not to be construed as applicable to appropriations for payment of interest on the public debt.

(f) they are not to be construed as applicable to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

All the foregoing exemptions are included in the resolution at the suggestion of the representatives of the fiscal agencies. They are more technical than fundamental, and they are made in the interest of administrative efficiency, or for the elimination of unnecessary bookkeeping.

Another principal purpose of the resolution is to provide Congress and the public with accessible information on annual expenditures by the Federal Government. This is accomplished by the provisions in the resolution requiring reports from the respective Appropriations Committees and conference committees on appropriations bills to include an informative table itemizing available appropriations and estimating annual expenditures from the appropriation items with totals in each case. A similar table will be required showing Government corporations' checking account transactions.

Both the provisions for limitations on obligations referred to in paragraph 7, and in the paragraph immediately above with respect to committee reports exclude public debt retirement transactions and trust funds. Trust funds are not considered by the fiscal agencies to represent Federal funds, and debt retirement is paid largely out of surplus revenue—when there is any.

Under provisions of the resolution the expenditure estimates in the reports are to be set up in tabular form. While the resolution does not require that the appropriation bill itself be set up in tabular form, it does not preclude such a presentation. As one of the sponsors I would welcome the consolidated bill in tabular form.

GENERAL APPROVAL

Mr. Chairman, for the record, I should like to quote from the report last year of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration which said:

"The desirable results of a consolidated appropriation bill are numerous and obvious. The undesirable possibilities connected with this objective were found to be as follows:

"1. Length of time required by the Appropriations Committees and the respective Houses in consideration of a consolidated bill

"2. Necessity for the President to veto a bill containing all appropriations in the event he disapproved of one or more items.

"With respect to the first point, the committee believes that with the customary cooperation between the two Houses and their respective committees the time requirement can be met.

"With respect to the second point, the difference in desirability of the item veto for use in connection with a consolidated bill and for its use in connection with 12 bills is a matter of degree. In view of the controversial viewpoints with respect to the constitutionality of the item veto, the committee believes that the subject of the item veto should not be introduced at this time in the consideration of this concurrent resolution, particularly in view of the fact that fewer vetoes of appropriation bills may be expected since Congress has tightened up the rules prohibiting substantive legislation in appropriation bills."

The Rules and Administration Committee in its report last year said further—with respect to the provisions of the resolution limiting obligations—"the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office testified that—

"The existing Federal bookkeeping and accounting procedures are not adaptable to control of expenditures on the basis of cash withdrawals from the Treasury without difficulty and additional expense to the Government."

"On the basis of this contention, the committee requested the sponsors of the resolution, with the assistance of representatives of the fiscal agencies, to work out changes in the resolution which would bring its requirements within the scope of existing Government fiscal procedures for execution in the executive branch.

"This was done in the form of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which was drafted with the assistance of representatives of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Senate Legislative Drafting Counsel."

Mr. Chairman, Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 is identical to the substitute referred to, which was unanimously approved by both the full Committee on Rules and Administration and its subcommittee, last year.

Representatives of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office are here today. Since the bill amends the rules of the legislative branch, it is presumed they will not wish to be called upon to pass on the policy of the resolution. But I hope they may be given opportunity to testify that the provisions of the resolution do not conflict with fiscal procedures in the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of this resolution. There are other sponsors who wish to be heard in its behalf.

In conclusion I should like to add that the objectives of this resolution have been endorsed as a long step forward in the right direction by such eminent authorities as the late Harold Smith, former director of the Budget, Dr. Fred R. Fairchild, of Yale University, Senator Styles Bridges, former chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Congressman Christian Herter, Mr. Carter W. Atkins, executive director of the Connect-

lent Public Expenditure Council. And I should like permission to file brief statements by these authorities for the record.

In addition the objectives of the resolution have the endorsement of a great many governors and former governors of the various States of the Union. I should like permission to file brief statements from some of them.

NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to digress for a few minutes from the pending business and address myself to the proposal for the construction of a new Senate Office Building. For the past 3 or 4 weeks the walls of this Chamber have echoed the ardent pleas of many distinguished Senators for economy. I can show them where, by not building the new Senate Office Annex, we can save about \$22,000,000. We can also save an additional \$1,500,000 that will be necessary in order properly to furnish the building. Last, but not to be overlooked, we can also save the taxpayers in the neighborhood of \$1,100,000 per year in the upkeep of the building, and interest payments on the sum we will have to borrow in order to construct this edifice.

I am sorry the chairman of the Public Works Committee is not present. Under date of May 9, I offered a resolution in this body asking that the Architect of the Capitol and the Senate Office Building Commission suspend demolition and removal of the buildings and other structures on the land acquired as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate until further study and action by the Congress.

I was promised by the chairman of the committee that the committee would look into the matter, but to this moment no action has been taken. I notice from press reports that bids have been received recently for the leveling of the approximately 80 dwelling units now located on the land in question, just across C Street from the present Senate Office Building. It is proposed to let a contract in the near future.

I suggest to the commission in charge of the matter that it cancel the letting of the contract to level the buildings. We have recently passed in the Senate a housing bill on the plea that there was a great housing shortage in Washington, and other parts of the country, and yet we are permitting the leveling of 80 dwelling units within a stone's throw of where I now stand. I think the dwellings should be permitted to remain until new homes are found for the occupants of those buildings.

Mr. President, I wish to devote a few minutes to the legislative history of this proposal. Ordinarily, when a public building is erected or is to be erected at Government expense, under the rules of the Senate, the proposal is first submitted to the Committee on Public Works. In this instance S. 723, Eightieth Congress, authorizing a study of the proposed Senate annex building was approved by the Committee on Public Works. An appropriation of \$25,000 was authorized for that purpose. That bill was passed without a hearing of any kind, and became Public Law 169, Eightieth Congress. Later there were meet-

ings of the Commission with reference to the building of the proposed structure. The Commission did not appear before the Committee on Public Works in order to obtain an authorization for its construction. No showing or justification was made. On the contrary, the Commission met, plans were proposed, and in the wee hours one morning last June, when the Senate was about to adjourn, a deficiency appropriation bill was brought into the Chamber authorizing and appropriating \$1,100,000 for the purpose of purchasing the building site. In the same measure, \$20,600,000 was authorized as the total cost of the building, and \$850,000 was appropriated for the purpose of hiring architects and engineers to draw plans for the construction of the proposed structure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will gladly yield in just a moment.

Authority for erecting this structure will be found in the deficiency bill to which I have referred. I challenge any Senator to show one single line of testimony from anyone indicating the need or the necessity for the building. It is not to be found. I repeat, the authorization did not come from the Committee on Public Works, from which it should have originated. It will be found in the second deficiency appropriation bill of 1948—Public Law 785, Eightieth Congress—together with the appropriations of \$1,100,000 and \$850,000 to which I have just referred. The authorization for this building is legislative matter which was included in an appropriation bill, and I am confident that a point of order would have been made against it if Members of the Senate interested in the subject had been aware that it was in the bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to preface my question by saying that neither the Senator from Louisiana nor the junior Senator from Virginia was on the Appropriations Committee when this deficiency bill, containing legislation, was brought to the Senate. Frankly, I did not know about it until it was published in the newspapers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Many of us were in the same situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Has the money already been expended for the land acquisition?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it has.

Mr. ROBERTSON. How can we best move expeditiously to delay the start of the building and the moving of the families which the Senator says will be dispossessed in a city in which there is a housing shortage?

Mr. ELLENDER. The adoption of the resolution proposed by me under date of May 9, which is now before the Committee on Public Works, would accomplish that, but, up to the present moment, no action has been taken on that resolution. Of course there is another way to stop it, and I propose to take action in due time, namely, when a request comes before the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am

chairman, for \$20,000,000 plus to erect the structure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator advise what the final cost of the building is estimated to be, including acquisition of the land, and everything necessary in connection with it?

Mr. ELLENDER. The estimated cost of the structure is \$20,600,000. The cost of the land is \$1,100,000. Let me invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the engineering and architect's fees alone will be almost \$1,000,000.

While I am on the subject—the Senator anticipated me—I have a statement which was made by the architect of the Capitol with respect to the expenditure of the money previously appropriated by the Congress, namely, \$1,100,000 for land acquisition and \$850,000 for architect and engineering fees.

The following are the items included in the \$1,100,000 expended up to May 10, 1949:

Appraisal of properties, \$9,750.

Purchase of properties, \$928,525.

Advertising, \$360.

Miscellaneous, \$270.

Total expenditure for the purposes I have just enumerated, \$936,905.

Outstanding obligations:

Examination of property titles, \$4,500.

Purchase of properties, \$59,151.

Miscellaneous, \$36.

Total obligations outstanding, \$63,687.

Total expended and obligated to May 10, 1949, \$1,002,592.

Unobligated as of May 10, 1949, \$97,408.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to know what the underground trolley will cost.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that is included in a lump-sum figure and I do not have the amount. Nor did I try to ascertain what the garages will cost. We have garage space at present, under the terrace, for 214 automobiles, and in the new building it is proposed to furnish space for 200 more automobiles.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to proceed a moment, then I shall be glad to yield.

I should like to give an accounting of the \$850,000 appropriated for the purpose of paying the architect and engineering fees. As I have said, this was appropriated in the second deficiency bill the day Congress recessed, on June 19, 1948, in the wee hours of the morning.

There was an item in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1948, as I indicated, of \$850,000. Of that amount there was expended up to May 10, 1949, for architectural and engineering fees, \$347,345. Test borings on site, \$4,075.

Lighting tests, \$1,780.

Miscellaneous, \$292.

Total expended up to May 10, 1949, for the items just indicated, \$353,492.

Outstanding obligations:

Architectural and engineering fee, \$573,155. That is in addition to the \$347,345 I have just mentioned.

Lighting tests, \$975.

Miscellaneous, \$82.

Total obligations, \$574,212.

Total expended and obligated to May 10, 1949, \$927,704.

There is a deficit of \$77,704.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator understand that this million dollars, approximately, which has been spent in the acquisition of property, does not anywhere near cover the ultimate amount which it is expected will be spent to acquire property which will be needed by the Government around this building?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that there is a move to buy a few more lots in the neighborhood, but I do not believe that the acquisition of those lots will cost more than \$50,000 or \$60,000, as I understand from a report submitted by the Architect.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the land acquired does not go half way across the block, and the most inexpensive property has been acquired. Will the Senator permit me to agree with him that this is a very good place to save the expenditure of \$20,000,000 this year?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator is of that belief.

Mr. AIKEN. Because I have a feeling that the expenditure of the \$20,000,000, as in most Government projects, will be only the start.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not only the \$20,000,000 I want to save, but it is the cost of upkeep. Stop and think of it. It is going to require \$1,100,000 a year to operate that building and to pay the interest on the money to be borrowed to erect the building. Every Senator knows we do not have the money to erect the building. We are going to have to borrow every cent that is necessary to construct it.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me further agree with the Senator from Louisiana in his protest against turning the families in Schott's Alley out into the street, with nowhere to go. After the Senate has expressed so much sympathy for people who lack places in which to live, it seems to me very poor taste to turn these folks from their very humble homes into the street with nowhere at all to go. I know that is so, because one of them has come to me and asked if I would not help find him a place to go, because so far he has not been able to find any place.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have received many such requests, and I wish to say that I think it is shameful that the great arm of the Government is now being used to put those people out of their homes with no place to go. The officials are not trying to find any places for them, and those people are being ordered out by the court.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is telling the truth, I know.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I am in thorough accord with what the Senator is saying, and I wonder if he has devised some plan whereby this appropriation can be stopped.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I indicated a moment ago, the money so far appropriated, in the amount of not quite \$2,000,000, has been spent and obligated. The amount needed to erect the building remains to be appropriated. It was authorized in a deficiency appropriation bill during the Eightieth Congress, and I understand that an effort is to be made to appropriate \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 to start it. I further understand that the Commission plans to get bids in July for construction of the building.

If the Senate can take concrete action early on my resolution, that will be the best procedure. It will accomplish the purpose. In the resolution I am asking that the proposal to contract with someone to level the buildings which are now on the site be dropped. Let us not disturb those buildings for some time. Because of the shortage of houses in Washington suitable for dwellings, the buildings will be put to good use until such time as others are erected to take care of the present occupants.

To answer further the distinguished Senator from Virginia, when the request is made before the subcommittee of which I am chairman for the \$10,000,000, it is my purpose to go into detail and ascertain the necessity for the building. Congress has never been furnished the justification, to this moment. The record is silent on the subject, and no one has appeared advocating this expenditure. I believe that at some time soon the Senate should be furnished evidence to show why the building is necessary.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the plan of the Senator would be to fight the proposed appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. And attempt to secure the passage of his resolution suspending the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. It might be well to go a step further and offer a resolution to cancel the authorization.

Mr. ELLENDER. That could be done, but I would not see any point in doing it now.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator knows I was chairman of the Rules Committee for about 6 or 7 years, and as chairman of that committee I had charge of the allocation of office space in the Senate Office Building. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that if the proper economy were shown in the use of that space, in other words, if Senators were prohibited from having more office space than they required, and certain committees having more office space than was required, had to give it up, there would be ample office space in the present office building, in the judgment of the Senator from Virginia, to do the work of the Senate. I entirely agree with the Senator. The Senator from Virginia has three rooms, and has many visitors, representing a State immediately adjacent

to Washington. As the Senator knows, there are quite a number of offices in the Senate Office Building which could be used for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I propose to point that out.

Mr. BYRD. I am in thorough accord with the Senator. I think he is undertaking a fine work, and it is one in which I wish him great success.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, whenever any Government bureau appears before the Congress to ask for an appropriation of funds to build any kind of a structure, a justification must be made, else the request will fall on deaf ears. Every Senator knows that. Yet when it comes to building for the Senate no justification whatever is presented. First, an appropriation of \$25,000 is made to make a study of the proposal and without any further ado the Senate authorizes the erection of the structure without a scintilla of evidence presented to any Senate committee in justification thereof.

I do not believe there is an acute or urgent need for the proposed space. Our only problem here is inefficient management and utilization of the space we already have, as has just been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD.]

There is a common misconception that most Senators are struggling along with three rooms for offices. As a matter of fact, only 30 Senators have three-room suites. According to information given me by the Rules Committee the remaining Senators have four, five, and six rooms each, including rooms assigned them in the Capitol, and excluding committee rooms.

I have a summary of existing office space and its assignment which I wish to present to the Senate. Five Senators have six rooms. Twenty-six Senators have five rooms. Thirty-five Senators have four rooms. Thirty Senators have three rooms. The total rooms assigned are 328 in regular suites in the Senate Office Building, 31 detached rooms in the Senate Office Building, and 31 rooms in the Capitol, or a total of 390 rooms assigned to the 96 Senators.

If the total number of rooms presently assigned to Senators were equally divided among the 96 Senators, each would have four rooms, and there would be six rooms left over.

I realize, of course, that quite a few Capitol rooms assigned to Senators are not occupied by office personnel, but by dividing the total number of rooms assigned to Senators, less one for each Senator, into the total number of employees that Senators' offices say they have, I find that the average number of people per room is two and seven-tenths. That does not sound overcrowded to me. I have yet to see a room in the Senate Office Building or in the Capitol that cannot accommodate three people, and many rooms can accommodate more.

One of the purposes of the new building is to give each committee chairman a suite of five rooms for his own office staff. Let me point out that at the present time three chairmen have six rooms,

eight have five rooms, three have four rooms and one has three rooms.

The 15 standing committees have 52 rooms and 124 employees, an average of 2.4 employees per room. Bear in mind that 11 committees have large-sized committee rooms. I admit there are a couple of committees that are overcrowded, but there are several others with a surplus of space. I can think of one committee, the Finance Committee, for instance, that has one large committee room, and four office rooms, with only four employees, or less than one employee per room.

Mr. President, I should like to show the Senate what is proposed with respect to this new building to be erected. I wish Senators would listen to this. The new building is contemplated for the use of a mere handful of people. I will list them: 15 Senators who are chairmen of standing committees, and their office staffs; the staffs of the 15 committees, and 4 subcommittees; the Vice President and his staff, and the employees of the Legislative Council. Now that is the personnel to be provided for in the new building and nothing else. In other words, if the plans are followed through, then in order for a Senator to be able to secure office space in that building he will have to be chairman of a committee. That is the plan.

I realize that there will also be space for press and radio people, for the telephone exchange, the page school, and a few others, but this building is not being constructed for them. It is not their space needs that dictate this expenditure. This building, I repeat, is being built for the use and occupancy of a grand total of 377 persons. My office force obtained that information by adding the present staff of the 15 Senators who are now chairmen, and the present or projected staffs of the committees, and other activities that will occupy the new building.

The Appropriations Committee will have space for 22 employees. I have allowed 10 employees for each of the other 14 committees, a total of 140 employees, although their current strength is less.

With respect to subcommittees, provision is made in the new building to accommodate employees of four subcommittees, as follows: The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 19; Finance Committee, 8; the Committee on the Judiciary, 7; the Committee on Rules and Administration, 12. Or a total of 46.

With respect to committee chairmen and their office employees—and I obtained this information from each chairman's office—the total number is 135, including the 15 Senators. Vice President and his staff, 8. Legislative counsel, 15. Provision for joint committee staffs, 11. The latter figure is an arbitrary one. No specific provision is made for joint committee offices, but I am informed the space will be available if desired. That is a grand total of 377 persons to occupy that building.

Each of the Senators will have a suite of five rooms for himself and his staff. Except for Appropriations, Foreign Rela-

tions, and Finance, each standing committee will be furnished a committee room with seating capacity of 90 persons, an anteroom, and four office rooms. The Appropriations Committee will have a committee room, seating 250 persons; 3 subcommittee rooms, one seating 150 persons and the other two seating 100 persons each; 4 anterooms; 1 conference room; and 4 office rooms. Foreign Relations and Finance will each have a committee room, seating 120 persons, 1 anteroom, and 4 office rooms for the staff.

Provision is also made for offices for 4 subcommittees, 11 rooms for joint committees if the space is desired, and an auditorium seating 500 persons, with facilities for recording hearings, moving-picture projection, broadcasting, and television. It would appear that we are going to have some entertainment around here if the plans materialize.

In addition, there will be two large special hearings rooms, each about the size of the caucus room in the present Senate Office Building. There will also be accommodations for a press room and for various service personnel.

The plans also call for a physical-therapy department. That sounds like a clinic, but its principal feature is a swimming pool measuring 40 feet by 25 feet 6 inches. We already have one in the Senate Office Building for the accommodation of Senators.

There is to be provided also a two-level garage that will take care of approximately 200 cars. As a matter of fact, one-fourth of the net square footage of the building is taken up by the garage. Inasmuch as the existing garage built for Senators can accommodate 214 cars, and there are only 96 Senators, I am unable to understand the purpose of providing additional garage space.

There will also be a cafeteria seating about 700 persons, and, of course, private dining rooms with waiter service for Senators. The plans also include a dining terrace for Senators on the roof, but I understand that somebody decided that was too much, and it is being eliminated. But that provision for the dining terrace was contained in the original plans. Mr. President, with all of this additional space, I am wondering of what use will be our spacious caucus room and the many beautiful committee rooms now located in the Senate Office Building. I presume that use will be found for them, all of which will further aggravate an already top-heavy governmental machinery.

Let us contrast this proposed Senate Office Building with two Federal office buildings; one that is being erected for the General Accounting Office and one that is proposed for the Bureau of the Census. Listen to the comparisons, Senators. The authorized cost of the Census Building is \$11,500,000. The gross square feet, 700,000. Office personnel for that space, 5,000. Cost per gross square foot, \$16.42. Cost per person, \$2,300.

The General Accounting Office: The authorized cost is \$25,400,000. Gross square feet, 1,891,000. Office personnel to be housed in that office building, 5,575.

The cost per square foot is \$13.43, and the cost per person is \$4,556.

Listen to the figures for the Senate Office Building: The authorized cost will be \$20,600,000—and remember, that is for the structure only; it does not include the cost of the land; it does not include the cost of the furnishings. The gross number of square feet is 626,000; personnel for the building, 377; cost per gross square foot, \$32.90, in contrast to \$16.42 for the Census Building and \$13.43 for the General Accounting Office. The cost per person to occupy the building is \$54,655, in contrast with the cost per person in the United States Census Building of \$2,300, and the cost per person in the case of the General Accounting Office of \$4,556.

In order to further illustrate the extravagance to which we go, Senators have only to step out on the north porch of this very building and note the high-grade lumber which is being used to make a tool shed for the contractor who is going to repair the roof on the Capitol building. He is using grade A lumber. He does not have to worry about the cost. His fee is fixed. Look at the fence being erected around that space. It is built of fine plywood. I do not know what that costs, but some time ago I bought some plywood which cost me 55 cents a square foot. I do not know what this particular plywood costs, but whenever the Government is involved no one looks at the cost. There are many examples of extravagance within sight. I ask Senators to look at them. The finest kind of lumber is being used to build tool sheds and fences so that the roof of the Senate Chamber may be repaired.

As I have pointed out, if the present plans are carried through it will cost \$54,655 for each of the 377 persons to be accommodated in the new building. Its operation will cost the American taxpayers \$11,400 a year for each of the 96 Senators in addition to the huge sum now being spent to give Senators office space. How do I get those figures? I arrived at them in this manner: The \$22,000,000 to be spent on construction, if applied toward our national debt, would reduce the amount of interest our Government is paying by \$550,000 a year, figured at 2½ percent on the bonds. The new building will cost about \$550,000 a year to operate. Therefore, if the new building is not constructed there will be a total saving to the taxpayers each year of \$1,100,000, which amounts to \$11,400 for each of the 96 Senators.

As I have just indicated, the building is being erected for the purpose of housing the chairmen of the 15 committees of the Senate and 4 subcommittees, together with their staffs. In other words, when we vote for the construction of the new building we are adding \$11,400 a year to the cost of operating each Senator's office.

The Congress has already appropriated a total of \$1,975,000 for this building. Most of this money has been spent. However, \$1,100,000 was used to purchase the site for the new building, and that is not wasted. The other \$875,000 has been spent or obligated for plans and architectural and engineering advice.

Perhaps some of that can be recovered. In any event, I do not believe that the Senate should be influenced by the possible loss of \$875,000 in determining whether or not the new building should be constructed. As I have stated, by eliminating this project we can save in 1 year approximately \$1,100,000, which would more than offset the \$875,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, by Eggers & Higgins, architects. The letter is dated May 28, 1948. It shows how the building is to be built and how the space is to be occupied.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 28, 1948.

MR. DAVID LYNN,

Architect of the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LYNN: Complying with our agreement for preliminary plans for the proposed new Senate Office Building, to be constructed on the westerly half of square 725 and facing on First Street, B Street, and C Street, we are reporting to you as follows:

The site, approved by the Senate Office Building Commission for the proposed new building, is located directly East of the present Senate Office Building.

The building is to be a seven-story structure above grade and two stories below grade, with a marble exterior of an architecture in the classic style in harmony with the existing buildings on Capitol Hill. The general dimensions of the building are 249½ feet east and west by 447 feet north and south. The building will be approximately 9,000,000 cubic feet in content and will be connected with the present Senate Office Building by suitable transportation and pedestrian tunnels.

The set of preliminary drawings herewith submitted consists of the following:

1. A site plan.
2. Basement-floor plan.
3. Ground-floor plan.
4. First-floor plan.
5. Second- and fourth-floor plans.
6. Third- and fifth-floor plans.
7. Sixth-floor plan.
8. Seventh-floor plan.
9. Sections.
10. Elevations.
11. Details and isometric.
12. Perspective of exterior.
13. Alternate plan of special hearing rooms and dining room.

PRIMARY PURPOSE OF NEW BUILDING

As planned, the primary purpose of the proposed new building is to house the 15 standing committees of the Senate, including office accommodations for the chairman and employees of each standing committee, and the senatorial staff of the chairman of each standing committee.

We have been informed that the committees are inadequately accommodated in the Capitol and Senate Office Building. Under the proposed plans, committee activities will be adequately housed and centralized in the new building.

It is understood that the committee rooms in the present Senate Office Building, when vacated by the standing committees, are proposed to be made available for use by subcommittees, and office rooms vacated are to be made available to increase the office accommodations of the Senators continued to be housed in the existing building.

Under our plans, provisions are made as follows:

Committee on Appropriations:

One large standing committee room, with rostrum, and seating capacity of 250 persons. Approximate size of room: 60 feet by 70 feet by 21 feet high.

Three subcommittee rooms, each with rostrum; one with seating capacity of 150 persons and two with seating capacity of approximately 100 persons each. Approximate size of rooms:

One, 32 feet by 78.5 feet by 21 feet high.
Two, each 31.4 feet by 66 feet by 12.5 feet high.

Four anterooms (one for each committee room).

Five office rooms for standing committee chairman and his senatorial office staff.

Eight office rooms for 22 committee employees, with capacity for future expansion.
One conference room.

Committee on Foreign Relations; Committee on Finance:

Each of these committees to be provided with the following:

One large standing committee room, with rostrum and seating capacity of 120 persons. Approximate size of room: 32 feet by 55 feet by 21 feet high.

One anteroom.

Five office rooms for standing committee chairman and his senatorial office staff.

Four office rooms for committee employees with capacity for future expansion.

Other 12 standing committees:

Each of the other 12 standing committees to be provided with the following:

One standing committee room with rostrum and seating capacity of 90 persons. Approximate size of room: 31 feet by 52 feet by 23 feet high.

One anteroom.

Five office rooms for standing committee chairman and his senatorial office staff.

Four office rooms for committee employees.

General lay-out of standing committee quarters: As indicated in the foregoing, the plans provide a committee room for each of the 15 standing committees of the Senate, equipped with a rostrum of sufficient size to accommodate the full membership of the respective standing committees; an adjoining anteroom of sufficient size to accommodate the full membership of the respective committees, seated at a conference table; 4 office rooms, adjoining each committee room, for the committee employees.

The plans also provide an office for the chairman of each of the standing committees, and four adjoining offices for the chairman's senatorial office staff.

Subcommittee quarters: No provision is made in the new building for subcommittee rooms except the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. It is understood, as previously indicated, that it is proposed to make the committee rooms in the present Senate Office Building available for the use of the other subcommittees.

Provision is, however, made for office accommodations for the employees of 4 subcommittees, as follows: Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, 19 employees; Committee on Finance, 8 employees; Committee on the Judiciary, 7 employees; Committee on Rules and Administration, 12 employees.

Joint committees: No provision is made in the new building for committee rooms for any of the joint committees of Congress. Provision is made, however, for a minimum of 11 offices for employees of these committees, if such assignment is desired.

Auditorium: The plans provide for an auditorium, with seating capacity of 500 persons, and with facilities for recording hearings, moving-picture projection, broadcasting, and television.

Special hearing rooms: The plans provide for two large special hearing rooms, each about the size of the Caucus Room in the present Senate Office Building.

Quarters for Vice President:

The plans provide 4 rooms, located in the corner of the building nearest to the Capitol, for the office of the Vice President.

Office of the Legislative Counsel:

The plans provide 15 office rooms, 1 file room, and a library for the Office of the Legislative Counsel. The accommodations are such as to provide amply for future expansion of this office.

Miscellaneous activities:

Other activities, for which accommodations are planned in the new building, include the following:

Accommodations for: The press, the periodical press, radio, and television.

A cafeteria seating about 700 persons, with kitchen and other auxiliary services; also, dining rooms with waiter service.

Folding room.

Stationery room.

Barber and beauty shops.

Mechanical and maintenance shops.

Shipping and receiving facilities.

Storage and locker facilities.

Mail receiving and distribution center.

A telephone exchange adequate for needs of Congress.

A physical therapy department.

School for pages.

Automobile parking facilities for approximately 200 cars under cover.

Estimates of cost

Acquisition of site: As per estimate of Architect of the Capitol on an assumed condemnation basis, for the acquisition of all privately owned property in the westerly half of square 725

\$1,100,000

Construction and equipment of building: The cost of the building including tunnels, architectural and engineering fees and other incidental expenses, but exclusive of the cost of furniture and furnishings, is estimated at

\$20,600,000

Total estimated cost of site

and building 21,700,000

Additional land considered desirable to acquire: It is suggested that consideration be given to the acquisition of plot No. 852 (24) with a 15.5-foot frontage on C Street. This would permit a thorough circulation of service alleys in the easterly half of this block, and thus avoid the inevitable congestion that would result from a cul-de-sac.

Very truly yours,

EGGERS & HIGGINS,
OTTO R. EGGERS.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if Senators feel that our space needs are sufficiently urgent to warrant new construction, it would seem to me to be a wiser and more economic expenditure if we were to use the money, or a portion of it, to build a comfortable, functional, and adequate building—but not ornate or luxurious—for the use of the 81 Senators who are not chairmen of committees. The present building could then be used by the committees and the chairmen, and surely it would prove adequate for their needs.

To my mind, there is no evidence of urgent need for any new construction at all. I think it is a waste of money. I think the Senate can do very well with its existing space. I am confident that a comprehensive survey would show that present space can be redistributed so as to effect better utilization.

If, however, the Senate determines to go ahead with the proposed building, I can only say that this construction is not

a matter of public necessity, or in the public interest, but is a patent luxury, in which the Senate indulges itself only because there is no check on our actions such as we exercise over other Federal establishments. I can imagine the storm of protests which would arise if some other department of our Government were to come before the Congress at this time and ask for \$21,725,000 to build accommodations for 377 persons, at a cost per person of \$54,655.

Mr. President, I again urge consideration of my resolution so that a thorough study can be made of the needs for the proposed structure.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1842) to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense; to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill the enlarged responsibility; and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words about the pending amendment, which has been offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Let me say that if he had not offered it I would have offered it, because I believe very strongly in the amendment.

I think the Senate should understand that this amendment, which would strike out everything beginning with the word "but" in line 19 on page 4, over to line 3 on page 5, does nothing but strike from the bill language which is already in the existing law. We may approve or disapprove of the existing law. I am not discussing that point; but all that this language does is to reiterate what is in the existing law. So it cannot have any additional effect from a practical standpoint; but it does have a very fundamental effect from a symbolic standpoint, and it does raise a question of principle.

If Senators will turn to page 4, they will see that the duties of the Secretary of Defense are listed in three paragraphs. The third paragraph provides that one of his duties shall be—

Taking of appropriate steps, including such coordination, transfers, and consolidations as may be necessary, to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, research, and personnel, and in such other fields, as he may deem proper—

Then, instead of a period, there follows the word "but."

Yesterday I asked the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TRININGS], chairman of the committee, what the reason was for this provision. He said—and you can see it for yourself in yesterday's RECORD—that the reason for the provision is that it would not have been possible to get the votes to report the bill from the Armed Services Committee unless this provision were in the bill. The Senator from Maryland indicated that he himself was not particularly in favor of it. I asked him why those who wanted it were so much in favor of it. He said that they were very enthusiastically for

it. I asked him why they were for it, and he did not answer. Today I have tried to find out why those who want to repeat this piece of the existing law in the bill want to do so, and no Senator arises to answer my question.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, if he wishes to answer my question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts, I will say that in due course of time, after he shall have completed his address, I shall be very glad to state why some of us, at least, are opposed to the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad that someone is to give me some substantive reasons for it, in addition to the reason that it is necessary to have it in the bill in order to get votes. The only argument made so far has been that the votes to pass the bill could not be obtained unless this piece of the existing law were repeated. That is what is called an ad hominem argument. It is a very powerful argument to get the votes to get something through. But it is not an appeal to reason, and it does not give a rational motive for putting in this language, which repeats the language of the existing law, and thereby nullifies the language in section 3.

My reason for wishing to have this language taken out of the bill is that it does violence to the spirit of unification of the armed services. It seems to me that the United States must unify its armed services, or she will perish. We simply do not have the inexhaustible economic resources and we do not have the inexhaustible resources in young manpower of military age to be able to afford proliferation and triplication and quadruplication and all the other things that are indulged in at the present time in the armed services. We must build up a loyalty to the armed forces as a whole, and not build up unification as sort of a stepchild, something of which we are ashamed.

Whenever we bring in a unification bill with so many limitations that it actually fosters separatism, we make a grave mistake. It is all very well to be respectful of the feelings of some of the gentlemen in the Pentagon; but when the shooting actually starts, if we misuse our young manhood and waste it because we have not organized the military machine according to the teachings of science, we pay a terrifically high price for our failure to organize our military machine in the way that we should.

The language of this bill is harmful, of course, from an economic standpoint. We know that out of each Federal Government dollar 34 cents goes to the Pentagon and 16 cents goes to foreign aid. Thus, 50 cents, one-half of each dollar of the total Federal expenditures, is being spent because of the dangerous nature of the world situation. I think it has been estimated that a person with an income of \$2,000 pays \$68 in taxes to the Pentagon. I submit that if the money that is being spent for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard were spent in the way that you, Mr. President, spend your

own money or in the way that I spend my own money, very, very large sums of money indeed could be saved. However, of course, a government always operates on a much more lavish footing, and for that reason we do not expect such savings.

But certainly if we are going to hold the Secretary of Defense responsible for economy, and then if we are going to put into this bill a provision prohibiting him from moving personnel from one branch of the armed forces to another, we are going to make it very difficult for him to save any money.

Of course it is important to save money, but it is even more important to save manpower, to save lives. What would be the effect of the philosophy of this kind of a bill in the tragic event that our country were to become involved in another war? Of course the effect would be to freeze the manpower of military age into water-tight compartments, so to speak. If the nature of war were to change from one period of time to another—which often happens—we would be stuck with a commitment to have a certain number of men used in a certain unit or a certain branch of the armed services, for we would be prohibited by law from shifting them around. I cannot conceive that that would ever operate as against the Marine Corps, because of course the Marine Corps is used in a land war or in a sea war or in an air war. So no matter what might happen, the Marine Corps would never be obsolete or out of place. Of all the branches of the armed services that do not need this kind of protection, I would put the Marine Corps at the top of the list, because of the versatility of the Marine Corps, for the marines are trained for an air war or a sea war or a land war. So no matter how the nature of warfare may change, the marines will always be in demand.

But I can conceive of a type of operation in which the entire stress of the war might be naval and the major battles might be on the sea. In that event, would it do any good to have millions of men doing squads right on the land because of the requirements of some musty old act of Congress? Of course, Mr. President, all of us perceive the absurdity of such a situation.

I remember very well that during World War II, in the spring of 1942 a very large percentage of the young officers were taken out of the Army, in order to build up the Air Force. That was the right thing to do; it was the smart thing to do. The German submarine campaign was being waged very successfully at that time; we were utterly unable to get our divisions across the ocean. We had to win the air war. So we took a great many of the young lieutenants out of the armored divisions and perhaps out of the infantry divisions, for all I know, and put them into the Air Force, and thus built up the Air Force. Then the Air Force struck a tremendous blow, a wonderful blow. The Air Force was never turned back by enemy action in any part of the world, and our Air Force won the air war.

Then we come to the spring of 1945, when the United States Army was beginning to run out of men for the Infantry. At that time there was a change of policy and increments for the Air Force were stopped, and a policy of funneling into the Army the men who had been intended for service in the Air Force was begun. I suppose some of those men did not like that change in policy. Of course, Mr. President, if we are to run a war on the basis of personal likes and dislikes, we never get very far.

The war in Europe came to an end before it was necessary to apply that principle on a very large scale. But I give that illustration to point out the advantage of having the benefit of great fluidity between the armed services, so as to be able to supply the manpower where it is most needed, and not to have men marching around, training for a type of warfare that will not be fought. Efficiency in our armed forces shortens a war and avoids casualties; it saves lives. A policy based on a proper regard for the realities of the situation is the most humane type of policy we can have.

In the war in Africa it was common talk about the British Eighth Army—I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the details—that replacements which arrived there for the Coldstream Guards had, under the rules of the British Army, to be assigned to the Coldstream Guards, and could not be assigned to the King's Own Scottish Borderers, even though the King's Own Scottish Borderers had been almost shot to pieces and were desperately in need of replacements. That was said to be one of the reasons why the British Army had so much trouble.

That illustration, Mr. President, points out the common sense and the reality of this amendment.

Much that is in the pending bill today flies squarely in the face of what should be our main objective. It is a repetition of the mistakes of the old law; it is a gesture of defiance to the whole principle of unification. It is an example of hostility to the idea of economy and efficiency in the conduct of military affairs, either in war or in peace.

For that reason, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, one more word before I take my seat: I understand that the able junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] will obtain the floor in a few minutes. I wish to pay a very real, heartfelt, and sincere tribute to him, not only for his accomplishments in civilian life and for all the intelligence and courage he has shown here since he has been a Member of the Senate, but, of course, above all, for his gallant and magnificent war record. He is here now both as a Member of this body, a former combat soldier, and a wounded veteran. All of us would listen to him with respect if he did not have that background; but with that glorious qualification, whatever he says will go straight to our hearts and will receive our very highest consideration.

However, let me say that the loyalty and devotion of the Senator from Illinois to the Marine Corps are no greater than are mine. I was brought up on the traditions of the Marine Corps; one who

was very close in my family circle spent his whole life in the Marine Corps. I think the Marine Corps is so good and has such a hold on the admiration and affection of the American people that it does not need a lot of artificial legislation to protect it. I think we are not doing the Marine Corps a real service if we say that it shall be tied down to amphibious warfare. If that had been the case in the war of 1917-18, I do not suppose our country could have had those glorious Marine divisions in France in 1917 and 1918.

It is impossible to tell what the nature of war is going to be; we cannot tell whether it will be amphibious or air-borne or armored or of some other character. There is only one thing we can tell, and that is that we are always going to need human bravery to win a war, and we are always going to need shock troops; and so long as we need human bravery and so long as we need shock troops, we are going to need the Marine Corps. So the Senator from Illinois is not looking at anybody who wants to hurt the Marine Corps. I not only do not want to hurt them, I want them to prosper. I do not want to see them reduced to the status of guards at navy yards or ship's complements, or anything of the kind. I think they perform an essential service in our national defense picture as shock troops, and there comes a time in every war when it is impossible to do without shock troops.

So I do not think the Marine Corps needs this type of protection, any more than I think the Army engineers needed to get a special exemption in the Hoover reorganization bill. I think the Marine Corps needs it much less. I think it is much stronger than the Army engineers, because, while the Marines do not have the contact with river and harbor projects the Army engineers have, they have something much more precious, and that is a strong hold on the affections and the confidence and the admiration of the American people.

It seems to me it would be very wasteful and very thoughtless and very bad in the long run if we should ever develop the idea that the welfare of any one of our services is inconsistent with the best interests of economy and efficiency in the conduct of war. So that, Mr. President, is the reason why I am supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I hope it will be agreed to. I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 23), 1949:

SUPERINTENDENT OF UNITED STATES ASSAY OFFICE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

James J. Andrews, of New York, N. Y., to be superintendent of the United States assay

office at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, who are scheduled for graduation on June 3, 1949, for appointment as second lieutenants in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Harman Charles Agnew
 Malcolm Joseph Agnew
 John George Albert
 Charles William Anderson, Jr.
 John Stebbins Andrus
 Stewart Martin Appelbaum
 Carl Franklin Arantz, Jr.
 Adrian Byron Arganbright
 John William Armstrong
 David Lee Arnold
 Albert Morris Austin 4th
 Arthur Williams Banister
 David Porter Barnes
 Frank Gentry Barnes
 Robert Cooke Barton
 Lewis Roy Baumann
 Maurice Manuel Benitez
 Louis Henry Benzing
 John Robert Boag, Jr.
 Frank Banker Bondurant
 Richard Carl Bowman
 Schuyler Buell Brandt
 Robert Joseph Braun
 Frank Hawkins Brock
 Charles Henry Brown, Jr.
 Lewis Carlton Lindsey Browne.
 Roy Cleveland Brunhart
 Thomas Farris Bullock
 William Wesley Bumpus
 Robert Paul Butler
 Charles Artaud Byrne
 Mortimer Browne Cameron, Jr.
 Edward Joseph Campbell
 Jay Allen Carey
 William Arthur Carroll
 Richard Theron Carvoith 3d
 Luther Henry Cassler
 George Barrett Chamberlin, Jr.
 Charles Emmett Cheever, Jr.
 Charles Gould Cleveland
 Henry Porterfield Taylor Corley
 Thomas Maurice Crawford, Jr.
 Carl Raymond Crites
 John Henry Cronin, Jr.
 Timothy Cornelius Cronin 3d
 Alexander Brown Culbertson
 Thomas Gifton Davis
 Theodore Francis DeMuro
 Robert Armstrong Derrickson, Jr.
 Ben Wade Oakes Dickinson 3d
 William Eugene Dirkes
 Ralph Emerson Dougherty, Jr.
 Paul Crowther Dow, Jr.
 Norman Dale Eaton
 Robert Brower Ennis
 Emmet Tinley Everest
 Jack Dwight Finley
 Wallace Addison Ford
 Donald Luther Gabel
 Robert Russell Garrett
 Chester Charles Gilbert
 Jack Worrell Gillette
 Albert Hauck Goering
 William Francis Gorog
 George Dudley Graham, Jr.
 William Lee Green III
 Abbott Congleton Greenleaf
 William Walter Gustafson
 Daniel Guyton
 John Asa Hammack
 Irving Leonard Hammer
 Robert Adair Hansen
 Leslie Earl Harris, Jr.
 James Vincent Hartinger
 John Powell Hawn
 Edward Joseph Heesacker
 Gerard Francis Helfrich
 James Robert Hendricks
 David Hendrickson
 Joseph Robert Henry
 Richard Charles Henry

Edward Robert Hilton III
Francis Hinchion
Perry Carnot Hicken, Jr.
Alan Joel Horton
Robert James Howard
Eugene Earle Hustad
John Edward Ike
Edward Weber Ivy
Lewis Maverick Jamison
John Arras Jenkins
William Griffith Jenkins
W. Hugh Jenkins, Jr.
Miers Cornelius Johnson, Jr.
Kelso Jones
Norman Frederick Katz
Charles Thomas Keffer
Charles William Kessler
John Richard Kiely
E. Hugh Kinney
Donald Davis Klein
Raymond James Klemmer
Edward Anthony Kostyniak
Milton Arthur Kramer
David Christian Krimendahl
William Howard Lake
William Roth Lambert
Chris Andrew Lay, Jr.
Robert Edward Leisy
Ronald Emile Lemay
Nelson Trimble Levings
William Battelle Liddicoet
Robert Oliver Littell
Thomas Bernard Luzon
Kenneth Alden Main
Robert Lucas Makinney
Eugene Marder
Morton Leo Marks
James Frank Marr
Robert Thomas Marsh
Abner Broadwater Martin
Frederic Hine Maugher
John Norman McCarthy
Leon Witcher McCrary
James Richard McDaniel
Dan Lockwood McGurk
Donald Andrew McLean
Philip Cummings McMullen
William Fletcher McNurty
Michael Werner McNamee
John Edwin Miller
Virgil Millett, Jr.
James Errington Milligan
Walter Reed Milliken
Anthony John Mione
Hugh Mitchell, Jr.
Lewis Franklin Moore
Wayne Stewart Moore, Jr.
Milan Mosny
Raymond Moss
Wilbur John Mueller
William Edward Mundt
Louis Paul Murray
Emil Abraham Nakfoor
Marshall Edsel Neal
Charles Franklin Neef, Jr.
Edwin Arthur Nelson
Wayne Aaron Norby
Philip Raymond O'Brien, Jr.
Charles Whitney Oliver
Robert Harley Olson
Robert Lloyd Orem
Dolphin Dunnaha Overton III
Robert Edwin Owen
Basil Pafe
Davis Pendleton Parrish
William Thielman Pauli
Robert Michael Pfeiffer
Joseph Lee Pospisil
John Archer Poulson
Thomas Sheridan Pratt
James Delahunt Prescott
Robert Edwin Pursley
Ralph Christian Raabe
James Walther Rawers
John Charles Reed
James Blayne Rice
William Vaughn Rice, Jr.
William Clay Robinson
Kenneth Hall Roper
William Carroll Ross
Paul Sherman Rufsvold
Richard Grams Rumney
John Harold Saxon, Jr.

John Thomas Schall
William Leo Schlosser
James Forrest Schmidt
Richard Howard Schoeneman
John Christopher Scholtz, Jr.
Howard Francis Seney
Robert Shebat
George Marvin Shepherd
William Chapin Shiel
Jefferson Allan Simpson
Robert Stanley Slizeski
Mahlon Allison Smith II
Mansfield Irving Smith
Russell Hinett Smith
William Cremin Smith
George Winfred Smythe, Jr.
William Harry Spillers, Jr.
Stewart VanVliet Spragins
James Wesley Stansberry
Michael John Steger
William Kent Stemple
Robert Clarence Stender
Floyd Albert Stephenson, Jr.
James Reddick Stillson
Robert Jack Stuart
Don Reetz Swanke
Robert Frederick Swantz
George Howard Sylvester
William Brown Terrell, Jr.
Joseph James Thompson
Richard Earl Toth
William Jackson Trautvetter
William Frederick Trieschmann, Jr.
Edwin George Triner
Chester Stuart Trubin
Joe B. Tye, Jr.
Jay Van Cleef
John MacEwan VanderVoort, Jr.
Edward Whitney Wagner
Victor Reed Wakefield
Winston Guerd Walker
John Thomas Wallace
John Adkin Walter III
Douglas Spoor Weart
George Maurice Wentsch
Fredrick Robert Westfall
Richard Arthur Eric White
Edward Burke Wilford III
Arnold Winter
John Beugnot Wogan, Jr.
Donald Rey Woods
John Donald Woodson
William Clinton Workinger, Jr.
Hugh Wynne
Elsworth James Zimmerman

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, who are scheduled for graduation on June 3, 1949, for appointment as second lieutenants in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Dale L. Ashcroft
Harry E. Baumgarten, Jr.
Robert S. Berg
Thomas Frederick Blake, Jr.
Bill W. Bodager
M. Michael Bonner
Louis E. Branch
Charles P. Cecil, Jr.
John R. Clark
John T. Dolan
Alston R. Ellis
Atlee R. Ellis
Robert E. Finnigan
William M. Foley
John C. Friend
Richard F. Frost
William M. Fulton
Norman Lawrence Gibson
Robert J. Gilliland
Max L. Gilliam
Floyd W. Graham
James Ross Haughey
John P. Howe
James S. Hurst
Emmett S. Iverson
Robert E. James
Richard Janer
Jerry R. Kenyon, Jr.

William S. Knobie.
Charles G. Kretschmer III
David M. Latham
Gene E. Leslie
Alan M. Lindy
George H. Lochner
Irving T. McDonald, Jr.
Louis V. Miller
Joseph R. Morrison
Reed C. Mulkey
Brian P. Murphy
Thomas A. Nemzek
John C. Peters
Harry O. Purnell
Frank O. Roland, Jr.
Harold James Shirley
John P. Sleck
Robert M. Spencer
Gordon G. Stewart
Orlando A. Wall
Jay R. Wallace
Robert B. Weaver
Cyril R. White
Robert L. White
Ralph D. Whittier
Evert D. Wilmoth
Robert B. Wisherd

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

John W. Barlow
John D. Bell, Jr.
Joseph F. Cheatham
Edward T. Cohee, Jr.
James M. Crews, Jr.
Clark M. Hening
Clifford A. Moore
John T. Potts, Jr.
Louis C. Rasmussen
Robert E. Smith
Henry C. Smyth, Jr.
William B. Warwick, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Thou source of all life and power, do Thou impart to blind, mortal eyes the abiding assurance that Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee. Stir up our hearts and wills, that we may attain more of self-mastery; help us to think and do only those things that will leave no regrets in our hearts, and no pain in Thine.

Do Thou guide the world, for it is failing to see; deliver it, for it is in bondage; and save it, ere it is too late. Above all, give us a larger sympathy for all men, and a holy ambition to be of service in a needy world.

In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 55. An act to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska;

H. R. 603. An act for the relief of Jephtha R. Macfarlane;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of B. G. Jones;

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Mark B. Craig and others;

H. R. 681. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Generazzo;

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of John P. Reilly;

H. R. 692. An act for the relief of Joseph Thompson;

H. R. 738. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Catherine S. Tremayne and A. I. Lang;

H. R. 967. An act for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 1037. An act for the relief of Samuel Ensler and Louis Puccinelli;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Hal W. Cline;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of William Price;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzeley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzeley and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly;

H. R. 2285. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works;

H. R. 2566. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

H. R. 2812. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America;

H. R. 2906. An act to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers;

H. R. 3259. An act to add to the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, Ky., certain land acquired by the United States for that purpose;

H. R. 3396. An act to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin;

H. R. 3663. An act for the relief of Lawrence Reeves;

H. R. 4151. An act to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River pact; and

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 858. An act to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the longshore, stevedoring, building, and construction industries;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford;

H. R. 1337. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes;

H. R. 1754. An act extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949;

H. R. 3334. An act to grant the consent of the United States to the Pecos River compact;

H. R. 3967. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950; and

H. R. 4392. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 266. An act modifying a limitation affecting pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional, or domiciliary care;

S. 276. An act to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner Irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 314. An act authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes;

S. 885. An act to provide for the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 930. An act to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreement with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes;

S. 1080. An act for the relief of James A. Gordon;

S. 1138. An act for the relief of John W. Crumacker, commander, United States Navy;

S. 1167. An act for relief of the estate of Marion Miller;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of Murphy & Wischmeyer;

S. 1324. An act to provide for the modification of the Corps of Engineers' flood-control project on the Heart River at Mandan, N. Dak.;

S. 1483. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 2312 and 2313, so as to include thereunder motor vehicles and aircraft which have been embezzled, feloniously converted, or feloniously taken by fraud;

S. 1557. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia;

S. 1577. An act to revive and reenact, as amended, the act entitled "An act creating the City of Canton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944;

S. 1580. An act concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto;

S. 1659. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest-fire protection compact;

S. 1749. An act to amend section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to combat the

citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, wheat-stem sawfly, and the Hall scale;

S. 1760. An act to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734; 7 U. S. C. 429);

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20 of each year as Emblemb Day;

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post entitled "Coalition Meat Ax."

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances and include in one an article appearing in the *Montana Standard*.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

USE OF INFERIOR HARDWOODS IN MANUFACTURE OF PAPER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the first white paper made from scrub oak. It is a product of the laboratories of the University of Florida at Gainesville. Please let me emphasize its importance. Scrub oak is one of a number of so-called inferior hardwoods which occupy hundreds of thousands of acres in this Nation, and for which at present there is practically no market value.

If it is possible to develop production techniques which will permit the use of the inferior hardwoods in the manufacture of paper, wallboard, and plastics, a market will have been created for the product of these hundreds of thousands of now near worthless acres. In addition the ever growing shortage of timber products in this country will be alleviated.

The University of Florida is carrying on much work of importance in this and similar fields, and it is felt that industry can shortly take advantage of its developments. I would like to point out that this is the same institution and part of the same staff which developed the proximity fuze, one of the three most important weapons of the last war.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the broadcast of William Hillman over the Mutual network in relation to the tragic and most unfortunate death of the late Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Truman program and include an editorial on the same subject from a great Democratic paper, the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter and in the other an article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PRICE DECLINES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. I was very much interested, Mr. Speaker, to notice in the United States News and World Report a chart showing that you can get five meals now for what four cost in July 1948, and I shall include the list in my remarks. It shows that prices of commodities are coming down. They have been ever since last December. I wonder what Mr. Keyserling, one of the President's chief economic advisers, thinks now, after he advocated the regimentation of everything and considered all the time that prices were going up. He was a bull in price market, wanted the Government to build steel mills in January, he said they would continue to advance. The opposite has been the case. He wrote the President's economic report in January, and it is as wrong as anything could be. He not only wrote the President's report as an economic adviser but he helped write the report of the joint committee of House and Senate, which all the Democratic Mem-

bers signed. The Republicans refused to do so for they knew it was wrong. I wish you would just read this table of prices and see how far he was out of line in saying cost of living was going up and up, he is the President's chief economic adviser. It seems to me if they would appoint somebody else than Mr. Keyserling it would be better for the country, the President, and the people.

This chart shows how table prices are coming down:

How the food dollar has stretched

[Retail prices in Washington, D. C.]

	July 1948	April 1949
Hamburger, 2 pounds.....	\$1.32	\$0.86
Pork chops, 2 pounds.....	1.71	1.30
Sliced bacon, 1 pound.....	.79	.49
Butter, 1 pound.....	.93	.69
Milk, 2 quarts.....	.40	.34
Eggs, 1 dozen.....	.72	.61
Bread, 3 loaves.....	.39	.36
Flour, 5 pounds.....	.49	.48
Coffee, 1 pound.....	.51	.47
Sugar, 5 pounds.....	.48	.44
Apples, 3 pounds.....	.35	.38
Oranges, 1 dozen.....	.49	.29
Potatoes, 10 pounds.....	.52	.53
Green beans, 2 pounds.....	.35	.29
Carrots, 1 bunch.....	.13	.07
Cabbage, 2 pounds.....	.15	.10
Tomatoes, 3.....	.19	.19
Onions, 1 pound.....	.08	.04
Total.....	10.00	7.93

The prices of all commodities are less today than 6 months ago. This is now a buyer's market. It pays everybody to shop and take advantage of it. Keyserling is wrong, all wrong.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. J. A. Cosgriff, of Olivia, Minn., relative to the utilization of doctors in the armed services.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain newspaper articles and editorials.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d of January 1949, the day the Eighty-first Congress convened, I introduced what is now H. R. 83, a bill to outlaw the Communist Party.

We are facing the most serious menace of all times—international communism. The Communist Party in the United States should be outlawed because its activities have become so dangerous to the welfare of our citizens that it can no longer be allowed to shield itself behind the protective bulwark of American law. In reality the American Communist Party is not a political party in

the true sense of the word but is an arm and an agent of a foreign power—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is clearly demonstrated by the history of the Communist Party in the United States.

The ultimate aims of the Communist Party in this country are to overthrow the American form of government and the democratic way of life. The Communists would establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship which we have already seen imposed on many countries of the world.

By praising the revolutionary teachings of Lenin and Stalin, the American Communists practically admit advocating the use of force and violence for attaining their aims. Because of its loyalty to the Red flag of international communism and the Soviet Union, the Communist Party in the United States is a fifth column, and thus a threat to American security. Prime Minister Paul-Henri Spaak, in a speech before the UN Assembly on September 28, 1948, in Paris, stated:

You make us uneasy because in every one of the countries represented here you maintain a fifth column, alongside which Hitler's fifth column was but an organization of boy scouts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on States' rights.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained permission to insert in the RECORD a newspaper article. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost will be \$168.75. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mr. A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil. The title of this editorial is "Our Nation's Foundation." The editorial is timely and good.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the unfortunate death of Secretary Forrestal, and include therein a short statement he made in the House some time ago, together with several newspaper articles.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. 103]

Arends	Eaton	Patman
Barrett, Pa.	Gilmer	Pfeiffer,
Bonner	Grant	William L.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hagen	Phillips, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Hall, Edwin	Plumley
Celler	Arthur	Powell
Chapfield	Hinshaw	Ramsay
Chudoff	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes
Clevenger	Hull	Riehlman
Combs	James	Shafer
Cooley	Jenison	Short
Crook	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Cunningham	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Davenport	Klein	Stanley
Davies, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter	Taylor
D'Ewart	McSweeney	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Morrison	Whitaker
Dolliver	Murphy	Withdraw

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FRANK J. PATZKE ET AL.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1299, an act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments are merely clarifying and do not affect the amounts as passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "Dakota," insert "and Bertha Myrtle Patzke, of Bly, Oreg."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "his" and insert "their."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "his" and insert "their."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke and others."

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

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask something about these amendments?

The SPEAKER. This is a claims bill. The gentleman from New York said the amendments are only clarifying and do not change the amount.

Mr. TACKETT. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. CHELF) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. EDWIN CARL JOHNSON, of Colorado.

AMENDING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 900)

to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 643)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 2 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (Public Law Numbered 806, Eightieth Congress) is amended by deleting the words 'direction and control of its Board of Directors' at the end of the said section and substituting therefor the words 'supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary")."

"SEC. 2. Section 4 (h) of the said Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and inserting in its place the following: 'The Corporation shall have power to acquire personal property necessary to the conduct of its business but shall not have power to acquire real property or any interest therein except that it may (a) rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and (b) acquire real property or any interest therein for the purpose of providing storage adequate to carry out effectively and efficiently any of the Corporation's programs, or of securing or discharging obligations owing to the Corporation, or of otherwise protecting the financial interests of the Corporation: *Provided*, That the authority contained in this subsection (h) shall not be utilized by the Corporation for the purpose of acquiring real property, or any interest therein, in order to provide storage facilities for any commodity unless the Corporation determines that existing privately owned storage facilities for such commodity in the area concerned are not adequate: *Provided further*, That no refrigerated cold storage facilities shall be constructed or purchased except with funds specifically provided by Congress for that purpose: *And provided further*, That nothing contained in this subsection (h) shall limit the duty of the Corporation, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, to utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce in the warehousing of commodities: *And provided further*, That to encourage the storage of grain on farms, where it can be stored at the lowest cost, the Corporation shall make loans to grain growers needing storage facilities when such growers shall apply to the Corporation for financing the construction or purchase of suitable storage, and these loans shall be deducted from the proceeds of price support loans or purchase agreements made between the Corporation and the growers. Notwithstanding any other

provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed or approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation. Insofar as practicable, in effecting such exchange of goods, normal commercial trade channels shall be utilized and priority shall be given to commodities easily storable and those which serve as prime incentive goods to stimulate production of critical and strategic materials. The determination of the quantities and qualities of such materials which are desirable for stock piling and the determination of which materials are strategic and critical shall be made in the manner prescribed by section 2 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596). Strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation in exchange for agricultural commodities shall, to the extent approved by the Munitions Board of the National Military Establishment, be transferred to the stock pile provided for by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; and when transferred to the stock pile the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for the strategic and critical materials so transferred to the stock pile from the funds made available for the purchase of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, in an amount equal to the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the material transferred to the stock pile. Nothing contained herein shall limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire, hold, or dispose of such quantity of strategic and critical materials as it deems advisable in carrying out its functions and protecting its assets."

"SEC. 3. Section 9 of the said Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. DIRECTORS, ADVISORY BOARD: (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall be an ex officio director and shall serve as Chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist, of six members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by, and hold office at the pleasure of, the Secretary. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at such rate not in excess of the maximum then payable under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, as may be fixed by the Secretary, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Federal Government the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present.

"(b) In addition to the Board of Directors there shall be an advisory board reflecting broad agricultural and business experience in its membership and consisting of five members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Not more than three of such members shall belong to the same political party. The advisory board shall meet at the call of the Secretary, who shall require it to meet not less often than once each ninety days; shall survey the general policies of the Corporation, including its policies in connection with the purchase, storage, and sale of commodities, and the operation of lending and price-support programs;

and shall advise the Secretary with respect thereto. Members of the advisory board shall receive for their services as members compensation of not to exceed \$50 per diem when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such, together with their necessary traveling expenses while going to and coming from meetings.

"Sec. 4. Section 10 of the said Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1946 edition, 661)."

"Sec. 5. Section 4 (c) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended—

"(a) by inserting in the second sentence thereof after the word 'jurisdiction' a comma and the following: 'without regard to the amount in controversy';

"(b) by striking out the fourth sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'No suit by or against the Corporation shall be allowed unless (1) it shall have been brought within six years after the right accrued on which suit is brought, or (2) in the event that the person bringing such suit shall have been under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time the right accrued, the suit shall have been brought within three years after the disability shall have ceased or within six years after the right accrued on which suit is brought, whichever period is longer. The defendant in any suit by or against the Corporation may plead, by way of set-off or counterclaim, any cause of action, whether arising out of the same transaction or not, which would otherwise be barred by such limitation if the claim upon which the defendant's cause of action is based had not been barred prior to the date that the plaintiff's cause of action arose: *Provided*, That the defendant shall not be awarded a judgment on any such set-off or counterclaim for any amount in excess of the amount of the plaintiff's claim established in the suit.'; and

"(c) by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'except that (1) any such suit against the United States based upon any claim of the type enumerated in title 28, section 1491, of the United States Code, may be brought in the United States Court of Claims, and (2) no such suit against the United States may be brought in a district court unless such suit might, without regard to the provisions of this Act, be brought in such court.'

"Sec. 6. Section 15 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"USE OF WORDS 'COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION'"

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words 'Commodity Credit Corporation' or any combination of the same, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do or purport to do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a

fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both."

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ELBERT THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference recommended that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment and that the House agree to the same.

In general the conference substitute follows the language of the House amendment. Except for clarifying changes, the differences between the conference substitute and the House amendment are indicated below.

The House amendment provided that the members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and serve at his pleasure. The Senate bill provided that the members of the Board of Directors would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Both the House amendment and the Senate bill provided for an Advisory Board. The conference substitute retained the language of the House amendment with respect to the Board of Directors of the Corporation, but modified the provisions relating to the Advisory Board so that appointment of the five members of the Advisory Board would be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the members of the Advisory Board would serve at the pleasure of the President.

The House amendment modified the provision in the present Charter Act which prohibits the Corporation from acquiring real property or any interest therein in such a manner that the Corporation could rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business, or acquire real property or any interest therein for the purpose of providing storage adequate to carry out effectively and efficiently any of the Corporation's programs, or of securing and discharging obligations owing to the Corporation, or of otherwise protecting the financial interest of the Corporation. The Senate bill provided that such authority could not be used for storage for cotton, tobacco, and refrigerated cold storage. The conference substitute contains the language of the House amendment and the following proviso with respect to refrigerated cold storage:

"*Provided further*, That no refrigerated cold-storage facilities shall be constructed or purchased except with funds specifically provided by Congress for that purpose."

The conference substitute would permit the Corporation to lease refrigerated cold storage facilities but would prohibit it from constructing or purchasing such facilities except with funds specifically provided by

Congress for that purpose. This limitation on the construction or purchase of refrigerated cold storage facilities is not intended to prevent the Corporation from making replacements of machines and equipment, repairs or improvements necessary to operate and maintain leased cold storage facilities.

Both the House amendment and the Senate bill contained a provision, included in the conference substitute, which provides that before the Corporation could acquire real property or any interest therein for the purpose of providing storage facilities for any commodity, it must determine that existing privately owned storage facilities for such commodity in the area concerned are not adequate. It is understood that the Corporation, in its determination of the adequacy of storage space "in the area concerned", will give due consideration to marketing and storage practices employed by private agencies in the case of the particular commodity involved. For some commodities, especially those which are largely consumed on or near the farms which produce them, the "area concerned" must of necessity mean the immediate area in which the commodity is produced, because it is not customary or practicable to store the commodity in areas remote from points of origin. For other commodities a different situation prevails. In the case of cotton, as an example, the "area concerned" could well mean the entire cotton producing belt. The whole cotton marketing system, as well as the freight rate structure, is built around the fact that cotton moves for storage toward the ports and consuming mills at no additional expense to the grower.

Wool, as another example, normally is stored in the consuming areas of the Northeast, far removed from the heavier producing areas of the West.

This fact has been recognized by the Corporation in the operation of its cotton loan and purchase programs. Where threatened or confronted with total local cotton stocks in excess of local storage capacity, it has been the practice of the Corporation to "reconcentrate" sufficient loan or purchased stocks to provide storage space for the remainder of local cotton storage demand. Such "reconcentrated" cotton has been moved to available cotton storage facilities en route to ports of exportation and domestic consuming areas so that, under the railroad cotton rate and "transit" structure, the cotton could be reshipped to consuming destinations without loss in transportation costs. This practice—common among private cotton marketing agencies—recognizes the economy of utilizing available storage capacity along routes of normal movement, as opposed to the waste involved in providing additional local storage capacity which will not be substantially utilized year after year.

In its 1948 cotton loan program, the Corporation applied this principle in inaugurating its "receiving agency" arrangements, under which the Corporation "receiving agent" would receive the cotton from the producer, and, without delay, provide the producer with full benefits of the loan program. Such cotton was placed under railroad bills of lading, consigned to available cotton warehouses located along authorized railroad routes to seaports and domestic consuming areas. Under this procedure, the railroad bills of lading, initially used in lieu of warehouse receipts in consummating the loan, are later exchanged for insured warehouse receipts issued by the warehouses to which the cotton is consigned. This procedure has operated to the satisfaction of all concerned. It permits prompt use of the loan procedure by cotton producers, and maximum economical utilization of available cotton storage facilities.

The House amendment contained a provision with respect to the storage of grain

on farms which provided that the Corporation shall make loans not to exceed 17½ cents per bushel of the estimated crop to grain growers needing storage facilities when such growers shall apply to the Corporation for financing the construction or purchase of suitable storage, and these loans shall be deducted from the proceeds of price-support loans or purchase agreements made by the Corporation and the growers. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference substitute follows the language of the House amendment except that it eliminates the condition that the loans not exceed 17½ cents per bushel of the estimated crop.

The provision for loans to grain growers for financing the construction or purchase of suitable storage does not intend that the Corporation (1) shall be limited in any way in utilizing other authority contained in its Charter to assist farmers including other than grain farmers by loans or other means in providing adequate storage facilities; (2) shall look exclusively to the proceeds of price support loans or purchase agreements received by the grower for the repayment of the loan to the grower for storage facilities; (3) shall be restricted from making loans available to growers for storage facilities through banks and other established lending agencies; and (4) shall be required to apply the full amount of the proceeds of any price support received by a grower against the loan made to the grower for storage (on the contrary, it is contemplated that the Corporation would provide for repayment of the loan over a period of time).

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contained provisions permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation to exchange agricultural commodities for strategic and critical materials produced abroad. The Senate bill placed these provisions in section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act. The House amendment set them forth as an amendment to the Act approved August 11, 1939, entitled "An Act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad". The conference substitute places these provisions in section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and follows the language of the provision in the House amendment except that there was added thereto the words "easily storable", contained in the Senate bill, in the description of the agricultural commodities which shall be given priority in exchange for strategic and critical materials, and there was also added a provision contained in the Senate bill that strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be transferred to the stock pile "to the extent approved by the Munitions Board of the National Military Establishment". In placing the authority for the exchange of agricultural commodities for strategic and critical materials in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as did the Senate bill, the term "agricultural commodities" has the meaning ascribed to it in Section 2 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

BRENT SPENCE,

PAUL BROWN,

WRIGHT PATMAN,

MIKE MONRONEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is practically the House bill that passed the House by a vote of 326 to 52. As nobody has asked for time, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAMBLE) there were—ayes 158, noes 28.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY, ALLOWANCES, AND PHYSICAL DISABILITY RETIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4591) to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes.

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 further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4591) providing pay and physical disability retirement for members of the uniformed services, with Mr. RABAUT in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, May 20, the Clerk had read through line 4 on page 1 of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, on Friday when the Committee rose we had barely begun to read the bill. I feel that there is a preliminary statement I should make at this time.

The first is that we are concerned with our ability to attract and retain the type of men we need in the armed services. I may point out that prior to the war when commissions in the Regular service were tendered to honor graduates of schools they were invariably accepted. Rarely was there a vacancy. This year 1,000 such commissions were tendered and thus far only 11 have been accepted. Those two facts alone, I believe, indicate the situation which exists in reference to our ability to attract men from the honor graduates who are tendered a commission in the Regular service.

The other day I went over in quite some detail the number of resignations which we have had in the service. The fact is that of those men who were integrated into the Regular Navy since 1946, 15 percent have resigned. I appreciate the statements which have been made here to the effect that there are a great many men who have applied for return to extended active duty and have not been accepted. That situation does exist. There is a large number of them. But the acceptance of those applications

does nothing to solve the problem which confronts us. It is not a case of securing men on a temporary basis to go on extended active duty. We have to attract the kind of men we want and retain them in the proper age distributions. It does no good for us to have men on temporary duty so far as the career service is concerned.

This bill provides a career compensation plan. We want to attract men who are under 25 years of age and who are willing to go into the service for the purpose of remaining there, we hope, for the full active period of 30 years. Unless and until we can do that, our Military Establishment will remain upon a temporary basis. I believe you will agree that that is a very unhealthy situation.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. What the gentleman says is also true with reference to the enlisted man. Since the war we have enlisted over 1,000,000 men. The reason they do not reenlist is because there is not enough attraction in the future life of a soldier for them. This bill will correct that situation.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. I am coming to the question of enlisted men.

There has been concern expressed on the floor of the House with reference to the enlisted men. I have noted that there is a great deal of confusion with reference to what this bill does as to the enlisted men. First of all, may I say that the committee has received hundreds of letters from men in the enlisted ranks as well as in the officer corps. At first there was a good deal of confusion as to what the bill provided. Radio commentators and newspaper columnists have publicized what they claim to be discrimination against the enlisted men. It answered those letters, and I believe we have been able to convince the enlisted men that under this bill they are given a most attractive career.

In addition to that, the Hook Commission was composed of three outstanding businessmen and one educator, and that was the Reverend John Cavanaugh, president of the Notre Dame University. Father Cavanaugh was primarily concerned with the sociological provisions of the bill and the manner in which it would affect the young men, and the moral standards which would apply in the service. He appeared before our committee and wholeheartedly endorsed this bill. He stated that he had been primarily concerned with the welfare and the interests of the enlisted men.

A great deal of confusion has arisen over the provision of abolishing family allowances. I hope that I may have your attention while that is discussed, because there is great confusion among the membership as to that provision. It does not affect the compensation of the enlisted men so far as pay allowance for quarters and for subsistence is concerned. By that I mean it does not affect them adversely, but it does give them a very substantial increase.

At the present time quarters allowance is drawn by only the three highest grade

enlisted men, the three highest grades of noncommissioned officers. At the present time those allowances are \$31.50 for subsistence and \$37.50 for quarters. Under this bill, we increase the quarters allowance for the first three grades to \$67.50 a month, an increase of \$30. In addition we provide that the first four grades will hereafter be entitled to quarters allowances, and when a fourth-grade man has served for a period of less than 7 years his quarters allowance is \$45, but when he has served 7 years his quarters allowance goes up to \$67.50.

What does this mean? It means that the married enlisted man who has heretofore had a total in allowances of \$69 under the provisions of this bill is going up to \$99, so that there is that substantial increase.

The opinion seems to prevail on the part of some that the family allowance has some connection with this provision. It does not, even with the abolition of the family allowance, which is not a portion of this compensation, but is a gratuity that was instituted during the war to provide for the family when the man who was supporting them went into the service. Under the provisions of this bill, any man above the bottom three grades, with four dependents or less, will draw more money even though the family-allowance law is repealed.

Now the people that we are worried about; the fact that we have 150,000 single men who are claiming dependents because under the Dependents Allowance Act, the family Allowance Act, it does not have to be a wife and children, but it extends to parents, brothers and sisters and in-laws. Do you realize that we have one private who is now drawing family allowance for 14 people? He is a private in the Army drawing family allowance for 14 people. If you are going to have a career plan where men are willing to pursue that career, you are not going to be able to be paying a man about half for long service, and for important service, of what you are paying a man who is rendering very relatively unimportant service, but you are paying him because of the number of children or brothers and sisters that he might have. We have a corporal with 12 dependents, a wife and 11 children, who is drawing \$280 a month in family allowance. That is in addition to his pay, quarters, subsistence, and clothing. In cash he draws \$400 a month. The total value of his pay is \$508 a month. We have a private with 9 dependents, a wife and 8 children, total allowance \$220; a private with 14 dependents, 5 class A, wife and 4 children; 9 class B, one parent and 8 brothers and sisters, total family allowance \$285. This is the phase of the family law which is abolished by this bill. During the war the family allowance was absolutely essential and thoroughly justified. It was something that had to be done in morality and justice, when you were taking men into the service who had families and there was no one to support them, but can it be contended that on a career compensation plan this can be continued? I submit that it cannot.

Now, on the family-allowance provision, somebody asked me to yield, and I will yield at this time. I have another point I want to make.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will yield, under what conditions does the soldier draw the quarters allowance? In other words, if he is overseas does his family get the quarters allowance?

Mr. KILDAY. Unless they are occupying Government quarters, they get it.

Mr. LANHAM. But if the soldier himself and his family are occupying Government quarters they do not get that allowance, or the subsistence allowance?

Mr. KILDAY. They get the subsistence.

Mr. LANHAM. They do get the subsistence? Does the family get that even if the soldier is overseas?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. Would it be possible to repeal the family-allowance provision at the end of the enlistment period instead of at the end of 6 months, because it seems unfair that a man who has gone into the Army depending upon getting that family allowance should have it withdrawn arbitrarily.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree that that is one view of it. The other view is that the man who enlisted prior to July 1, 1946, has a contractual right to draw this family allowance until the termination of the enlistment which he accepted prior to July 1, 1948, and in this bill we protect that. Some of those men went in for 6 years. So long as they serve, under that enlistment, they will continue to draw it under this bill because we gave them an absolute contract to pay them. But as to those who went in after July 1, 1946, who went in under the provisions of law then existing, it was understood that it would terminate at any time the war was declared over, plus 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. As the law now exists and in the Family Allowance Act of 1942 there is a provision that it shall terminate 6 months after the war is declared to have terminated, so if we do not do something to revise the pay scales, such as we have done in this bill, to bring these men with four dependents or less up to something comparable to what they are getting now, or more, you face the prospect of having all of these families find themselves with no family allowance because of the termination of the war. So those who are concerned about the families must remember that that is the situation.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I wish my distinguished friend would explain this saving clause which states that by the passage of this

bill no one shall draw less than he is now drawing. It seems to me that if that is followed out, you will have two pay scales in effect and a great deal of confusion. Will the gentleman straighten that out?

Mr. KILDAY. That is the provision in the bill, and it is not an unusual provision. I think we have had grandfather clauses in legislation from the beginning of the Government. So that is provided, with the exception of this family allowance provision.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. With respect to the two cases the gentleman presented, where one man has 14 dependents and another 8, that does not occur all the way through the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. In a case like that, does not the gentleman believe that if we cut out this contract we have offered them, of family allowances, pretty soon we are going to have pitched into our lap compulsory military training?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I cannot agree with the gentleman on that. I handled the bill on the floor last summer when we had the Selective Service Act up, and I still have some scars from that fight, too. I think we are going ahead pretty nicely now. If we get our pay scales correct, we are going to be able to get them.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman, we need a pay raise, but I am disagreeing with him on the way of bringing it about, which I hope to tell the gentleman about a little bit later.

I have another question in regard to enlistment. When men are taken into the service with dependents in that number, does not the gentleman believe that is the fault of the recruiting officer and not the fault of the family-allowance provision?

Mr. KILDAY. I would not undertake to defend it for a minute. Of course, since September of last year no recruit has been accepted with any dependents. That has ceased. Before the war, no one except those of the first three grades could marry without permission, and if they did, they were subject to be released from the service. I agree with the gentleman on that.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the gentlemen of the committee have done a very good job trying to meet this problem, because it is a real problem. Here is one criticism, or suggestion, that I have to make. I note that as you drew the first bill there was a proviso in it to give those who were presently in the Army and came in after 1946 the benefit of the provisions of the law until their enlistments expired.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand the present law you give them the option of being discharged in the event their allowances are decreased.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. That is correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I would like to have you consider this: If you permit them to be discharged—let us assume a man has some children and he is going to be reduced in his allowance, and he wants to go out. You are moving now into a period where there is some unemployment, and I do not think it is quite fair.

Mr. KILDAY. I am certain the gentleman would agree with me that that would only be postponing the agony because if the gentleman will permit me to make this point, if you institute the higher pay scales and on top of that he draws more allowance, sooner or later some day the family allowance is going to go out and then you have the situation more aggravated because the reduction is more.

Mr. CARROLL. May I ask the gentleman how many men are in after 1946 that this might possibly affect?

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry, I cannot give you the figure. I may have that in my file, and I will try to look it up.

Mr. CARROLL. You see my point on that. In the original bill that you drew you made such a provision and then the committee voted it out.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I think you ought to give some protection to these men until their period of enlistment expires.

Mr. KILDAY. There are many things in this bill that the committee is responsible for, because we thought they improved the bill. We were amazed to see how much money was going out on bases other than for responsibility and services performed. And when you get \$314,000,000 a year, sooner or later you are going to have to get out from under that load, and if you postpone it you postpone the agony because it is going to be there when you reach that point. This was our considered judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an additional question?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Can the gentleman tell me, as to those men who came in after 1946, what was their period of enlistment, on the average?

Mr. KILDAY. I think it was 3, 4, and 6 years.

Mr. CARROLL. If you had some men in for 3, 4, and 6 years, do you not think it would be more equitable that those men, having come in for a 6-year period after 1946, be protected, inasmuch as they came in with certain inducements? To cut them off now seems to me to be inequitable. I think the position of the committee originally, giving them protection, was sound.

Mr. KILDAY. The committee never took that position. That was the bill which I introduced.

Mr. CARROLL. Then I commend the gentleman for the bill that he offered.

Mr. KILDAY. I was willing to be convinced of my error and I hope the gentleman will be.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In connection with this question of the removal of the family allowances, I think it should be remembered, and it may be the gentleman has already given the figures of the amount of the family allowances withdrawn by this bill, annually, that the amount involved is \$314,000,000. To offset that, based upon the same number of personnel that are in the services today with the added increase in basic pay of \$314,800,000, and also added an aggregate of \$142,000,000 in quarters allowances makes a difference in favor of the enlisted man, both from basic-pay increases and from added quarters allowances of \$143,000,000 more than that same group of people are receiving today.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to clarify that particular section to which he is addressing himself. That is Public Law 625, title I, section 101. I will read the specific language of the law so that there will be no doubt in anyone's mind as to when the pay allowances can be determined.

Section 101 reads:

The dependent or dependents of any enlisted man in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard, including any of the retired and reserved components of such services, shall be entitled to receive monthly family allowances for any period during which such enlisted man is in the active military or naval services of the United States on or after June 1, 1942.

(1) During the existence of any war declared by Congress and the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war, or

(2) During a period of enlistment or re-enlistment contracted by such enlisted man prior to July 1, 1946.

In other words, under the provisions of section 1, I think the gentleman has pointed it out, but I want to reemphasize it, according to the language of the statute, no further legislation is needed in the event we would not even pass this pay bill and that a family allowance may be cut off at any time under the terms of this particular act.

Mr. KILDAY. Whenever the President sees fit.

Mr. HÉBERT. Whenever the President sees fit, he can terminate the pay allowance.

Mr. RIVERS. Or when the Congress declares the emergency over.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. Did the gentleman state that in his judgment, taking the over-all provisions of the bill, it will encourage enlistments?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not have the slightest doubt of it.

Mr. MORRIS. Would the gentleman assure the House that there was no purpose on the part of the committee, or of anyone that you know of, to discourage enlistments?

Mr. KILDAY. No, indeed, sir. Those of us who had to deal with compulsory service legislation appreciate that situation. May I say to the gentleman that everybody who has responsibility for maintaining an adequate armed force endorses this bill. When we began our hearings James Forrestal, who was then Secretary of National Defense, appeared before the committee and endorsed it, and urged its passage. After he was succeeded by Mr. Louis Johnson, Mr. Johnson wrote to the committee and urged the passage of the bill.

On yesterday the President addressed the following letter to the Speaker of the House:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 23, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: For some time I have been concerned over the personnel situation in the armed forces. We are having great difficulty in attracting and retaining the caliber of personnel, both officer and enlisted, on a career basis which is essential to our fighting forces.

The Career Compensation Act of 1949 now pending before the House of Representatives will, in my opinion, provide the necessary incentive to follow a career in the armed services.

I feel that this legislation is a most important part of our defense program, and that it will do much to strengthen our national security in this critical period. Consequently, it is my hope that the House will see fit to take favorable action on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

All responsible officials of the Government say that it will do that, and without this legislation it is difficult, if not impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has again expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

First I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for the manner in which he has explained the rather intricate precedents involved in the legislation under consideration. As a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which drew up the appropriations bill for the National Military Establishment for fiscal 1950—and recently passed by this House—I am thoroughly familiar with the fiscal problems of the armed services in particular and with the Government in general. I am also thoroughly cognizant of the burdens of the taxpayer.

The appropriation bill for the armed forces passed by this House carried over \$14,000,000,000 for fiscal 1950. Of that amount about a third is for the pay and allowances of personnel. We are now

considering a bill which would increase these sums by \$360,000,000. It is a large item and one that requires careful scrutiny and precise justification.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has presented facts as to the situation in which the armed forces find themselves today in their efforts to attract and retain men of the ability required by our fighting forces. These facts add up to one inescapable truth—steady deterioration unless the Congress takes remedial action.

None of the services is currently having any difficulty keeping its enlisted ranks filled. A curious situation when we are asked to raise their pay—but the reason is not hard to find. Technological advances in all the services now require highly trained, skilled men. To meet this demand, the services maintain numerous schools which absorb more personnel as instructors and maintenance crews. And what is the result? These trained men acquire the skills that equip them to command good jobs in industry. The services constitute about as fine a training plant as there is in the country. And then we lose them because we have no planned compensation on a career basis. The turn-over is costly.

The situation with regard to officers is similar. We spend enormous sums to maintain service academies only to lose too large a part of the product through resignation at the end of their obligated service. Since we cannot attract college graduates we take what we can get and then educate them at Government expense. The services are in receipt of many applications for active service; of these most are qualified only in certain fields.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] last week told the House that he participated in the preparation of the Pay Act of 1922, the principles of which obtain today. With his characteristic forthrightness, he told you he thought that act faulty, 27 years ago. Since that time there have been piecemeal changes, until today we have a hodgepodge schedule of compensation devoid of career appeal.

We have under consideration a bill which did not originate in the minds of the generals and admirals. The career compensation plan was developed by a commission composed of three hard-headed businessmen and the president of one of our leading universities. As employers and taxpayers they know the value of responsibilities discharged and services rendered. They know the value of competent management and the false economy of mediocre management coupled with the high turn-over of personnel.

I do not endorse lightly an additional expenditure of \$360,000,000 next year. But I tell you in all sincerity, it is my firm conviction that it would be false economy not to pass this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of merit to this legislation, but there is a lot of demerit to its being called up at this particular time. Our Nation is in peril. Financial peril, bankruptcy. I would not want to be one to keep from any Army

officer remuneration sufficient for him to do the work assigned to him in a way for the benefit of our country, and to instill in him that desire to achieve an esprit de corps that makes the finest type of armed forces, but I sometimes wonder whether we are not taking pretty fair care of the Army right now, and I wonder how much more we ought to do for them. None is starving. The officers all seem to like their job. They have security.

The armed services of this country are now costing the taxpayers over \$15,000,000,000 a year, and \$15,000,000,000 is no chicken feed in anybody's language; the fact of the matter is that \$15,000,000,000 is so much that I doubt whether any Member of Congress knows how much it is, whether any Member of Congress can visualize how much it is. It is a tremendous sum of money. Then, I question sometimes all the spending that we do in Congress, whether we are taking the right attitude, whether this is really looking after the welfare of the people of our Nation. Are we going too far? Not only are we trying to take care of the people of our country but we are going so far afield that we are trying to look after everybody everywhere in the world. We do not know our ability to do for others. You have taken on too much, and it is going to sink you if you do not watch out. I know it will wreck us. I just picked up this morning's Times-Herald and my eye fell upon a fine cartoon on the editorial page by Batchelor. I think it would be wise if you all got this issue of the Times-Herald and pondered over this cartoon. It says so much and it is true. It is a cartoon of Uncle Sam down on his knees by the bed offering a prayer. He prays:

And I pray Thee, let the light of governmental economy open the eyes of Thy servants, no questions being made whether they be Republicans, Democrats, or atheists.

Underneath the cartoon appears the title: "Prayer of a Long-Suffering Man."

Uncle Sam has been a long-suffering man; he is asking the good Lord to give him guidance and to help him in trying to get a little economy into the Government. The title "Uncle Sam" ought to apply to every Member of the House of Representatives, men and women alike; they ought to look at that cartoon and each say to himself: "Am I doing what I should to keep our country sound? Are we operating it economically? Are we doing the thing that is best for these great people of ours? Are we going to perpetuate the great ideals that our forefathers tried to inculcate in this Government of ours when they said in the preamble to the Constitution, 'We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare?'" I just wonder whether we are looking after our own affairs today and those of our children and our children's children. It is your duty and it is my duty to perpetuate this country, this form of government; but let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that if we keep on the way we have been going in the last 12 or 15 years we are going to wreck this great Nation financially. Some day our

children will have to pay this great debt we are heaping upon them, or they will have to repudiate it. I am afraid they are going to repudiate it, because they cannot pay for our ruthless spending. Members of Congress, how many of you think of voting for increased cost of government, of the tremendous responsibilities. We must assume all responsibility when you vote funds as to where and how you will raise the money. Are you willing to tax your people more? Can they pay more taxes? Is it right for them to assume more burdens? Or will you bond the Nation deeper into debt and expect your children and their children to pay for your folly, for your unsound management of the affairs of your Nation?

Oh, men and women, there will be a day of reckoning. It is coming only too quickly. Will it make or break our Nation? Is it good for our country? We are not running this Government as I would run it. I can promise you that. You do not consider all phases of the legislation we consider. I am sure of that.

Whose fault will it be? It is going to be the fault of the Members of Congress who are voting for assuming these financial burdens and adding to our national deficit, so eventually we are going to crack because we cannot carry on. Men, the condition your country is in is a serious situation. Stop, look, listen. Pray for Congress and Uncle Sam.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record at this point, and be open to amendment at any point thereof.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is a very important bill and a long bill. Not everybody in the House has read this bill as carefully as the chairman has, so I am constrained to object.

Mr. VINSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—TABLE OF CONTENTS AND DEFINITIONS
Sec. 101. This act is divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Table of contents and definitions
Sec. 101. Table of contents.
Sec. 102. Definitions.

Title II—Provisions relating to basic pay and special pays

Sec. 201. Basic pay.
Sec. 202. Service creditable in computation of basic pay.
Sec. 203. Special pay—Doctors and dentists.
Sec. 204. Special pay—Hazardous duty.
Sec. 205. Special pay—Diving duty.
Sec. 206. Special pay—Sea and foreign duty.
Sec. 207. Special pay—Reenlistment bonus.

Title III—Provisions relating to allowances

Sec. 301. Basic allowance for subsistence.
Sec. 302. Basic allowance for quarters.
Sec. 303. Travel and transportation allowances.
Sec. 304. Personal money allowance.

Title IV—Provisions relating to retirement, retirement pay, separation and severance pay for physical disability

- Sec. 401. Establishment of a temporary disability retired list.
- Sec. 402. Temporary disability retirement, physical disability retirement, and disability retirement pay.
- Sec. 403. Separation and severance pay for physical disability.
- Sec. 404. Periodic physical examinations.
- Sec. 405. Recovery from physical disability.
- Sec. 406. Termination of disability retirement pay.
- Sec. 407. Reappointment to the active list of officers placed on the temporary disability retired list.
- Sec. 408. Physical disability resulting from misconduct or willful neglect.
- Sec. 409. Rank or grade in which retired.
- Sec. 410. Cessation of benefits upon separation.
- Sec. 411. Members or former members heretofore retired for physical disability.
- Sec. 412. Definition of active service.
- Sec. 413. Regulations.
- Sec. 414. Powers, duties, and functions.

Title V—Miscellaneous provisions

- Sec. 501. Training duty with or without pay of Reserve and National Guard personnel.
- Sec. 502. Active service credit in Coast and Geodetic Survey.
- Sec. 503. Payments based on purported marriages.
- Sec. 504. Contract surgeons.
- Sec. 505. Enlisted persons—Clothing allowance.
- Sec. 506. Allowance—Shore patrol duty.
- Sec. 507. Pay and allowances—Enlisted men—Philippine Scouts—Insular Force of the Navy.
- Sec. 508. Pay and allowances—Cadets and midshipmen.
- Sec. 509. Assimilation to pay and allowances of commissioned officers.
- Sec. 510. Daily rate of pay and allowances.
- Sec. 511. Termination of war—Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended.
- Sec. 512. Retired and retainer pay of members on retired lists or receiving retainer pay.
- Sec. 513. Retired pay of members and former members of Reserve components.
- Sec. 514. Retired pay grade of certain warrant officers and enlisted persons.
- Sec. 515. Retired members and former members serving on active duty.
- Sec. 516. Saving provision to retain present compensation.
- Sec. 517. Provisions relating to increase of retired pay by active duty.
- Sec. 518. Saving provision and amendments relating to members of the Marine Band.
- Sec. 519. Saving provision relating to former Lighthouse Service and former Bureau of Marine Inspection personnel.
- Sec. 520. Saving provision relating to members and former members receiving retirement pay on date of enactment of this act.
- Sec. 521. Saving provision relating to laws providing for pay repealed by this act.
- Sec. 522. Provisions of the Public Health Service Act amended and repealed.
- Sec. 523. Provision relating to retirement of officers specially commended for performance of duty in combat.
- Sec. 524. Amendment of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended.
- Sec. 525. Amendments of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 190; 41 Stat. 776).
- Sec. 526. Amendment of the act of February 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 20).

- Sec. 527. Amendments of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 315).
- Sec. 528. Amendment of the act of May 27, 1903 (35 Stat. 418).
- Sec. 529. Amendment of section 4 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 737).
- Sec. 530. Amendment of section 4 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act (55 Stat. 240).
- Sec. 531. Amendment of the act of June 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 394).
- Sec. 532. Amendment to the National Defense Act.
- Sec. 533. Acts and parts of acts repealed.
- Sec. 534. Authorization for appropriations.
- Sec. 535. Effective date.

DEFINITIONS

- Sec. 102. For the purposes of this act—
 - (a) The term "uniformed services," unless otherwise qualified, shall be interpreted to mean and include the Army of the United States, Navy, Air Force of the United States, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and all Regular and Reserve components thereof.
 - (b) The term "member," unless otherwise qualified, means a commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, flight officer, and enlisted person, including a retired person, of the uniformed services. As used in this subsection the words "retired person" shall include members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who are in receipt of retainer pay.
 - (c) The term "officer," unless otherwise qualified, means a commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, and flight officer, either permanent or temporary, of the uniformed services. As used in this subsection the word "temporary" shall include temporary officers whose permanent status is that of an enlisted person.
 - (d) The term "commissioned officer" means a member of the uniformed services having rank or grade of second lieutenant, ensign, or junior assistant grade, or above, either permanent or temporary, in any of the uniformed services, except that for purposes of section 203 of this act such term shall be limited to the definition prescribed in subsection (a) of said section.
 - (e) The term "warrant officer" means a commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, or flight officer, including a master, chief engineer, first mate, second mate, assistant engineer, or second assistant engineer of the Army Mine Planter Service.
 - (f) The term "Secretary," unless otherwise qualified, shall be construed to mean the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, or the Federal Security Administrator, as the case may be.
 - (g) The term "dependent" shall include at all times and in all places the lawful wife and unmarried legitimate children, under 21 years of age, of any member of the uniformed services, except as hereinafter limited in this subsection. Such terms shall include the father or mother of such member, provided he or she is in fact dependent on such member for over half of his or her support and actually resides in the household of said member. It shall also include unmarried legitimate children, over 21 years of age, of such member who are incapable of self-support because of being mentally defective or physically incapacitated, and who are in fact dependent on such member for over half of his or her support: *Provided*, That the term "children" shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon such member: *Provided further*, That in the case of female members of the uniformed services, the term "dependent" shall include a husband in addition to those persons otherwise defined as dependents in this subsection, but only when such

husband, or children as defined above, are in fact dependent upon said female member for over half of his or her support.

The term "father" or "mother," as used in this subsection, shall include a stepparent, or parent by adoption, and any person, including a former stepparent, who has stood in loco parentis to the person concerned at any time for a continuous period of not less than 5 years during the minority of such member: *Provided*, That a stepparent-stepchild relationship shall be deemed to be terminated by the stepparent's divorce from the blood parent: *Provided further*, That no member claiming a dependent as defined in this subsection may be paid increased allowances on account of such dependent for any period during which such dependent is entitled to receive basic pay for the performance of duty as defined in section 201 (e) of this act.

(h) The term "basic allowance" shall be interpreted to mean only the "basic allowance for quarters" and the "basic allowance for subsistence."

(i) The term "inactive-duty training" shall be interpreted to mean any of the training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or equivalent training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or hazardous duty performed with or without compensation by members of the Reserve components of the uniformed services as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned pursuant to section 501 of this act or any other provision of law, and in addition thereto shall include the performance of special additional duties as may be authorized by competent authority by such members on a volunteer basis in connection with the prescribed training or maintenance activities of the unit to which the members are assigned: *Provided*, That the term "inactive-duty training" shall not include work or study performed by such members in connection with correspondence courses of the uniformed services: *Provided further*, That any inactive-duty training performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States, while in their status as members of the National Guard, or the Air National Guard, of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 92 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or pursuant to any other provision of law, shall be deemed to be inactive-duty training in the service of the United States.

(j) The terms "he," "his," and "him" include the terms "she" and "her."

(k) With respect to the Army and the Air Force, the term "Reserve component" or the term "Reserve components," unless otherwise qualified, shall include but not be limited to those members, officers, or enlisted persons who are not appointed, enlisted, or inducted in a Regular or Reserve component of the Army of the United States or of the Air Force of the United States, but are appointed, enlisted, or inducted in the Army of the United States or the Air Force of the United States without specification as to any component thereof pursuant to any provision of law.

Mr. JOHNSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the table of contents be dispensed with and be printed in the proper place in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of section 102, which is merely the reading of definitions, be dispensed with, and printed in the proper place in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 5, line 17, strike out the word "terms" and insert "term."

Page 7, line 14, insert a comma after the word "duties."

Page 7, line 15, insert a comma after the word "authority."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO BASIC PAY AND SPECIAL PAYS

BASIC PAY

SEC. 201. (a) For the purpose of computing the basic pay of members of the uniformed services, pay grades are prescribed, and monthly basic pay for such members is established within each pay grade according to cumulative years of service, as follows:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Cumulative years of service						
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12
O-8.....	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00
O-7.....	810.00	810.00	810.00	810.00	810.00	810.00	810.00
O-6.....	600.00	600.00	600.00	600.00	600.00	600.00	600.00
O-5.....	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00
O-4.....	405.00	405.00	405.00	405.00	420.00	435.00	450.00
O-3.....	330.00	330.00	345.00	360.00	375.00	390.00	405.00
O-2.....	262.50	277.50	292.50	307.50	322.50	337.50	352.50
O-1.....	225.00	240.00	255.00	270.00	285.00	300.00	315.00

WARRANT OFFICERS

W-4.....	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$345.00	\$360.00	\$375.00	\$390.00
W-3.....	300.00	300.00	300.00	307.50	315.00	322.50	330.00
W-2.....	262.50	262.50	262.50	262.50	270.00	277.50	285.00
W-1.....	217.50	217.50	217.50	225.00	232.50	240.00	247.50

ENLISTED PERSONS

E-7.....	\$202.50	\$202.50	\$210.00	\$217.50	\$225.00	\$232.50	\$240.00
E-6.....	172.50	172.50	180.00	187.50	195.00	202.50	210.00
E-5.....	142.50	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00	187.50
E-4.....	120.00	127.50	135.00	142.50	150.00	157.50	165.00
E-3.....	97.50	105.00	112.50	120.00	127.50	135.00	142.50
E-2.....	82.50	90.00	97.50	105.00	112.50	120.00	127.50
E-1.....	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

O-8.....	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$1,005.00
O-7.....	810.00	810.00	810.00	810.00	840.00	870.00	870.00
O-6.....	600.00	615.00	645.00	675.00	705.00	735.00	735.00
O-5.....	510.00	525.00	555.00	585.00	615.00	645.00	645.00
O-4.....	465.00	480.00	510.00	525.00	540.00	540.00	540.00
O-3.....	420.00	435.00	450.00	465.00	465.00	465.00	465.00
O-2.....	367.50	367.50	367.50	367.50	367.50	367.50	367.50
O-1.....	330.00	330.00	330.00	330.00	330.00	330.00	330.00

WARRANT OFFICERS

W-4.....	\$405.00	\$420.00	\$435.00	\$450.00	\$465.00	\$480.00	\$480.00
W-3.....	337.50	345.00	360.00	375.00	390.00	405.00	405.00
W-2.....	292.50	300.00	315.00	330.00	345.00	360.00	360.00
W-1.....	255.00	262.50	277.50	292.50	307.50	322.50	322.50

ENLISTED PERSONS

E-7.....	\$247.50	\$255.00	\$270.00	\$285.00	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
E-6.....	217.50	225.00	240.00	255.00	255.00	255.00	255.00
E-5.....	195.00	202.50	217.50	232.50	232.50	232.50	232.50
E-4.....	172.50	180.00	195.00	195.00	195.00	195.00	195.00
E-3.....	150.00	150.00	150.00	150.00	150.00	150.00	150.00
E-2.....	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00	120.00
E-1.....	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00

(b) For basic pay purposes, commissioned officers are hereby assigned by the rank or grade in which serving, whether under temporary or permanent appointment, to the

various pay grades prescribed for commissioned officers by subsection (a) of this section, as follows:

Pay grade	Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps	Navy, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey	Public Health Service
O-8.....	General, lieutenant general, and major general.	Admiral, vice admiral, and rear admiral (upper half).	Surgeon general, deputy surgeon general, and assistant surgeon general having rank of major general.
O-7.....	Brigadier general.	Rear admiral (lower half) and commodore.	Assistant surgeon general having rank of brigadier general.
O-6.....	Colonel.	Captain.	Director grade.
O-5.....	Lieutenant colonel.	Commander.	Senior grade.
O-4.....	Major.	Lieutenant commander.	Full grade.
O-3.....	Captain.	Lieutenant.	Senior assistant grade.
O-2.....	First lieutenant.	Lieutenant (junior grade).	Assistant grade.
O-1.....	Second lieutenant.	Ensign.	Junior assistant grade.

(c) For basic pay purposes, warrant officers shall be distributed by the Secretary concerned in the various pay grades prescribed for warrant officers in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) For basic pay purposes, enlisted persons shall be distributed by the Secretary concerned in the various pay grades prescribed for enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section.

(e) All members of the uniformed services when on the active list, when on active duty, or when participating in full-time training, training duty with pay or other full-time duty (provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, or in the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performances of the duties provided for by sections 5, 81, 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended), and, in addition thereto, all members of the National Guard and the Air National Guard when they are entitled by law to receive from the Federal Government the same pay as that authorized for members of the Regular components of the uniformed services of corresponding grade or rank, shall be entitled to receive the basic pay of the pay grade to which assigned, or in which distributed, pursuant to subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section, in accordance with cumulative years of service: *Provided*, That in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, in the case of members of the uniformed services called or ordered to extended active duty in excess of 30 days, active duty shall include the time required to perform travel from home to first duty station and from last duty station to home by the mode of transportation authorized in orders for such members: *Provided further*, That any full-time training, training duty with pay, or other full-time duty performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, pursuant to this section, while in their status as members of the National Guard or the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia and which entitles them to receive basic pay, shall be deemed to be active duty in the service of the United States.

Mr. SUTTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of section 201 (a) be dispensed with, and be printed in the RECORD at this point and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 9, in the tabulation of commissioned officers under "O-8" "Over 30" strike out "\$10,005" and insert "\$1,005."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, line 17, strike out "performances" and insert "performance."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 8, line 23, strike out section 201 (a).

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a misconception that I am

against the pay raise. I am not against a pay raise for the armed services, but I am for an equitable pay raise. Too long has the brass had the breaks. It was the civilian in uniform who won World War II, it was not those who sought refuge in the bombproof shelters of the Pentagon. It was your enlisted man, your second lieutenants, your first lieutenants, your captains, and they are the ones who are suffering, along with those in equivalent ranks. They are the boys that need a break, they are the boys that are entitled to a pay raise, and they need it badly. They should receive a considerable increase. I am in favor of giving it to them. If you will bring in a bill providing for a pay raise that takes care of the enlisted man and compensates him for taking away his family allowance, and include the ensigns, second lieutenants, first lieutenants, lieutenants (jg), lieutenants, and captains, then I am for it. On top of that, we should raise the generals just a little, but I am not in favor of giving the whole thing to the top brass. They do not need it as these other boys do.

You speak of career boys. With 200,000 applicants right now for 9,000 billets, do not tell me we cannot get Army officers and Navy officers back in the service. I have them applying, and you have, too. Every Member of this body knows numerous ex-officers who are seeking to reenlist in the Army or Navy. They were good officers. They went down through the valley of hell during World War II. You cannot tell me they are not competent and efficient enough to run the armed services of this great Government.

A substitute is going to be offered for my amendment, and it is a good amendment, too. It will be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. It gives the second lieutenant, the first lieutenant, and the captain the same pay raise you are asking for and at the same time makes the pay raise on a gradual scale. I hope this committee will adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri because it is a fair amendment. We do not want to disrupt the armed services. Heaven knows we do not. Above all, I believe in the armed forces of our country, but I believe in fair and equitable treatment of all men regardless of their rank.

In spite of what the gentleman from Texas has said, I do not believe that he can specifically name one man in the enlisted men's group who, with his family, will have as much take-home pay after you repeal his family allowance.

I will not go back to my district in the State of Tennessee, the grand old Volunteer State, that has been the Volunteer State in every war this country has ever had, and tell the wife of that enlisted man or the baby of that enlisted man, "I am the one who took the food out of your mouth." Oh, for shame.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment would take food out of their mouths, because the gentleman's amendment strikes out all the pay.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman did not hear me when I said the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] would offer a substitute for my amendment.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is not then in favor of his own amendment?

Mr. SUTTON. I stand with the statement that I made in the genesis of my remarks, to wit, I favor the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], which we have worked out and agreed upon.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment takes the food out of the mouths of the enlisted men and everybody.

Mr. SUTTON. In the same breath I told the gentleman I was in favor of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], which would take care of the enlisted man, the second lieutenant, the first lieutenant, the captain, and equivalent ranks.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is not asking the committee to adopt his amendment?

Mr. SUTTON. I repeat again that I am asking the committee to adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri, which we have agreed is equitable and fair.

Mr. VINSON. Therefore the gentleman is against the amendment he has offered.

Mr. SUTTON. I am for a pay raise, as I said and I will support the amendment which I am happy to state provides for a fair, just, and equitable pay raise for the lower ranks.

Let us get back to what I was saying.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. I will not go back to my people and tell them I did my duty here at the Capitol, if I take this food and clothing away from their babies. You made a contract with those boys who enlisted after 1946, and a promise made is a debt unpaid. They knew that this family-allowance provision existed. You have a few extreme cases of men having 14 dependents, or 8 dependents. Show me how many cases like that there are in the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. That is strictly a matter of policy of the recruiting officer and not an argument against the family-allowance provision. It is time that we started to think. It is time we started to fulfill our contracts. If we cannot fulfill our contracts to the boys in the service, and their wives, mothers, and children, how can we even look at ourselves in the mirror? My conscience would hound me to my grave. My sense of fairness will not permit me to take away that family allowance after we made a contract with those boys who enlisted after 1946. Are you not going to fulfill this pledge and this promise to them? Are you going to say to these people, "Get out of the Army," with economic conditions as they are today? And with unemployment coming on us?

Do you want to pitch the United States into more unemployment and refuse to comply with your promise?

Mr. Chairman, something is wrong. Let us look at it sensibly. Let us help the people who need some help. Let us help these enlisted men. Let us help the man who is gun fodder, and that is not demagoguery—that is actuality, because I saw it. Let us give them their just dues and a fair break. Let us give the low ranks their break, then help the upper brackets. But take care of those boys who are actually doing the fighting, not the ones who are sitting behind a desk at the Pentagon Building, and not the ones who have a chauffeur. May I say to my friend from Georgia that there were two cars sitting out there this morning in front of the Capitol. I asked the boy, "What are you doing over here? Who is in this car?" "I brought three officers over here to lobby for this bill."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I do not think the gentleman has a monopoly on interest in the enlisted man. I should like to remind him that to take the place of this family allowance which he regrets is to be withdrawn by this bill, amounting to an annual cost of \$314,000,000, this bill gives to that same enlisted man—

Mr. SUTTON. Yes; it gives him \$173,000,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. It gives to that same enlisted man an added basic pay of \$314,000,000, plus an added quarters allowance of \$142,000,000, making a net gain to those same people in whom you and I are interested, \$143,000,000.

Mr. SUTTON. When a man gets a 3-percent raise amounting to \$2.50 a month, how can that compare with the \$50 a month that his dependents are getting? How can a corporal getting \$7.50 a month raise compare that with the \$50 a month that you have taken away from him? Answer that, if you will.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Does the gentleman favor the family allowance as a permanent policy?

Mr. SUTTON. Not as a permanent policy; but there was a contract with these men and I favor the Government complying with its promises.

Mr. HARE. Does the gentleman realize that the family-allowance proposition was a temporary wartime measure?

Mr. SUTTON. Does not the gentleman realize that conditions in the world are still in a crisis, and that the war has not been officially declared over; and does not the gentleman realize that China is still in a state of war; and does not the gentleman also realize that we are appropriating \$5,500,000,000 for ECA to keep down communism?

Mr. HARE. Does the gentleman realize, by the same token, that we can certainly appropriate \$500,000,000 for the pay of our own armed services?

Mr. SUTTON. I am in favor of the pay raise, and I have repeatedly said

that, but I am in favor of a fair, impartial, just, and equitable pay raise.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. In the committee hearings on the bill, H. R. 2553, at page 1384, the original bill sustains the gentleman's position.

Mr. SUTTON. That is what should have been kept in this bill. I congratulate

the gentleman from Texas on putting that in his original bill.

Mr. CARROLL. That sustains the very argument that the gentleman is making now, because it was provided in substance that no enlistment term shall operate inequitably against men who have entered a contract with the Government.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 9, after line 2, strike out the table and insert the following table in lieu thereof:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Cumulative years of service												
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-8.....	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$926.25	\$954.75
O-7.....	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	769.50	826.50
O-6.....	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	570.00	584.25	612.75	641.25	669.75	698.25
O-5.....	456.00	456.00	456.00	456.00	456.00	456.00	456.00	470.25	484.50	498.75	527.25	555.75	584.25
O-4.....	384.75	384.75	384.75	384.75	399.00	413.25	427.50	441.75	456.00	484.50	498.75	513.00	513.00
O-3.....	320.10	320.10	334.65	349.20	363.75	378.30	392.85	407.40	421.95	436.50	451.05	451.05	451.05
O-2.....	254.63	269.18	283.73	298.28	312.83	327.38	341.93	356.48	356.48	356.48	356.48	356.48	356.48
O-1.....	218.25	232.80	247.35	261.90	276.45	291.00	305.55	320.10	320.10	320.10	320.10	320.10	320.10

WARRANT OFFICERS

W-4.....	\$320.10	\$320.10	\$320.10	\$334.65	\$349.20	\$363.75	\$378.30	\$392.85	\$407.40	\$421.95	\$436.50	\$451.05	\$465.60
W-3.....	291.00	291.00	291.00	298.28	305.55	312.83	320.10	327.38	334.65	349.20	363.75	378.30	382.85
W-2.....	254.63	254.63	254.63	254.63	261.90	269.18	276.45	283.73	291.00	305.55	320.10	334.65	349.20
W-1.....	210.98	210.98	210.98	218.25	225.53	232.80	240.08	247.35	254.63	269.18	283.73	298.28	298.28

ENLISTED PERSONS

E-7.....	\$196.43	\$196.43	\$203.70	\$210.98	\$218.25	\$225.53	\$232.80	\$240.08	\$247.35	\$261.90	\$276.45	\$291.00	\$291.00
E-6.....	167.33	167.33	174.60	181.88	189.15	196.43	203.70	210.98	218.25	232.80	247.35	247.35	247.35
E-5.....	138.23	145.50	152.78	160.05	167.33	174.60	181.88	189.15	196.43	210.98	225.53	225.53	225.53
E-4.....	116.40	123.68	130.95	138.23	145.50	152.78	160.05	167.33	174.60	189.15	189.15	189.15	189.15
E-3.....	94.58	101.85	109.13	116.40	123.68	130.95	138.23	145.50	152.78	160.05	167.33	174.60	181.88
E-2.....	80.03	87.30	94.58	101.85	109.13	116.40	123.68	130.95	138.23	145.50	152.78	160.05	167.33
E-1.....	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75	72.75

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I may state that the body of the amendment constitutes a new table to the request of the gentleman from page 9 of the bill. It would be a little involved for the Clerk to read it. I can explain it much more readily. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for five additional minutes and that the amendment may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a simple statement before I state in detail what this amendment does.

The thing I am concerned with is whether or not action today will tie the hands of the Appropriations Committee in such a way as to make it impossible to make an equitable readjustment of appropriations in future years. The pending bill will, in effect, add \$406,000,000 to the annual appropriations for the Military Establishment. It is not a matter of \$406,000,000 for 1 year. It is a matter of \$406,000,000 every year that you have the same composition and size of the armed services. We here would establish a pay scale. It would be frozen at this figure until subsequent legislation might modify it one way or another.

Back in 1933, when the pay scale of the Army was high in relation to general economic conditions, it brought on the Economy Act, and that produced a great deal of difficulty throughout the country, in veterans' compensation as well as in the Army. I would like to see us estab-

lish a pay scale that is scientific, that is based upon responsibility, that is graduated, that does get away from the hodgepodge that has grown up over a period of years.

So, over the week end I got in contact with the Budget Division of the armed services in the Pentagon. I asked for tables, which could be substituted for this table which is in the committee bill, that would save in the nature of \$100,000,000 from the estimates that they had made of the cost of the bill as presented by the committee. They did prepare two such tables for me, one based on a 3-percent reduction from the committee schedule, the other a 5-percent reduction in the upper grades. I have them here under a memorandum from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. These are not tables that I have worked out. They are tables worked out by the Budget Office in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the same technical people who worked out the schedule that is in the bill presented here and also the schedule for the Hook Commission. I have taken the top part of the 5-percent table—that covering field grade and general officers—and combined it with the 3-percent table for all grades below that—that is, below major—and have offered that as a new pay schedule. Applying the estimates of savings also supplied by the Budget Office in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, this amendment will save approximately \$114,000,000 each year out of the proposed \$406,000,000 increase.

I am striking at the problem of the over-all cost of Government. Many people speak about reducing the cost of Government, but the practical problem is before you right now. If we pass a bill that requires an additional \$400,000,000

or more for the Military Establishment every year, then the Appropriations Committee has its hands tied. If you want them next year to cut the total appropriation for the armed services by half a billion dollars, they cannot do it on the Army pay unless they reduce the size of the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. They have to do it in subsistence or equipment or in matériel. So what I am seeking here is to get a schedule which would permit us to save something and still preserve what I consider the fine features of this bill, in establishing a scientific, graduated pay scale for the Army and the Navy.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the fact that the amendment was not read, will the gentleman now give us some comparisons? For instance, let us start right at the bottom.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to take all these individual cases. The pay schedule under the amendment, from the grade of general to major, inclusive, is 5 percent below the schedule proposed in the committee bill. From major down it is 3 percent less than the committee has proposed.

Mr. VINSON. Then is it 5 percent on each grade from the grade of major up?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. From major up through general it is 5 percent below the new pay schedule in the committee bill.

Mr. VINSON. In the proposed bill a major's pay is fixed at \$480. It would be 5 percent less than that? That is the way you make your calculation, is it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. VINSON. And from captain on down to the enlisted grades, grade 7, it is 3 percent under what the proposed bill carries for each grade; is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. How much saving will that bring about?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That will accomplish a saving of approximately \$114,000,000.

Mr. VINSON. For each fiscal year?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For each fiscal year.

Mr. VINSON. That is for a full year?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is for a full year.

Mr. VINSON. So therefore this bill going into effect in October, there would be a greater saving? It would not cost that much?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true the first year.

Mr. VINSON. So the Committee can thoroughly understand it, just take this scale and show the difference between the committee figures and the gentleman's figures: For instance, a major general under the proposed bill would get \$1,005 a month; under the gentleman's 5-percent reduction what would he get?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us take the figures under the first column. The major general at the present time, according to the table in the committee report on page 49 would be getting \$733.

Mr. VINSON. That is his present pay.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. And the committee bill carries \$975.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And my amendment would carry \$926.25; but with 30 years' service it would be \$954.

Mr. VINSON. Then, that is a 5-percent cut in each grade.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. And it is not an overall cut, but it is a 5-percent cut on each grade.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On each grade down to captain.

Mr. VINSON. Because, that makes a big difference.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Maybe it is too early to ask this question, but does the gentleman's amendment apply to warrant officers and enlisted men also?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Three percent when you get to the rank of captain and below; not a 3-percent cut of their present pay, but a 3-percent cut of the committee schedule.

Mr. JOHNSON. But my specific question is: Does it include warrant officers and enlisted men?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. All the way down?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. It is a complete table.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment includes a 3-percent cut on the present salaries?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Only a 3-percent cut on the total that is in the committee bill, which leaves, in all instances, a raise over present pay.

Mr. VINSON. It is 3 percent under what we put in the bill for each grade under the rank of captain and 5 percent for each grade over the rank of captain.

Mr. CARROLL. The point I had in mind, if the gentleman from South Dakota would yield so that the chairman of the committee might answer, is the enlisted man on a salary of \$75. Does this 3-percent cut apply to his salary?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us take the \$75 per month man. In the first place, the \$75 salary applies only to a recruit and only for 3 months; he gets \$75 only for 3 months. When you apply the 3-percent cut to the \$75, bearing in mind that this would not apply to the recruit already in the service, it would mean that the recruit who came in after this law became effective would get \$72.75.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct for 3 months. It still is a pretty fair entrance salary when subsistence, clothing, lodging, medical care, et cetera are concerned.

Mr. CARROLL. So actually the gentleman's amendment provides a lower pay than the present bill.

Mr. VINSON. That is the only category.

Mr. CARROLL. In that particular category.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that one instance only; and that would apply only to the recruit; and in that instance he has a reduction of \$2.25 for only 3 months, which would be a little over \$6 for the entire period it would be applicable but it makes the schedule consistent.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Under this bill the brigadier general would get approximately a 60-percent increase, yet the gentleman's amendment would cut him only 5 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is not quite that bad when you consider changes in allowances. Yet you cannot make any uniform increases under the theory of the bill. The theory of the bill is to get rid of some of the inequities that exist at the present time and place pay on the basis of responsibility and advancement in service. Let us take another example; let us take the master sergeant.

Mr. VINSON. The master sergeant gets \$214.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is as of today. By the table on page 49 of the committee report, the bill would increase that to \$270. My amendment would be 3 percent less than that or approximately \$262, leaving him with a substantial raise over his \$214, and even better than that when other allowances are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman from Georgia has the table in front of him I will run over the table. Let us take the private now in class E-2. He gets \$80; the committee bill proposes \$82.50; my amendment would cut him to \$80.03. He gets just a nominal increase. A private first class, E-3, under present law gets \$90; the committee bill proposes \$97.50; my amendment would give him \$94.58.

Mr. VINSON. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This table uses the 3 percent clear on through up to and including the grade of captain.

Mr. VINSON. And the reduction of 3 percent is on the committee bill's figures.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is exactly correct.

I have here a memorandum on the economies effected by using an over-all 3-percent cut in all grades and by a 5-percent cut from the top down to and including the top three grades of enlisted personnel. A straight 3-percent cut would save \$107,500,000; the limited 5 percent would save \$103,800,000 according to the study in the office of the budget of the Secretary of Defense. By combining them, using the 5 percent for the grades above captain and the 3 percent below that, as my amendment does, the saving will be approximately \$114,000,000 and still mean substantial improvement in individual pay and retain the careful graduated relationship worked out by the Hook Commission and the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorandum referred to follows:

National Military Establishment—Summary table of effect of reductions in basic pay scale on cost of H. R. 4591, based on fiscal year 1950, average strength

[In millions of dollars]

	Cost at rates in H. R. 4591	Cost at reduced rates	Reduction in cost by reason of amendment
A. Assuming a 3-percent reduction in basic pay scale:			
Basic pay.....	\$2,997.7	\$2,907.8	\$89.9
Reserve and National Guard training.....	281.8	273.3	8.5
Lump sum terminal leave.....	25.8	25.0	.8
Death gratuity.....	7.0	6.8	.2
Retirement and severance payments.....	269.1	261.0	8.1
Total, items affected by changes in basic pay scale.....	3,581.4	3,473.9	107.5
B. Assuming a 5-percent reduction in basic pay scale for officers, warrant officers, and top three grades of enlisted personnel:			
Basic pay.....	2,997.7	2,910.8	86.9
Reserve and National Guard training.....	281.8	273.6	8.2
Lump sum terminal leave.....	25.8	25.1	.7
Death gratuity.....	7.0	6.8	.2
Retirement and severance payments.....	269.1	261.3	7.8
Total, items affected by changes in basic pay scale.....	3,581.4	3,477.6	103.8

Source: Office of the Budget, Secretary of Defense, May 23, 1949.

The tables or schedule in the amendment were prepared by the Defense Establishment and I am depending upon their figures and estimates. They are the same group who prepared the data for the committee.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. As I understand the gentleman's arguments, he believes in the principles of the bill the committee has reported; the only thing in which he differs is that we should have a little lower scale. The underlying philosophy, the idea of the bill that it will bring about a good career service, is concurred in by the gentleman. Is that true?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. I want to accomplish the general objectives of this bill, but I cannot escape the fact that there is a feeling in the country that we should not freeze the pay schedules to the economic outlook of 6 months or a year ago.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think there is a lot of merit in the gentleman's attitude. I may say to the gentleman that I am glad to find that the gentleman who for years has been on the committee making appropriations for the Military Establishment, agrees that this is a bill that is well-conceived in principle and will bring about the principle set forth, which is to get a career system for our armed services.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman realizes that under the present situation it is just a hodgepodge set-up, entirely inaccurate, very inconsistent, and something should be done. Our bill is the approach.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do realize that, and that is why I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to strike out the section entirely will not prevail. I have offered my amendment as a perfecting amendment. It should be voted upon first so that there is a chance to have a new schedule before us and draw the issue between that and striking out the section completely.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. What the gentleman has just said is that this bill and these figures were arrived at some 6 months ago, and therefore he thinks the conditions have changed. But, that line of argument would hold with reference to every appropriation bill, because your appropriation bills were made up last August. So, I do not think the gentleman's argument is upon sound foundation, because we proceeded to enact every appropriation bill based upon facts and conclusions that were reached by the budget last August.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, in the bill reported by the subcommittee on independent offices, with which I had something to do, we did not accept the figures

that were made last August, and we brought in a bill that reduced the budget estimate by \$673,000,000. And the recently reported ECA bill, it might be noted, was modified from last summer's estimates by the Bureau of the Budget as well as by the Appropriations Committee precisely upon that ground.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman himself recognizes that this bill is not based upon the philosophy of cost of living. This bill is based upon the philosophy of responsibility, and if the responsibility existed in August and it exists today, the conclusion reached in August would be the proper conclusion to apply when you enact the law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Except that salaries are running on into the future. I would like to leave just this little incident with the committee. This matter of Army pay was a concern of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Army and the Air Force at the time we had the last hearing with General Eisenhower, when he was Chief of Staff. We were aware then of the danger of losing some of the best men in the Military Establishment, and the Committee on Appropriations could not deal with the situation then because we were limited to the pay schedule in existence then. The chairman of our committee said to General Eisenhower, "General, how do you face such a situation as that?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman should point out, and it should be considered by the Committee in the consideration of the gentleman's amendment, that it is anticipated by the Armed Services Committee that in the next year there will be put on the statute books a law providing for a contributory retirement system for the military people, under which they will be required to pay approximately 6 percent of their base pay, so that if that should develop within the next year it will result in a reduction over the pay scales proposed in the bill of approximately 6 percent. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what his view would be, assuming that his amendment is adopted, and eventually becomes part of the law, should the Congress, when it considers the contributory retirement proposal, make some appropriate adjustment of the pay scale at that time to compensate for the reduction occasioned by reason of his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I still continue my reservation of objection. I do not object; I reserve the right to object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman wishes me to respond to him in

the time he has under the reservation of objection, which I am perfectly willing to do. My reply to the gentleman is that my position on that bill will be governed, of course, by the terms of the bill and by conditions at the time. In general, I believe in the principle of contribution to retirement funds. I think at that time if the committee brings in that kind of a bill it should bring in a report which would give us the facts comparing the pay scale that might be in existence then with the economic outlook at that time, and showing the comparative benefits that go with holding a commissioned rank in the Army. There are many things that go into making a career in the Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps attractive entirely apart from the pay itself. There is the fact that there is security in the job. That is something you do not get outside.

Mr. COLE of New York. I take it that it is the position of the gentleman that the pay scale for the military people should be revised from year to year by the Congress depending on the economic conditions that might exist.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not think it is a practical proposition to revise it each year, but I think that you should take into consideration the overall picture. You should realize that the Government trains these people who are in the armed services. They get their education free, even after they are out holding a job, so to speak. They may then be sent to graduate schools or to the command school to further their education on Government time and Government pay to fit themselves for a higher grade or rank.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman cannot continue indefinitely under a reservation of objection. He has already used 5 minutes in answering the gentleman from New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Committee, of course, is aware that the way the time developed was outside of my control. I was merely answering a question raised under a reservation of objection.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentleman stated a minute or two ago that he thought the bill was written with the cost of living 6 or 8 months ago in mind. Does the gentleman not know that the record shows that in the last two consecutive months the cost of living has risen and not lowered?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I also know that the receipts of the Federal Government are going down, and that under the Treasury statement I had with me Friday, in the month of May of this year the net position of the Treasury on the basis of receipts from withholding taxes and other sources of revenue is

down. It had worsened by \$600,000,000 in the first 17 days of May as compared to the first 17 days of May a year ago. If the Treasury was off \$600,000,000 in its receipts in the first 17 days of May, largely the outcome of a change in the amount of withholding taxes received on wages paid, then the economy of the country has changed so much that we should not tie the hands of the Committee on Appropriations too much to a pay schedule based on the economic outlook of 6 months or a year ago. Remember that this bill will create a legal basis for pay obligations from now on—it is not an appropriation for a single year.

May I recite this little incident. The last time General Eisenhower appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, was when we were discussing this matter of military pay. We were all bothered by the difference in salaries offered in the Army and those offered outside in the early postwar months but we did mention some of the perquisites that go with a military career. It was the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], I think who said: "General, what do you say, how do you handle it when one of the men you need is offered big pay outside?" Then, as nearly as I recall, General Eisenhower said that he had to rely in part on the appeal in public service, and he added in a way I shall never forget: "I think, Mr. Chairman, a great mistake was made when we started leaving the word 'patriotism' out of our Fourth of July speeches."

Mr. Chairman, I think it is impossible for the Congress, in regard to civilian careers in Government or the service in Congress or service in the armed forces, always to measure the compensation in terms of dollars. Unless the men who serve in this body, unless the men who serve in the uniformed services, unless the men who serve in the civilian branches of the Government, are actuated by a spirit of patriotism and public service, then God help America. It will always be necessary in a country like ours that men and women have a desire to serve the common good if we are to have the public service the country needs.

To summarize, the pending amendment does preserve the relationship proposed by the committee bill and gets away from the hodgepodge that has grown up through the years, but it does offer an opportunity to save \$114,000,000 below the bill as presented, and it does permit the bill to be enacted and have the various improvements in retirement and other features that are tied in with the pay schedule. If you strike out the pay schedule completely, then you do not know what you have done to the rest of the bill because it is referred to in instance after instance as you go on through the bill.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING as a substitute for the Case amendment: On page 9, strike out the tables following line 2 and insert:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Cumulative years of service						
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12
O-8.....	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$775.00
O-7.....	675.00	675.00	675.00	675.00	675.00	675.00	675.00
O-6.....	550.00	550.00	550.00	550.00	550.00	550.00	550.00
O-5.....	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00	480.00
O-4.....	405.00	405.00	405.00	405.00	420.00	420.00	420.00
O-3.....	330.00	330.00	345.00	360.00	375.00	390.00	405.00
O-2.....	262.50	277.50	292.50	307.50	322.50	337.50	352.50
O-1.....	225.00	240.00	255.00	270.00	285.00	300.00	315.00

WARRANT OFFICERS

W-4.....	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$330.00	\$345.00	\$360.00	\$375.00	\$390.00
W-3.....	300.00	300.00	300.00	307.50	315.00	322.50	330.00
W-2.....	262.50	262.50	262.50	262.50	270.00	277.50	285.00
W-1.....	217.50	217.50	217.50	225.00	232.50	240.00	247.50

ENLISTED PERSONS

E-7.....	\$202.50	\$202.50	\$210.00	\$217.50	\$225.00	\$232.50	\$240.00
E-6.....	172.50	172.50	180.00	187.50	195.00	202.50	210.00
E-5.....	142.50	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00	187.50
E-4.....	120.00	127.50	135.00	142.50	150.00	157.50	165.00
E-3.....	97.50	105.00	112.50	120.00	127.50	135.00	142.50
E-2.....	82.50	90.00	97.50	105.00	112.50	120.00	127.50
E-1.....	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Cumulative years of service					
	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-8.....	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$775.00	\$805.00	\$805.00
O-7.....	675.00	675.00	675.00	675.00	705.00	705.00
O-6.....	550.00	550.00	580.00	605.00	635.00	635.00
O-5.....	480.00	480.00	510.00	535.00	565.00	565.00
O-4.....	435.00	450.00	480.00	505.00	535.00	565.00
O-3.....	420.00	435.00	450.00	465.00	485.00	485.00
O-2.....	367.50	367.50	367.50	367.50	367.50	367.50
O-1.....	330.00	330.00	330.00	330.00	330.00	330.00

WARRANT OFFICERS

W-4.....	\$405.00	\$420.00	\$435.00	\$450.00	\$465.00	\$480.00
W-3.....	337.50	345.00	360.00	375.00	390.00	405.00
W-2.....	292.50	300.00	315.00	330.00	345.00	360.00
W-1.....	255.00	262.50	277.50	292.50	307.50	322.50

ENLISTED PERSONS

E-7.....	\$247.50	\$255.00	\$270.00	\$285.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
E-6.....	217.50	225.00	240.00	255.00	270.00	270.00
E-5.....	195.00	202.50	217.50	232.50	247.50	247.50
E-4.....	172.50	180.00	195.00	210.00	225.00	225.00
E-3.....	150.00	157.50	172.50	187.50	202.50	202.50
E-2.....	120.00	127.50	142.50	157.50	172.50	172.50
E-1.....	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00

Mr. BOLLING (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are the other items, remaining to be read, identical with what is in the bill?

Mr. BOLLING. Yes; they are identical with the committee's proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON. Only the ones that have been read are those that are changed?

Mr. BOLLING. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, then the gentleman's amendment merely deals with the rank of major on up?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. And it does not deal with the balance of the pay scale at all?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us represents an effort to make an important step forward in developing a sound national defense policy. It is vitally important that the United States not do in the coming years what we did in the twenties and thirties—drop our guard, as it were. In those years, our armed services were treated like unwanted orphans. They had inadequate recognition, inadequate appropriations, inadequate pay to maintain minimum

morale, minimum equipment, minimum effectiveness. We suffered for this at Pearl Harbor in 1941 and we paid for it time and again on Bataan, at Wake, and in the shipping lanes of all oceans during 1942 and 1943.

We must not make the same mistake again. The Armed Services Committee in this bill is attempting to take one of the many steps which we must take if we are to be adequately defended.

I agree with those Members who have cited the frightening significance of the increased rate of resignations from the services. I agree that we must attract into our services the highest type of career men. One of the important attractions must inevitably be the rate of monetary compensation. Permit me to point out that this is equally important in our civilian departments and that as yet we have not remedied the equally discouraging situation which finds us unable to attract our ablest men and women into the service of their country in civilian government service.

However, the matter before us now is the armed services. The fundamental purpose of this bill is sound. It would bring order out of chaos and modernize an antiquated and patched-up pay, allowance, and retirement system. However, such a measure must be sound, not only in theory, but also in practice. It must take into account conditions as they are, not as the outside observer believes them to be. It was with relief that I noted that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia did not include in his revised remarks which appear in the RECORD of May 20 the flat statement which he made on the floor of the House last Friday afternoon in speaking of general or flag officers, to the effect that they did not have cars or chauffeurs. I do not question the gentleman's good faith in making the remark. It does, however, demonstrate the difference between an academic approach to the theory of the case and a practical approach to the facts. The members of the Armed Services Committee cannot be familiar with relatively minor detail. They concern themselves with strategic concepts, the broad outlines of our national defense. Why should they know that in the Army the gulf between a major and a captain is much greater than that between a captain and a lieutenant? Why should they know that a colonel often has a personal car and chauffeur and that almost without exception a general or flag officer has both?

The amendment which I have offered takes into account the fact that our armed services must be more financially attractive if they are to retain and obtain the high type of young men and women that our national defense requires. But, more than that, my amendment takes into account the equally real fact that increasing rank carries with it substantial special privileges and benefits, some of them with large money value, others less tangible, but equally important—prestige is one of these latter.

My amendment affects no one below the rank of major. It does not change the proposed basic pay and allowance

schedules for junior officers, warrant officers, or enlisted men. It lowers the proposed basic pay raises of general or flag officers, colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors and their equivalents to bring them in line with lower ranks, taking into account the substantial special privileges and benefits which I have mentioned earlier.

So that you may follow the effect of my amendment, please turn to table 3 on page 49 of the committee report. Using the same device of the typical year, we find that major generals under my amendment would receive a monthly increase in pay and allowances of \$104.67, giving them a monthly income of \$1,000. Brigadier generals get a raise of \$188 and receive \$900.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman differentiate between base pay and allowance pay so that we can follow him in this? How much is the increase in base pay?

Mr. BOLLING. In the typical year, the proposal of the committee is to pay them \$870, that is, to brigadier generals. My proposal is to pay them \$705.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman apply the same percent, or what percent does he apply? Does he just merely take \$870 and look at it and say, "Well, I will put down a certain sum," or do you work it out on a percentage basis?

Mr. BOLLING. No. I will tell the distinguished gentleman from Georgia I do not work it out on a percentage basis, because I do not think a percentage basis is a sound approach to the problem. I think the percentage basis unfailingly overlooks the fact of the additional special privileges and benefits of increased rank. I have no criticism of those special privileges and benefits. I merely want to consider them in any bill that is passed.

Mr. VINSON. Let us talk about the special benefits. If he is not living in a Government house he would draw \$120 a month for rent and \$45 a month for subsistence. That is all the special benefits he would get.

Mr. BOLLING. No, sir.

Mr. VINSON. Just a moment. If he is living in Government quarters, the special benefit would only be subsistence \$45, and under the law today \$42. What is the special benefit, except probably the privilege of purchasing in the PX or the commissaries? What are these special privileges?

Mr. BOLLING. One particular point is the one to which I referred earlier.

Mr. VINSON. Automobiles?

Mr. BOLLING. Automobiles. If the gentleman will excuse me now, I would like to continue and finish this. I think it is rather ridiculous to say that a major or a field officer does not have substantial privileges that do not accrue to a junior officer. I also feel it is quite clear that a general officer has additional privileges in the form of cars and chauffeurs, all other transportation, under almost any conditions. But I wish to make this amendment clear.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I do not yield further at this time.

As I began to say, I find that under my amendment major generals would receive a monthly increase in pay and allowances of \$104.67, giving them a monthly income, basic pay and allowance, of \$1,000 a month.

Brigadier generals get a raise, under my amendment, of \$188 a month, and receive a monthly stipend in a typical year of \$900.

Colonels, a raise of \$106.33; monthly pay, \$800.

Lieutenant colonels, a raise of \$83.88; monthly pay, \$700.

Majors, an increase of \$88.25; basic pay and allowance of \$600 a month.

It seems to me this accomplishes the purpose of giving to all ranks a substantial increase in pay, but at the same time takes into account the facts of the case—the facts as we know them, particularly those of us who most recently served.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman's amendment does not preserve the relative gradings that are suggested in the committee's bill, does it?

Mr. BOLLING. No. It certainly does not. I do not believe that the approach on a percentage basis is other than the academic one which I described.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not think the committee proceeded on a percentage basis. As I understood it, the committee proceeded on the basis of attempting to evaluate the responsibilities in different grades and worked out its schedule on that basis.

Mr. BOLLING. I subscribe to the theory of paying for responsibility, but I do not subscribe to the theory that a man who is responsible for the lives of more than one man has a responsibility that can be compensated for.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is substituting his conception of the relative responsibility for that proposed in the committee bill?

Mr. BOLLING. That is not accurate. I have substituted my conception plus my understanding of the additional things that accrue to people of certain rank.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the gentleman state the savings that will be made by your amendment as compared with the committee bill?

Mr. BOLLING. The savings would be between twenty-seven and twenty-eight million, in rough figures.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, you have left the basic pay and allowances for enlisted men and junior officers the same as they are in the pending bill?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. What you have done in your amendment is to skim off some

of the cream that has been given to the field and general officers?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. And that reduction results in a saving of about \$27,000,000?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. It is to be distinguished from the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in that his amendment seeks to cut every single grade all the way down through the bill?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct. I believe the gentleman's amendment would have the effect not of taking the best features of the bill but of generally weakening the bill in toto.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It preserves the same grading, however, that was worked out scientifically by the Hook Commission.

Mr. BOLLING. I doubt that there is any science involved in working out a percentage. I would like to answer the gentleman's question in this respect: The general agreement that we found on the floor of the House has been that there was an urgent necessity for an effective career service. I believe that the people who need to be attracted into the service by a monetary compensation held out to them are in the enlisted, warrant-officer, and lower officer grades. I submit that the kind of pay bill we should have if my amendment passed would encourage everybody to stay in the service once they got there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the debate on this bill is on a little higher plane today than it was at the end of the week when we discussed it last. I am glad to know that our good friend from Tennessee and also our good friend from South Dakota, and the other members of the committee have given some thought and study to this bill over the week end and have come to the conclusion that the situation that faces us today in the Military Establishment demands that something be done.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman, of course, had a good deal of time, I have had only 5 minutes, but still I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SUTTON. My opinion has not changed at all; I still hold the same opinion I had. There is probably just a misconception of my meaning.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I understand; the gentleman has offered an amendment to the bill to strike out the entire pay clause; but notwithstanding that the gentleman now says that he will favor the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], which puts into effect a pay cut for only the four highest ranking officers. But I have the thought today that we are also likewise deeply interested in what is going to happen to those men in what we call the petty-officer classes and the junior-officer classes. That is a subject matter about which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] spoke this morning.

When we stop to consider that last year over 4,300 Regular officers have resigned from the Military Establishment, and that 3,000 of these were naval officers, the most of whom we had educated, men who had graduated from the Naval Academy, it makes us stop and wonder what is the cause. I know something about the feeling in the various categories of the armed services. Nobody has given more time than myself and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILPATRICK] to a study of the facts. The report of this special commission that was appointed by Mr. Forrestal a year and a half ago, was fully considered and the discussion of the over-all problem facing the men in the service with the men themselves—and it was through my initiative that we got the enlisted men to come before the committee and give us their views as to how they felt about the bill now pending before us—when we stop to consider the plaudits and tributes we are paying these boys, the best that can come from our minds and lips, awarding them medals of honor for participating in one of the grandest and most perfect achievements in the history of the Military Establishment, the Berlin airlift—we last week approved legislation to grant them a medal, and we applauded the general, the hero, who came home after he had done such a magnificent job in directing the destinies of our military forces in the European area—while we are giving these plaudits and speaking overwhelmingly of the splendid job they have done, we are permitting them to take a pay cut at the same time.

What do I mean by a pay cut? I mean that every member of the Military Establishment this year is taking a pay cut below that which he had a year ago. We all know that during the war the enlisted men were exempted from paying any income tax and the officers were exempted up to \$1,500 plus the family exemptions; we all know that that exemption came to an end on the first of January this year. As a result of that the enlisted men and officers too are taking a pay cut, the officers \$34,000,000 this year below what they had in take-home pay a year ago, and the enlisted men \$95,000,000 below what they received last year. This is the amount they will pay this year in taxes.

Now, what does that mean? In dollars and cents what does it mean to the married men in the enlisted grades? Let us take the four grades, 1, 2, 3, and 4. Let us take the petty officer. What has he suffered by way of pay cuts this year as the result of the elimination of the so-called income-tax provision? He takes a pay cut of \$139 as a married man in the fourth grade, but the single man takes a pay cut of \$238. In the first

grade the married man this year takes a pay cut in his take-home pay of \$370. A single man takes a pay cut of \$608.

We hear so much about these men who are participating in the so-called "pay-lift." These are the men who are taking the highest percentage cut of anybody in the military forces today because of the elimination of the so-called income-tax provision. Stop to consider that only 31 percent of our petty officers are reenlisting. Only 31 percent within the past 6 months have reenlisted because there is no attraction or incentive for them to remain in the service, and we also know that the same thing applies to the officer personnel. We certainly have got to do something about it. When you consider the feeling that they already had prior to January 1 of this year, what is the feeling that they now have when they have to cough up to the Federal Government by way of income taxes from \$300 to \$600 of the basic pay that they now receive? Those are things, my friends, that we must be interested in. Of course, we are interested in the cost of what this will mean to the Treasury of the United States.

Let me reassert again what we had to say a week ago in regard to the cost of this bill. In the 9 months of 1950 the gross cost will be \$360,000,000, but from the \$360,000,000 will come back in income-tax payments from the officer and enlisted personnel \$182,000,000, or, in other words, the net cost to the taxpayer in the fiscal year 1950 will be \$178,000,000. The gross cost of this bill in the fiscal year 1951, for a 12-month period, will be \$406,000,000, in round figures. The cash recovery over and above what the men in the service paid in 1948 will be \$200,545,000, or, in other words, the net cost to the taxpayer in the fiscal year 1951, the full year, will be \$205,593,000.

Now, then, who gets this money? The gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from South Dakota admit that the men who are taking the licking today as the result of the cut in the take-home pay are in the petty-officer class, and the junior-officer class, and they are the ones that are contributing more to the income tax of 1949 as the result of the repeal of the exemption the first of this year.

The petty-officer group, the chief, the first, second, and third petty officers in all branches of the military service receive \$244,000,000 out of this bill. The second lieutenants, the first lieutenants, and the captains, that the gentleman from Tennessee is so much interested in, and in whom we all should be interested in, will receive \$138,000,000 under the provisions of this bill or, in other words, the petty officers and the junior officers altogether receive in addition to what they now receive \$382,000,000 out of the provisions of this bill.

So we are interested, my fellow Members, in what goes on in the Military Establishment. We must maintain the morale. We just cannot stand idly by with all these resignations taking effect. Only 31 percent of the petty officers whose term expired within the last 6 months, reenlisted. We have to do some-

thing to cure that situation, and in this report the Hook Commission brought in to us a bill that is scientific, and in which every phase of our military problem has been carefully studied. I sincerely hope the bill as reported by the committee will pass this House.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many enlisted men appeared before the committee?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. During the hearings we heard from the officer personnel and we heard from civilian heads of organizations and from veterans' organizations. As we were closing the hearings, we felt we ought to hear from the enlisted men, and we got a representation from the enlisted men. I think there were about eight that came to the hearings, and they gave us a cross section of their views in regard to this bill.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee that handled this bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think a lot of us would perhaps be a little better able to weigh the merits of the proposed pay increases if we knew exactly what the purpose of the pay increase is. I have heard it stated by some members of the committee that the purpose of the bill is to provide a cost-of-living increase. Others say it is to compensate the members of the armed forces in a manner commensurate with their duties, obligations, and responsibilities. Others say it is for the purpose of recruiting men who will make the right type of soldier and the right type of officer. As for me, I should like to know what the real purpose of the bill is, so that I might consider it along those lines.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The fundamental purpose behind the bill is to develop an incentive for men who are trained by the Government to stay in the service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They are paid for their responsibility. When we stop to consider that in the case of the first-class petty officers 56 percent did not reenlist last year, in the case of the second-class petty officers 76 percent did not reenlist last year, and in the case of the third-class petty officers 84 percent did not reenlist last year, we realize there is no incentive for them to go ahead. We are trying by the provisions of this bill to give them an incentive to stay in the service and render that service to their fellow men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the first time you were to approach the writing of a pay bill you might feel about it as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has, and arrive at some figure, wherever you get it, and fix that as the compensation in the various pay grades as you go through the services. Quite frankly, we did that in 1942 and we did it again in 1946. That is the very reason the Hook Commission was appointed, so that an effort might be made to stabilize the pay scales and have the proper percentage of differentials between the grades and responsibilities, and a study might be made from which you could compare the compensation of the military service with the compensation for like jobs in industry. The Hook Commission spent about a year doing that. They analyzed the pay scales of about 100 industries. In the report of the Hook Commission you will find a graph, or chart, showing the comparable rates of pay in private industry and in the military services. It is significant in this graph, that in the military services the entering wage is a little bit in excess of the entering pay in industry. The military entering wage is a little in excess of the entering wage in industry.

When you come to the warrant officers, you will find from that graph that the Commission was unable to find anything in industry comparable to the grade of warrant officer and the graph has no comparison between industry and the services as to warrant officers.

When you come to the officers, the lowest grades are a little bit in excess of industry, and it gradually tapers off until finally you find that the highest grade military man is drawing about one-half the pay drawn by men in industry for handling comparable organizations.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You are comparing the wages paid in industry and the wages paid in the Army. Do you know of any industry, when a man moves out of the apprentice class, that increases his pay 8 cents a day—I said 8 cents a day, not 8 cents an hour.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think the gentleman has read the graph correctly.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; your increase here is about \$2.50 a month, which means about 8 cents a day; does it not?

Mr. KILDAY. He is only starting his career.

Mr. GROSS. He has moved out of the apprentice stage.

Mr. KILDAY. He has served for a period of 3 months. I hope the gentleman is not going to take the position that he has completed an apprenticeship training equal to from 2 to 4 years.

Mr. GROSS. When does he complete it?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not care to discuss a matter of that kind any further than I have.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. On page 6110 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, inserted an estimate by the Bureau of the Budget giving a comparison of military personnel with classified civilians. I pass this on to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I have read the Senator's statements.

Mr. SUTTON. In every instance, except three, namely, the major general, the corporal, and the private first class, military personnel is paid in excess of the civilian personnel.

Mr. KILDAY. I have read and analyzed this very carefully. I think I indicated on the opening day of this debate the situation which existed between the Bureau of the Budget and the Hook Commission and your Committee on Armed Services. There has been an attempt made by the Bureau of the Budget to tie their own civil-service pay to the armed-services pay in an attempt to get an increase in pay for themselves. I say deliberately and advisedly there is no comparison between military pay and the table that Senator FLANDERS placed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I have had some correspondence which leads me to believe that if the family allowances are cut out, as proposed by the bill, we are going to lose a considerable number of enlisted men. Am I to interpret that the motive of the committee is a desire to eliminate married men from the enlisted ranks?

Mr. KILDAY. The committee has no desire to do so. I pointed out that there were men drawing family allowances for as many as 14 dependents, and with as many as 8 or 9 brothers and sisters. The committee takes the position that when you are compensating men for responsibility and services, it is definitely unfair to the man who is really discharging a duty, such as a master sergeant, and to pay him less than the fellow who happens to have 8 or 9 brothers and sisters.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am speaking of men with just two children.

Mr. KILDAY. People with just two children, under this bill, are going to get more than they would get under the family-allowance provision, unless they are in one of the bottom three grades.

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is not the way the enlisted men understand it, evidently, from the correspondence.

Mr. KILDAY. As I told you, we have had hundreds of letters. The enlisted men were misled by radio commentators and newspaper columnists. Those men who wrote into the committee all received a prompt and courteous reply explaining exactly what their personal situation would be, and those who have asked for information on this bill were given accurate information about it.

Mr. BIEMILLER. In the first three classes; is that true?

Mr. KILDAY. The man with four dependents or less will make more money under this bill.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I wish the gentleman would elaborate on that a little further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes. Most of his time has been taken up with questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know that I will require the five additional minutes, but I do want to emphasize the fact that the pay scales set out in the Hook Commission report are definite and scientific. I believe it was the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] who said he did not believe there was anything scientific about it, but the Commission did thoroughly analyze industry wage rates and compared them with military pay rates, and they came up with these figures.

As I have said, Secretary Forrestal, Secretary Johnson, and President Truman have endorsed the rates carried in this bill. In the letter received by the Speaker yesterday the President expressed the hope that this bill would be passed.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Will you be kind enough to explain simply and briefly, because I sincerely desire this information, what has been the effect of the income-tax law upon officers and upon enlisted men. Let us take them in categories. I think it is an important part of this discussion.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry I would not be able to tell you how much in individual cases.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] made a very fine statement. Let us take general officers, for example. When did the income-tax law cease to apply to them?

Mr. KILDAY. January 1.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Up to January 1. They had \$1,500 exemption in addition to the family allowance.

Mr. CARROLL. Applying the increase under the present bill, if the income-tax law is applicable to general officers, what will be their base pay, comparing it with the present bill under consideration, as distinguished from the act under which they operate today?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I can give those figures, but it would take quite a while. The general officers all stand to lose under the present take-home pay about 6 percent below what they actually received last year.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, let us put it this way: If we should adopt some of these amendments, would the general officers or field officers be receiving less pay than they had during the war?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think it would be very close, if you adopt one of these amendments.

Mr. KILDAY. I have not analyzed it, but under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] I think quite definitely that would be true. What he is going to pay in income tax will depend entirely, of course, upon the bracket in which he falls and the number of dependents he has. It is computed the same as for anyone else. So you would have to go to the individual to determine what he is going to pay.

Mr. CARROLL. I was wondering whether the committee had taken that into consideration.

Mr. KILDAY. Our tables very definitely took that into consideration and it is worked out with that in mind and with the allowances and everything else in mind.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And there is no exemption under the present bill?

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] made a further suggestion, that there is a bill under consideration by your committee under which in the next session, or possibly this session, you are going to begin to consider whether or not officers will be included in the retirement system.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Is that bill under consideration by your committee?

Mr. KILDAY. My subcommittee has been quite busy with this bill since January.

Mr. CARROLL. I wondered if you also had that under consideration when you gave this pay raise.

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot say that that is true.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The contributory pension system is something the men in the service have asked for in many ways, because there is no provision in the present pension system for the dependents of an officer who dies after he leaves the service.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts say that this contributory retirement system is going to apply also to enlisted men?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the contributory pension system is something we should do something about.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it also proper when we attempt to compare wartime pay with peacetime pay that we must remember that a great many officers during the war held temporary grades above that which they now hold?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true, of course, depending on the service. Some were two or three grades above where they would be on a career basis. We are here talking about career pay on a career basis, where the man has to qualify for promotion under the promotion laws which have been passed by Congress.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BOLLING. Would the gentleman from Texas seriously contend that a major general who under my amendment receives an increase of \$104 would suffer because of the income tax to such an extent that he would be receiving less than he did under his old pay?

Mr. KILDAY. I was not asked that question; I was asked the question

whether he would receive less; and as I understood the gentleman from Colorado, a general might conceivably receive less under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment than he now receives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 201 and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments to section 201 are now pending at the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. Three amendments are now pending: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, and the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The Chair did not understand my question; it was how many amendments are at the Clerk's desk that apply to section 201 that are not before the committee at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. There are four, one in addition to the three the Chair previously mentioned.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate to section 201 and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will be divided equally between the Members seeking recognition.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Am I correct in understanding that this restriction of time applies only to section 201?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, and all amendments thereto.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask a question which I think is vital. Under the bill we are now considering, is the enlisted man receiving a sufficient increase in his pay allowance to offset or equal the loss of his family allowance? I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], or some other member of the committee, will explain that so that we will know what grades will receive sufficient increases under the present bill to offset the loss of the family allowance.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, of course a study of this bill will indicate that after the first three grades a man with two children stands to gain as a result of this bill. There is not only an increase in pay, as an incentive to stay in the service, but there is an increase in the so-called quarters allowance which has been increased from \$31.50 to \$67.50 a month. It is interesting also to note in that regard

that out of the total increase for quarters allowances in this bill, the enlisted men get \$142,000,000 of that and the officers only receive \$3,000,000.

Mr. GOLDEN. Regardless of the sum total, does it take care of the individual?

Mr. VINSON. It does not take care of the first three low-grade groups. It does take care of the situation from the fourth grade up.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is the statement I made to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, recognizing, as I do, that the committee has put in a great deal of time and conscientious effort on this bill, I still think that the philosophy of the bill is wrong, that the committee has attacked the problem from the top instead of the bottom, that the enlisted men and the recruits, the privates, are the ones who should be taken care of first.

I have heard it repeatedly said by members of the committee that this is a bill for the enlisted men, that it is desired to attract career men into the Army as recruits. I want to ask a question, and I submit it to members of the committee who may answer it. During the war I know of the case of a man from my State, a college graduate, a former State officer, who enlisted voluntarily in the Navy. He went up by rapid strides to the rank of chief petty officer. I discovered he could go no further. So I went over to the Navy Department and talked to one of the admirals, whose name I do not care to repeat at this time. The admiral got out this man's complete record, went over it carefully and he said to me: "I have not found a man with a better record." But he said he could not be commissioned because he is over age in rank. That is the position you are in. The enlisted men cannot overcome the barrier between the enlisted ranks and the officer ranks. There is always something in their way. I submit to any Member of this committee, what is the situation with respect to being over age and still serving in the enlisted ranks?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I will say to the gentleman it is always necessary to have an age limit in reference to a grade. As a matter of fact, we have an age limit before a man can come to Congress. A man cannot come to Congress before he is 25 years of age.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But you do not have an upper age prohibition.

Mr. VINSON. When a man is of a certain age, his ability to do the work of that grade might be lessened if he is over the age limit.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If he is capable of serving as a petty officer, certainly he is capable of serving as an officer, and age is a matter of arteries and blood vessels.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, you have to have age limitations. It has been in all legislation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the Navy can take in a man and then find that he is so admirably qualified that they made of him a petty officer very soon, and this man has an outstanding record, he must be physically sound and qualified to serve as an ensign.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the facts are that a warrant officer is a specialist in his field.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This admiral said to me, "I am sorry to say, but we make ensigns sometimes very soon, but we cannot get along without some high-class chief petty officers."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Now, it is the man that goes in as an enlisted man that has to overcome that barrier between the enlisted ranks and the officer personnel. The philosophy of this bill is wrong. You ought to do something for the enlisted men instead of doing it all for the officers. The officers are all right. They fought bravely, died heroically, conducted themselves gallantly but for the good of our country and in the name of right and justice do something sometime for the privates. They constitute an important branch of every outfit and organization in the armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, as I maintained last week. I agree with what the preceding speaker just said that this bill is top-heavy. The emphasis is all on top. There are going to be many amendments offered to this bill. I have an amendment to this section and I also have one in connection with the family-allowance section, and some others. But, I do think that there are so many amendments that the thing to do with this bill is to have it recommitment so that the committee in its wisdom and judgment, after knowing how the different Members of the Congress feel about it, may perhaps give a little more time to the subject. I have an amendment to offer in the event the Case amendment is voted down that has to do, on page 9, with the only enlisted man who is not given any sort of raise at all. I understand from the committee that the so-called recruit is only supposed to be in that stage for about 3 months. In spite of that the chart on page 9 indicates that the recruit may well be in that situation up to 30 years. Where every other single man in the service gets some sort of a pay raise after 2 or 3 or 4 years, the enlisted man in grade No. 1 goes in at \$75, and according to this chart, even if he is in that same grade for 30 years, he will still get \$75. I understand they are not supposed to stay in that grade. If they are not supposed to stay in that grade, it does not make any great difference if we are going to give them a little money, and my amendment, which will be offered if the Case amendment is voted down, is to the effect that beginning the 8th year they will be given a raise of \$2 a month, just as every other man gets a raise after a few years.

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. How much would the gentleman suggest to the committee the recruits' compensation be raised?

Mr. FURCOLO. It begins at No. 8, after 8 years of service. It goes to \$75 a month after the first 8 years, then just as every single other grade is increased, the recruit would go up \$2 a month from that time on, \$75, \$77, and so on up to \$93.

I also want to make this point, if I may. We hear a lot about all the officers the Army, Navy, and other services need now, but right at the present time they still have the attrition system, so-called, which forces officers out of the service if they have not been promoted after a certain length of time in a specified grade. Right in the hearings on page 1442 a member of the Commission said:

There is in limited operation now and it is the Commission's understanding that the practice is to be extended, a so-called attrition plan which forces officers out of the service if they fail of selection for promotion after a specified number of years in grade. These men may have good qualities but due to the limited number which can be promoted under law, they fail to make the grade for selection.

I say that if they have a system like that where admittedly, according to this report, there are qualified men in the service who are being forced out through this attrition system, the Committee on Armed Services can do something about that system. They certainly should at least sit down with the military and say, "Now, why is it you come in here asking for more men, yet you have a system whereby you force qualified men out?" That may be a small thing, it may be only 10 officers, but whatever the number is, let us find out about it. I think the committee can do it.

I have some other amendments I am going to offer later. I did want to mention that in passing. Also, if I get a chance, I shall present my amendment giving the lowest grade enlisted man another \$2 a month in line with all the others. I think that is the least you can do. You may say he is not qualified, he is a dope, he is a professional recruit, and so on, but he certainly must have something if the Navy and Army would keep him in for 20 or 30 years. He certainly is entitled to \$2 a month increase after serving at the same pay for 10, 20, or 30 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we hear a good deal of talk about the fact that we have not properly taken care of the enlisted man. I think the committee's bill does justice to the enlisted man. Let us talk about the recruit for a moment, the man who comes in as an 18-year-old boy. He gets \$75 a month. His allowances, food, clothes, quarters, and so forth, were estimated by the Hook Commission to be worth \$108 a month.

He starts life in the services at \$183 a month. There are very few boys when they start working that can make that much money in industry, in farming, or in any other kind of business. Then our bill goes along and keep stepping that boy up all the time so that in a very short time he will be getting double what he started with.

Let us look at specific effect for a career enlisted man under this bill.

(a) When he enlists at 18 or 19 years of age he receives \$75 a month completely free of all expenses. For 13 weeks while he is in apprentice or recruit training, he receives this cash pay equal to \$183 a month.

(b) Upon completion of that training he is advanced to the second grade—private or seaman second class. He now receives \$82.50 cash a month. This is a \$7.50 raise in 3 months.

(c) At the end of 12 more months he goes to the third grade—private first class or seaman first class—and this gives him \$97.50 a month. This is a \$22.50 raise in 15 months. This has a total value of \$205.50 a month.

(d) At the end of not to exceed 16 months more the enlisted man is eligible for and promoted automatically to the fourth grade—corporal or petty officer third class. He is now a noncommissioned officer and a skilled man. If he is not skilled he is not promoted and not re-enlisted. His pay is now \$127.50 a month. An increase of \$52.50 a month since he enlisted less than 3 years before.

(e) Should this corporal not succeed in getting to the fifth grade—sergeant—because of lack of vacancies he is assured of a \$7.50 a month increase each 2 years and at completion of 7 years' service he is entitled to quarters or quarters allowances of \$67.50 a month if he is married. This means a total monthly compensation of \$210 in cash plus his subsistence, his own quarters, and his clothing. Under present permanent pay scales he would get \$110 a month. For this noncommissioned officer who will be about 25 years old this pay bill means at that time in his career if he is a married man an increase of almost 100 percent. It gives him a total pay worth \$318 a month. And this is not dependent upon a temporary, illogical, scheme of family allowances.

(f) The outstanding soldier or sailor, however, is not going to remain a corporal or petty officer third class; he is going to become a sergeant or petty officer, second class. This grade is open to him within 3 years after enlistment if he is outstanding. If he reaches the grade in 4 years he receives \$150 cash plus family quarters or an allowance of \$67.50 or \$217.50 a month plus his clothing and food, or a pay worth \$325 a month. For each 2 years' service in that grade he gets an increase of \$7.50 a month. At the present time an enlisted man in the fifth grade with 4 years' service has an assured permanent pay plus quarters allowance of only \$158.25 a month. After 8 years' service the present permanent pay including allowances would be only \$164 a month. Under this bill it would be \$240 cash a month. This is an increase of 46 percent.

(g) The next step is to sergeant first class or petty officer first class. If this grade is reached at 8 years, which many men succeed in doing, the pay will be \$195 plus \$67.50 if married or a total of \$262.50 a month compared to present pay of \$186. This is an increase of 40 percent.

(h) The top of the ladder in enlisted grades is master sergeant and chief petty officer. These are the very keystones of the structure. At 18 years, for instance, the new pay is \$270 plus \$67.50 or \$337.50 cash a month in addition to food and clothing. Compare this with \$252 total under present laws. This is the kind of a pay scale which will retain your experts. For the master sergeant who remains in the service for 26 years the pay will reach \$300 a month plus \$67.50 or \$367.50 as contrasted with \$268 now. This is an increase of 36 percent.

This pay is assured him. It is not a temporary thing. He gets it because he is worth it, not because he has a big family or can claim seven or eight brothers or sisters as dependents.

The claim that this bill is not an enlisted man's bill does not jibe with the facts. In addition to setting up a decent pay scale based on skill and responsibility, let me just detail the other things it does for enlisted men:

(a) Gives them the same retirement laws as officers for the first time.

(b) Gives them the same travel and transportation allowances as officers.

(c) Puts them in same status as officers insofar as quarters allowances are concerned as soon as they reach the grade of corporal with 7 years' service, or sergeant regardless of length of service.

(d) Retains foreign service and extra pay although it is taken away from officers.

This bill is in effect a Magna Carta for enlisted men. It takes them out of an insecure, charity type of pay based on dependents alone, and puts them in a self-respecting status of being paid what they earn.

Above all it does this out in the open. It lets you, the men responsible for appropriations, know what you are paying for. It does away with \$425,000,000 of hidden pays and allowances.

The above story is the normal evolution that an intelligent, hard-working boy would go through. And if he were ambitious he would also be afforded the chance to develop his academic education so he could qualify for a commissioned officer.

In trying to arrive at a pattern that would be just and fair the Commission made extensive studies, and the pattern of payment for identical responsibilities runs along in the enlisted grades and also in the officer grades up to lieutenant colonel. From that time on it raises very rapidly in favor of private enterprise jobs and it levels off for the officer list, much below what the pay is in industry for jobs of comparable responsibility.

There has been some discussion here today that really worries me, and that is this tearing down and unmercifully criticizing of what is known as the "brass." I do not hold any brief for the men in those offices, but they have de-

voted a lifetime to military service. Without the Arnolds, the Kennneys, and the Spaatzes, the Giles, and others of their type, we would never have been ready to fight this last war in the air the way we did. In the Army and the Navy they also had these well-qualified men who prepared and executed the strategic concept that won the war. When they get \$1,000 a month for the terrific responsibilities they have, they are not being overpaid, they are not getting more than they ought to get. You can talk all you want about these men hiding behind the Pentagon Building, but I sat here during the war and, frankly, every man I knew over there was eager to get to the combat lines and have a division or a regiment that he could command.

We cannot build America by tearing down the men who are the leaders in various activities. There has been talk that they were behind the barriers and were in safe spots. Do you realize that dozens of generals were killed in this war? It worries me when you begin tearing down the leaders in the military, just like it worries me when you tear down the leaders in our industrial life. America was not built that way. There is room for all and we need not unreasonably tear the top officers apart to help the enlisted men, which we all want to do.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How many dozen generals were killed?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do know 39 generals of the Army were killed in action and 8 admirals. I do not have the number in the Air Forces. The proportion was almost as great as it was among the enlisted men.

Mr. GROSS. You said that dozens were killed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; it was over three dozen—39; not counting Air Force generals. The proportion of those killed to the total number of generals was almost as great as it was in the case of enlisted men.

Mr. GROSS. You said dozens were killed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; over three dozen were killed.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe that is accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON. I know it is accurate.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. My recollection is that some 25 brigadier generals were killed. A great many admirals were killed, as everyone knows.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, that is not a dozen.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is two dozen right there, and the gentleman from Georgia is only referring to brigadier generals; with the major generals, 12, and lieutenant generals, 2; it is over three dozen. That does not include the Marine Corps and the Air Forces, and so on. There were over 16,700 officers in the Air Force who were killed in com-

bat. The point is that America was not built that way, in this negative way of tearing down men who are successful. These men are at the top because they are successful. They are the kind of men we are trying to get from the lower ranks, so that when trouble comes tomorrow, or 10 years from tomorrow, we will have capable men to plan the strategy which will safeguard and make America secure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have been very interested in some of the situations which would be brought about with reference to family men. I received some information just about the time the House was meeting from an Army gentleman, who said that now approximately 50 percent of those enlisted men in the Army are married or family people, and that during the war some 70 percent were married people. He pointed out that on an average each of these families probably has three children. Likewise, I was told, as I understood him, that they consider families of four or more children as what might be termed "extreme cases," insofar as dependents are concerned. I have been very much troubled about this question of family people being better taken care of. According to some figures which were given to me yesterday, a family man with 3 children, counting his dependent allowance, gets \$173 a month. If he has 3 children, after 6 months, he gets \$178 a month, and after 1 year, he gets about \$188 per month. For a man with 3 children, under the terms of this bill, the \$173 is reduced to a total of \$75, the \$178 to \$82.50, and the \$188 to \$97.50. It is seen the dependent-allowance provision being cut out makes a lot of difference.

Let us carry him on over to some of the other enlisted classifications. If he is in 5 years, he gets \$203, under the present law, if he has 3 children. If this new bill should pass, he would get \$135 a month if he has 3 children. After 8 years, he would get \$230 a month currently, whereas if this bill passes, counting the quarters allowance of \$67.50, he would get \$210 a month. Admittedly, after that, perchance, he does all right financially, but my question is, if he has three children, how is he ever going to get up to that point? I fear that this legislation is definitely going to have the effect of keeping experienced family people out of the enlisted ranks. As to whether or not that is a good thing, I am not capable of saying. I do fancy some family men with considerable service who have planned the Army as a career will be disappointed. These men should be given additional consideration; likewise, the single men, in my opinion, are not dealt with liberally enough. After all, they have many financial responsibilities in a day like this when prices are so very high. If a man has had 10 raises in less than a year and yet makes only \$75, \$80, or \$90 per month, he still makes only \$75, \$80, or \$90 per month. I received from the Secretary of the Navy this morning a letter which I desire to read. It follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 23, 1949.
The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 21, 1949, in which you request certain information regarding the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (H. R. 4591) currently before the House. The information submitted herewith is applicable to the Navy and Marine Corps.

Approximately 27 percent of the enlisted men in the Navy and Marine Corps are married or family men today.

At the conclusion of World War II at the peak of the Navy's strength, 34 percent were married or family men.

Regarding the question of whether it is anticipated that more or fewer family men who have never been in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps will enlist or reenlist:

(a) It is anticipated that there will be fewer first enlistments by young men as it is currently the policy of the Navy and Marine Corps not to enlist for first enlistments men with dependents;

(b) For men with broken service, the policy is to accept men in pay grade 5 or above if they do not have more than three dependents;

(c) With regard to reenlistments there are no restrictions and it is anticipated that there will be more reenlistments as a result of the passage of this measure because the better and sounder pay scales and provisions of this bill will attract and hold career men in the service.

It is very desirable to have family men in the upper enlisted ranks as these are the career men who in many respects are the backbone of the regular service.

A man with 10 children who has not been in the service would under current directives not be accepted for first enlistment.

The average number of family dependents the average serviceman has had since the war is 1.8.

The number that have been extreme cases with reference to family allotments has been three-tenths of 1 percent.

Of the \$48,000,000 that the Navy has under family allowances, only \$48,000,000 may be considered as having gone to what might be termed extreme cases.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

Enlisted (wife and three children)¹ per month

	Years of service	Basic pay	Family allowance	Quarters	Total
Present:					
Recruit.....	0	\$75	\$98		\$173.00
Private.....	½	80	98		178.00
Private first class.....	1	90	98		188.00
Proposed:					
Recruit.....	0	75			75.00
Private.....	½	82.50			82.50
Private first class.....	1	97.50			97.50

¹ Does not include commutation of rations and quarters. Does not include value of "found"—\$108 per month. Under proposed bill, for period of 6 months after enactment, family allowance will be paid in addition to new pay—and then stopped. Those men who then receive less total money may elect to be discharged.

Enlisted (wife and three children)

	Years of service	Basic pay	Family allowances	Quarters	Subsistence	Total
Present:						
E-4 (corporal).....	5	\$105.00	\$98	0		\$203.00
E-5 (sergeant).....	8	132.25	98	0		230.25
E-6 (staff sergeant).....	12	162.00	98	0		260.00
E-7 (master sergeant).....	16	206.25	98	0		304.25
Proposed:					See note...	
E-4 (corporal).....	5	135.00	0	0		135.00
Do.....	7	142.50	0	\$67.50		210.00
E-5 (sergeant).....	8	172.50	0	67.50		240.00
E-6 (staff sergeant).....	12	210.00	0	67.50		277.50
E-7 (master sergeant).....	16	255.00	0	67.50		322.50

NOTE.—All enlisted personnel, under certain conditions, entitled to commutation of rations at \$1.05 a day; or depending on availability of facilities, \$2.25 per day; or \$3 per day, which is left unchanged in the proposed bill.

"For men with broken service the policy is to accept men in pay grade 5 or above if they do not have more than three dependents."

In other words, once you get to grade 5 you are all right, but what is the family man to do with his family until he gets to grade 5?

If it is very desirable to have family men in the upper enlisted ranks as career men, it behooves this Congress to properly take care of their needs not merely after they get to grade 5, but from the time they begin at grade 1 until they get to grade 5.

I desire to include some tables prepared for me here recently, also a memorandum handed me by the Army man to whom I talked with this morning:

Question. Under the terms of the bill which is being discussed on the floor of the House now, is it anticipated that more or fewer family men who have never been in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps will enlist or reenlist if once they have been in any branch of the service?

Answer. Currently, the Army is enlisting for original enlistment no men with dependents. It is anticipated that more men with prior service and with families will reenlist in view of the greater career opportunities offered under the provisions of this bill. For example, the pay and allowances of a corporal are increased nearly 100 percent over present emoluments.

Question. What is his opinion as to the desirability of having a considerable number of family men in the enlisted ranks?

Answer. As in any other walk of life, it is not considered desirable for a young man embarking on a career to be burdened with a family. During this period he is generally in his teens and is subject to frequent moves, is in no position to offer any stability to a family and in many cases the success of a marriage may well be jeopardized. Until after a young man has established a career, the Army does not encourage early marriages. After approximately 7 years of service when a young man about 24 or 25 has become a career soldier, the Army definitely favors family men in the enlisted ranks and adequate allowances are made for them in this bill.

Officers (second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain), wife, and three children

	Years of service	Basic pay	Quarter	Subsistence	Total
Present:					
Second lieutenant.....	0	\$180.00	\$60.00	\$42.00	\$282.00
First lieutenant.....	3	210.00	75.00	42.00	357.00
Captain.....	6	253.00	90.00	42.00	385.00
Proposed:					
Second lieutenant.....	0	225.00	75.00	45.00	345.00
First lieutenant.....	3	277.50	82.50	45.00	405.00
Captain.....	6	300.00	90.00	45.00	495.00

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that all of the other amendments and discussions have been on section 201 (a) and my amendment is an amendment to section 201 (b), I ask unanimous consent that the amendments on 201 (a) may be disposed of and that I may then be recognized to present my amendment to 201 (b).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could not be recognized in the time remaining. According to the request of the chairman of the committee, the final 5 minutes of the time is reserved for the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not asking for any additional time. I am asking unanimous consent, in order to avoid confusion, and having amendments pending on two different subsections at the same time—

The CHAIRMAN. Is your amendment on a different subsection?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is on subsection 201 (b).

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will ask for recognition at that time instead of at the present time, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But we have fixed the rule on the entire section.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement the gentleman would have to offer his amendment now to be considered on the entire section instead of section 201 (a). So let the gentleman offer his amendment now, and we will have the benefit of it as we vote on the other amendments.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I will make my unanimous-consent request, and if the gentleman wishes to object, he may do so.

Mr. VINSON. I am willing to give the gentleman my 5 minutes. Offer your amendment now and let us see what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON. It is under the unanimous-consent agreement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, each speaker is recognized for 4 minutes. Five minutes was reserved by the chairman for the committee. Is the gentleman yielding his 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. VINSON. I am willing to yield my 5 minutes to him to offer his amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have 4 minutes in my own right.

Mr. VINSON. Well, then, offer your amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes?

Mr. VINSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his own time for 4 minutes, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 9, line 4, after the word "assigned" strike out the balance of line 4, all of line 5, and insert in lieu thereof "except in time of emergency hereafter declared, in accordance with rank or grade of permanent appointment to."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can this amendment be pending at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent it can.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it will not be voted upon until the amendments to the first subparagraph are disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment would be adopted, subsection (b) would read:

For basic pay purposes, commissioned officers are hereby assigned, except in time of emergency hereafter declared, in accordance with rank or grade of permanent appointment.

The purpose of the amendment and the language is clear. The first clause, "except in time of emergency hereafter declared" is to permit the appointment of officers on a temporary basis and pay on a temporary basis in time of emergency. But the remainder of it would place commissioned officers in the pay scale on the basis of permanent appointment.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said that the purpose of this bill was to put all officers on a career basis. I believe this amendment is entirely consistent, that it places them on that basis.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In a moment or two, after I have had a chance to explain my amendment.

Last year this Congress passed an organization act setting up the various components of branches of the armed services and allotted a certain number of officers in the different ranks. The bill as now written without the amendment I have submitted permits a continuation of the evasion of those allotments. We know that there still exists a great many

officers in temporary ranks as a hang-over from the war. We know that officers continue to hold rank and are appointed to ranks of a temporary nature. It is overloaded on the top levels. Some will say that that is the fault of the Committee on Appropriations; actually, it is not, because it is impossible for them to go into the detail that would be necessary for them to ferret out the fat that exists in the temporary appointments. It seems to me that this amendment raises the issue. It is completely consistent, however, with the purpose of this bill as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]: "As a permanent peacetime proposition, shall the Congress legislate to fill the allotment of officers at various ranks or shall the armed services continue to do so, on a sometimes arbitrary basis, without requiring officers to pass before the boards that are necessary for permanent promotion within the service?"

I think it is important for the morale of the officers of the services in peacetime that the appointments shall be on a regular, recognized basis through boards of appointment and not by an arbitrary method that is permitted under the temporary system of appointment that has been in effect in wartime, and that is necessary in wartime. It seems to me such a system has no place in the peacetime organization of the armed services.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. One effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that a major given a temporary rank as colonel could only draw the pay of a major.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. And the other effect would be to disrupt the entire armed services, because you would be flooded with thousands and thousands of resignations. We dealt with that question in the pay bill last year, and it will adjust itself in 1957.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is too long to wait for these armed services to fall in line with the mandate of this Congress. Are we making the allotment of officers to the armed services? Or are the armed services going to continue to do it themselves?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Would not one effect of the gentleman's amendment be that if you needed a colonel for a period of 3 months you could not promote him for 3 months as is now provided, but would have to make it a permanent appointment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That would be the effect in time of peace, but I cannot see any need for temporarily promoting people to higher rank and paying them at the higher rank under normal peacetime conditions. There is nothing to prevent his being given an appointment as colonel for a temporary period of time, but he could not receive the extra pay for the higher rank during that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for 4 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat reluctant to take issue with the committee on this bill, particularly in view of the fact that I know these gentlemen have put in many hours of hard work in bringing out this bill, which I believe to be generally good.

Mr. Chairman, I do not take issue with the provisions of this bill relating to retirement and some of the other matters covered, but I do reserve my right as a Member of Congress to disagree with the conclusions of the committee in regard to these increases in pay, particularly in the higher brackets.

It has been stated on the floor by the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the subcommittee, that the purpose of raising the pay of officers in the higher brackets was to provide an additional incentive for men to make a career of the armed services. That purpose, in my opinion, fails when you take into consideration the fact that the Army has today some 200,000 applications for approximately 9,000 officer vacancies. That, then, could not be the purpose of this bill, because already you have 20 times as many applications for positions as you have vacancies. It stands to reason that you are going to find one man in 20 who will be capable of fulfilling the duties of his office if he receives a commission. Certainly 1 man in 20 of those applicants will make the service a good, capable, worthy career man.

It was stated here Friday that we needed good men for junior officers and that was the reason the officers' pay was increased in greater percentage than the pay of enlisted men under this bill—it was because we needed the officers to come into the Army and make a career out of it. It has been indicated on the floor here today, however, that the enlisted men are the ones who are being taken care of by this bill rather than the officers. I would like to know which we need; and if we need both, why not give both the same increase across the board?

As a matter of fact, we know that when a man goes into the Army to become a career soldier, he does not look at the pay that the generals receive as an incentive. He looks rather at the pay of the grade that he enlists in. If you are going to increase these salaries as a means of offering an incentive to men to go into service and to make a career out of it, then would it not be more reasonable to give the larger increases to the lower ranks where the enlistments occur?

The proposition has been raised that capable men are resigning from the Army to go into private industry. It has been a long-standing rule that the Government cannot compete in salaries with private industry. If we did, we would have to double taxes. Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which was recently considering a bill to raise salaries of the executive heads of Government agencies, the same question was raised, Should the Government attempt to compete with private industry in the matter of paying salaries? Not one member, not one witness, not one person who appeared before our commit-

tee at that time contended that the Government could possibly compete with private enterprise or with private industry in the payment of salaries. So, if it cannot compete, is there an added incentive for capable men to join lower ranks, by raising salaries in the upper brackets by 30 or 40 percent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will try the best I can to answer the gentleman who just preceded me in regard to who gets the money. First of all, we must recognize the fact that there is at the present time a tremendous shortage of officers in what we might call the lower ranks. We also know that there are hundreds, perhaps many thousands, of men who have had previous military experience and would like to get back into a commissioned status. We know also that the ratio of commissioned officers is geared to the number of enlisted men that we have in the service. If under that ratio or quota of majors or captains or colonels we are limited to say 2,000, and the 2,000 are there now, there is no opportunity for another man who holds the same rating to get into the service. If by chance he were taken in, then those in the lower rank, who ought to be going up, cannot go up because the fellow who has just come in has taken the position he logically is entitled to.

We must maintain a proper incentive for the men in the lower ranks, so that when a vacancy exists above they may have an opportunity to fill that vacancy. I can well understand how the Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps or the Air Corps cannot take in all who apply, because we know, as the result of the war, when we trained a large number of officers in the various ranks, that there is just no place for them, and if we would take them all in we would just crowd out the boys trying to make the service a career.

Reference was made to the junior officers that the Army is now trying to get. As I said before, over 4,500 officers in the military forces resigned last year. Of the 1948 ROTC and military college graduates the Army selected 899, but only 110 accepted a commission. Out of the class of 1949, of 1,003 who had been designated by the Army as being eligible, only 7 have accepted a commission. Now, we know that the men in the so-called petty officer grades are getting the best of this bill. The pay allowance of the chief petty officer will be increased by this bill 30.16 percent; the pay of the second-grade petty officer will be increased nearly 33.77 percent; the pay of the third-grade petty officer will be increased 38.63 percent and the pay of the fourth-grade petty officer will be increased 28.57 percent. Those are the men we are trying to retain in the service, because an examination of the fourth-grade men discloses that during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1949 only 16 percent have indicated their desire to enlist. Eighty-four percent did not reenlist during this year. Seventy-six percent of the third pay grade did not reenlist and 56 percent of the second pay grade did not

reenlist. We are trying to rectify that situation by giving them pay and allowances which will substantially increase what we might call the take-home pay that they will receive over 30 percent and above what they now receive. We are trying to do the job on a scientific basis because we know that that is the only way we are going to keep them in there. We should keep in mind the pay reduction that the men in the military are taking this year as the result of the expiration of the income-tax exemption. Those are the thoughts that we want to keep in mind in voting on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to close debate.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, of course, under the parliamentary situation, as I understand it, we have three amendments pending now. I believe the vote will come first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, which is a substitute, of course, for the Case amendment.

The first vote, as I understand the situation, will come on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. It is in the form of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Therefore, if the Bolling amendment should prevail, we will never have a chance to vote directly upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is most disruptive of all the work done by the Hook Commission and by the Committee on Armed Services. It disregards entirely the philosophy of the bill. It does away with the theory that men should be compensated on the basis of the service performed and responsibility undertaken. It substitutes for very carefully worked out pay scales, worked out after much effort and much comparison with industry, and full consideration of income-tax deductions and all matters of that kind, a series of figures and scales which I understand the gentleman has arrived at arbitrarily or in conversation with some of his fellows here in the House, and not upon any well-worked-out basis.

Should that prevail, we will continue the patchwork system we have had for years, under which there is no rhyme or reason to the pay scales, and there are no proper differentials between the various ranks and grades. It would mean that in the future, if there is a necessity either to increase or decrease the military pay, you will have to go through exactly what the Hook Commission and this committee have been through, because you could not percentage-wise do anything toward increasing or decreasing service pay. It would put us back exactly where we are. It would destroy the most desirable feature of the bill.

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

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

Mr. BOLLING. In view of what the gentleman has said about the way I arrived at my figures, let me say that I attempted to take advantage of all the

hard work of the Hook Commission and also of the hard work of the Committee on Armed Services, and add to that a realistic appraisal of those perquisites received by the higher ranking officers.

Mr. KILDAY. Just the same, the gentleman stated that he did not proceed percentage-wise nor in a manner of that kind. He simply decided upon a total amount for each pay period and substituted that for what the Commission decided. As to the perquisites, I do not know. The gentleman and some other gentlemen here have referred to perquisites. I have had quite a long observance of the armed services, but I have not seen them. I have seen the boys working in the kitchens and I have also seen them paid for it. Those things do not constitute perquisites, although some gentlemen seem to think that they do. However, I must insist it is an arbitrary figure arrived at without any scientific investigation of the situation.

In that respect, the Case amendment is much better than the Bolling amendment, because it proceeds percentage-wise on the basis of what has been worked out by the Commission. On the other hand, I still believe that the figures which we have in the bill are the proper figures, that they do constitute proper, adequate, and not excessive pay increases. I think what we have done with reference to the enlisted men proceeds along the same scientific basis and that now, once and for all, we ought to be able to establish a military pay system which in the future will be as available to us at the date we adopted it, and which could be increased or decreased percentage-wise in a bill in a matter of a line or two.

While the so-called Case amendment is far preferable to the Bolling amendment, I sincerely trust that the work of the Hook Commission will be carried out, and that both amendments will be rejected. I do not think it is even necessary to refer to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee, because it would leave all the Armed Services without any pay and therefore there is not much danger of its being adopted. I hope this amendment will be defeated and that the work of the committee, as recommended by the Hook Commission will be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired for debate on this section and amendments thereto.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOLLING) there were—ayes 41, noes 98.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 65, noes 91.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. KILDAY and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 85, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO:

Page 9, in the chart, strike out the figure "75" opposite the pay grade heading E 1 under the headings "over 8", "over 10", "over 12", "over 14", "over 16", "over 18", "over 22", "over 26", "over 30."

Insert the following figures under the respective heading: "over 8", "77"; "over 10", "79"; "over 12", "81"; "over 14", "83"; "over 16", "85"; "over 18", "87"; "over 22", "89"; "over 26", "91"; "over 30", "93."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FURCOLO. May the Chair state that the amendment shows that after 8 years it provides \$2 per month raise for the enlisted man?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded Mr. FURCOLO) there were—ayes 27, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the time that has elapsed and the number of Members who have come in since the amendment was explained, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 33, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SERVICE CREDITABLE IN COMPUTATION OF BASIC PAY

SEC. 202. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, in computing the cumulative years of service to be counted by members of the uniformed services for determining the amount of basic pay they are entitled to receive upon completion of such years of service, such members shall be credited with—

(1) full time for all periods of active service as a commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, Army field clerk, flight officer, and enlisted person in any Regu-

lar or Reserve component of any of the uniformed services; and

(2) full time for all periods during which they were enlisted or held appointments as commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, warrant officers, Army field clerks, or flight officers, in any of the Regular components of the uniformed services, or in the Regular Army Reserve, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard Reserve, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Organized Reserve Corps, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, or in the Medical Reserve Corps, or in the Dental Reserve Corps of the Navy, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, or in the Naval Reserve, or in the Air National Guard, or in the Air National Guard of the United States, or in the Air Force Reserve, or in the officers' section of the Air Force Reserve, or in the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve, or in the Air Corps Reserve, or in the Army of the United States without specification of any component thereof, or in the Air Force of the United States without specification of any component thereof, or in the Marine Corps Reserve Force, or in the Marine Corps Reserve, or in the Coast Guard Reserve, or in the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary; and

(3) for commissioned officers in service on June 30, 1922, all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and

(4) full time for all periods during which they held appointments as nurses, reserve nurses, or commissioned officers in the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Nurse Corps of the Public Health Service, or the Reserve components thereof; and

(5) full time for all periods during which they were deck officers or junior engineers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

(6) all service which, under any provision of law in effect on the effective date of this section is authorized to be credited for the purpose of computing longevity pay.

(b) Members of the uniformed services shall accrue additional service credit for basic pay purposes, for period while on a temporary disability retired list, honorary retired list, or a retired list of any of the uniformed services, or while authorized to receive retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay as a member of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, from any of the uniformed services or from the Veterans' Administration, or while a member of the Honorary Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps or Organized Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That, except for active service as prescribed in section 202 (a) (1), the service credit authorized in this section shall not be included to increase retired pay, disability retirement pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay while on a retired list, on a temporary disability retired list, in a retired status, or in the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve.

(c) The periods of time hereinabove authorized to be counted in the computation of basic pay shall, under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, include all service heretofore or hereafter performed by members of the uniformed services prior to their attainment of 18 years of age.

(d) The period of time to be counted in the computation of basic pay shall be the total of all periods authorized to be counted for such purpose in any of the uniformed services, but the same period of time shall not, for any reason, be counted more than once: *Provided*, That retired enlisted men heretofore or hereafter retired with credit for 30 years' service in the Army, Navy, or

Marine Corps, and who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898-1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum retired pay now or hereafter provided for the grade in which retired.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 14, line 19, after the comma insert "except as provided in title IV of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL PAY—DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

SEC. 203. (a) The term "commissioned officers", as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean only (1) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; (2) those officers who, heretofore but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who, prior to September 1, 1952, may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force or as medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; (3) such officers who on September 1, 1947, were or who thereafter have been or may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Officers' Reserve Corps, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, or as medical and dental officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service and who heretofore, but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have volunteered and been accepted for extended active duty of 1 year or longer, or who may, prior to September 1, 1952, volunteer and be accepted for extended active duty of 1 year or longer; (4) general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; and (5) general officers who subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who may be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who are included in part (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection.

(b) In addition to any pay, allowances, or special pays that they are otherwise entitled to receive, commissioned officers as defined in subsection (a) of this section shall be entitled to receive special pay at the rate of \$100 per month for each month of active service: *Provided*, That such sum shall not be included in computing the amount of increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this act or in computing retired pay, disability retirement pay, or any severance pay: *Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (3) of this section shall be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection only during periods of volunteer service: *And provided further*, That no commissioned officer as described in subsection (a) of this section shall, while he is serving as a medical or

dental intern, be entitled to receive the special pay of \$10 per month as is provided in this subsection.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 17, line 23, strike out "\$10" and insert "\$100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BREHM: Page 15, line 15, strike out "doctors" and insert "physicians."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept that amendment.

Mr. BREHM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL PAY—HAZARDOUS DUTY

SEC. 204. (a) Subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the President, members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall, in addition thereto, be entitled to receive special pay for the performance of hazardous duty required by competent orders. The following duties shall constitute hazardous duties:

(1) duty as a crew member as determined by the Secretary concerned, involving frequent and regular participation in aerial flight;

(2) duty on board a submarine, including submarines under construction from the time builders' trials commence;

(3) duty involving frequent and regular participation in aerial flights not as a crew member pursuant to part (1) of this subsection;

(4) duty involving frequent and regular participation in glider flights;

(5) duty involving parachute jumping as an essential part of military duty;

(6) duty involving intimate contact with persons afflicted with leprosy;

(7) duty involving the demolition of explosives as a primary duty, including training for such duty;

(8) duty at a submarine escape training tank, when such duty involves participation in the training; and

(9) duty at the Navy Deep Sea Diving School or the Navy Experimental Diving Unit, when such duty involves participation in training.

(b) For the performance of hazardous duty as prescribed in part (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section, members of the uniformed services qualifying for the special pay authorized pursuant to said subsection shall be entitled to be paid at the following monthly rates according to the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed for basic pay purposes;

Pay grade	Monthly rate	Pay grade	Monthly rate
O-8.....	\$100.00	W-2.....	\$100.00
O-7.....	100.00	W-1.....	100.00
O-6.....	210.00	E-7.....	75.00
O-5.....	180.00	E-6.....	67.50
O-4.....	150.00	E-5.....	60.00
O-3.....	120.00	E-4.....	52.50
O-2.....	110.00	E-3.....	45.00
O-1.....	100.00	E-2.....	37.50
W-4.....	100.00	E-1.....	30.00
W-3.....	100.00		

(c) For the performance of any hazardous duty as prescribed in parts (3) to (9), inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section by officers and enlisted persons qualifying for

the special pay authorized pursuant to said subsection, officers shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of \$100 per month, and enlisted persons shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of \$50 per month.

(d) The President may, in time of war, suspend the payment of special pay for the performance of any or all hazardous duty or may prescribe that members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay who are performing duties, other than those prescribed in subsection (a) of this section, in certain areas or under certain conditions which involve more than ordinary military risk or danger shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive special pay for hazardous duty at rates not to exceed those prescribed in either subsection (b) of this section or at rates not to exceed those prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, as may be determined by the President, in accordance with the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed for basic pay purposes or their ranks or grades, as the case may be.

(e) No aviation cadet shall be entitled to receive any special pay authorized pursuant to this section.

(f) No member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive more than one payment of any special pay authorized pursuant to this section for the same period of time during which he may qualify for more than one payment of such special pay.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 20, line 8, after the word "duty" insert "either."

Page 20, line 9, strike out the word "either."

Page 20, line 13, strike out the words "ranks or grades" and insert the words "ranks, grades, or ratings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: Page 19, after line 12, strike out the figures in the chart under the heading "Monthly rate" and insert the figure "\$30" in each place where any figure appears under the heading "Monthly rate."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment here, and I do not have any particular interest in the figure "\$30." I am satisfied with whatever figure the Committee in its good judgment decides. But the purpose of this amendment, and another one I will offer down a little bit lower on page 19, is in connection with hazardous pay, so-called.

Now, you know in the service they start out by paying certain qualified men, officers, and so on, a little greater rate of pay, basing it on the perhaps logical fact that they are more qualified, more able, and have more brains, or whatever you may want to call it. Then they also have a system of setting up hazardous pay which has to do with some sort of perilous duty. That sort of duty has nothing whatever to do with whether or not a man has brains or is qualified or anything else; in other words, the same reasoning that applies to the system whereby you pay one man more than another does not apply to this hazardous-pay section.

If the bill is passed in its present form, what it means is this: If you send out a lieutenant commander and an enlisted man in a submarine and you say, "Well,

now, you are going on a hazardous journey, there is some peril attached to this, so we are going to give you a bonus because you may lose your life," you say to the lieutenant commander, "We are going to give you \$150 bonus," but to the enlisted man we say, "We are going to give you a \$30 bonus." In other words, this Congress is putting its stamp of approval on the fact that in the eyes of Congress and the military, the life of an enlisted man is not worth as much as the life of an officer. I say, whether you put the hazardous bonus at \$30 or \$50 or \$100, whatever it may be, it should be the same for all. Under the system as it is now, if a major and several enlisted men go up in an airplane, you do the same thing. You say to all those men when they start out, "You have a hazardous duty here. If you go, we are going to give you a bonus," and you give the major \$150 and you give the enlisted man \$30. I do not think that is a fair and just system. I do not think anything is worse for the morale of the service than that particular system. I think in Congress here we should say, if all of these men are going to risk their lives on hazardous duty which has nothing to do with qualifications or basic pay schedule, that "We are going to treat you all alike as far as hazardous, perilous duty is concerned, so that an enlisted man who takes that risk gets the very same thing as the officer does."

I might add, without any criticism of the officers, that it is probable that the enlisted man will be subjected to more risks than the officer. A little later on I have the same amendment with reference to subsection (c), changing that the same way.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the words, "hazardous-duty pay" are a misnomer. It happens to be that we have carried that language in the law for quite some period of time, and it is understood that it relates to this type of duty. The proper term is "incentive pay"; that it is for the purpose of attracting men to perform this type of duty. It might be that we should never have gone to a percentage basis for hazardous pay. But, it so happens that back at the beginning of the First World War, when few of us were here except our illustrious chairman, they did adopt the provision for 50 percent of base or longevity pay as the proper basis for incentive pay, and it has continued down through the years.

Many of us have wanted to do something about the readjustment of this for a long time. The Hook Commission finally gave us a formula which seems workable, one that we think can begin the revision and finally settle the matter entirely.

No longer will a major general get \$4,400 a year for flight duty. He will get only \$1,200 a year under this bill. We have reduced him that much. We permit the second lieutenant to get a little bit more flying pay than he got before. He goes from about \$90 to \$100 a month on his flight pay.

Of course every man's life is as dear to himself and his loved ones as any other man's life. I am surely not going to contend that any ratio should be justified on the basis of the hazard to his life that is assumed. But I also realize that to a man in the higher pay brackets the amount of money to constitute an incentive must vary because the matter is relative. It depends on the amount of money you are receiving, the equation which a little bit more would make as compared to what you are receiving. We submit it to you on the basis that it is incentive pay rather than hazardous-duty pay. We feel that the differential must exist in order to attract the men in the higher pay brackets.

It is also true that most of the casualties occur among the pilots of the planes, and most of those are the commissioned officers. A \$30-a-month hazardous-duty pay in the case of a colonel would be very little incentive, in my opinion. It depends upon the ratio it bears to his other income. I trust that this amendment will be defeated and that we will be sustained in the first revision of this type of pay that has been undertaken since 1917, the first time we have found a formula under which we can do something about the present hazardous-duty pay.

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

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I should like to point out to the gentleman, if I may, first of all, that I said as far as I was concerned the figure of \$30 was not governing with me. I am satisfied to take the gentleman's opinion on it. Secondly, on page 2224 of the hearings, with reference now to the morale of the armed services, may I point out that one of the very few enlisted men who testified said:

Sir, I believe that whenever eight men are in an airplane each one of them holds his own life as dear to himself as any other man in that airplane.

That has a great deal to do with the morale of the services, and there is nothing that would help them more than that amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. We agree that the hazard is the same, but when you regard it in its proper light, as an incentive pay, then I do not believe you are justified in that position.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot speak for the other branches, but as a former pilot in the Air Force I found that after flying for 6 or 8 months the novelty wears off, it begins to become monotonous, and it becomes routine. You do not exactly look forward to flying as you did when you first started. I dare say that if it were not for flying pay, for this added incentive, we would not have enough men in the Air Force to fly our airplanes.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman. I think that is true. The larger your income, of course, the more the incentive must be.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the Furcolo amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: On page 19, after line 12, strike out of the chart the following:

"O-8----- \$100
O-7----- 100"

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this particular section of the bill pertains to hazardous-duty pay. The committee has made some excellent changes in the present law on this problem. Under the category of hazardous-duty pay the bill includes flying and submarine duty, glider duty, parachute duty, diving duty, submarine escape, deep-sea diving, and leprosy duty.

Under my amendment we would remove only the hazardous-duty pay or the incentive pay as far as the categories of O-8 and O-7 are concerned. Who does this affect? It affects the following members of the armed services: Generals, lieutenant generals, and major generals, and in the Navy, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, admirals, vice admirals, and rear admirals in the upper half; and I might add, under O-7, brigadier generals and rear admirals in the lower half, and some people in the Public Health Service.

It appears that the committee in its judgment, and I think wisely so, has completely revised the hazardous-duty-pay system in their bill compared to the way it exists at the present time. If you will turn to page 50 of the committee report, you will find that men who are in the category of major general receive under the present law \$366.66. Under the proposed bill they will receive simply \$100. In other words, in effect, this \$100 is a token payment for something that existed in the past. Under the category of brigadier general or the category of rear admiral in the lower half they presently get \$275 a month. This bill would give them \$100 a month. I say again it is merely a token payment to continue a system which the committee itself considers improper.

It seems to me the best illustration of the present situation is the case of General Eisenhower. I have figures which show that when he was in the service he received around \$15,000 a year. Under the present law a general of comparable rank who was an Air Force officer receives \$15,000 plus 50 percent of a part of that amount. There is no question that during the last war General Eisenhower probably flew as much as the Air Force general who was getting the 50 percent extra in the same rank.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has his figures somewhat confused. It is 50 percent of the base pay, and the highest base pay in the Army is \$8,800. Therefore, that is what the flight pay would amount to. What we are trying to do here is to get away from that 50 percent of the base pay. We are trying to cut it down and make provision here so that a major general and a brigadier general

will get \$100. The brigadier general in the Air Force is the man who leads the wing attack. The most important person to lead his squadron is the brigadier, and you are proposing in your amendment to eliminate him altogether.

Mr. FORD. I can say, from personal experience in the Navy, that the man with comparable rank in the Navy did not lead the attacks in the Navy Air Corps. They were aboard ship and that is where they should have been. But still they were getting their 50 percent extra as flight pay for combat flying, which I say is wrong.

Mr. VINSON. The skipper should always be able to do that which he orders someone else to do.

Mr. FORD. But they did not do it.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly. But he is qualified to do it, and under this bill under certain conditions he will do it and we compensate him for it.

Mr. FORD. I doubt if on any occasion in the last war did any admiral, vice admiral, or rear admiral ever lead any combat flight, and that is what we were paying them for in World War II. I think that is wrong. I am not familiar with the Air Force, but the rear admirals and other flag officers in the Navy put in their flight time by flying the requisite 4 hours per month in noncombat flying. I do not think they should be compensated an extra 50 percent or even an extra \$100 per month because officers of comparable rank in other branches of the service were doing equally good jobs and were flying just as many hours.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Speaking of generals who are combat aviators, can the gentleman tell me where General Tinker is at the present time?

Mr. FORD. As I said before, I am not fully informed as to the situation in the Air Force, but I can tell you that just as many people in the Ground Forces were flying from one place to another and probably being killed in an equal number of situations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one extra minute so I may read him a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. The statement is as follows:

During World War II over 90 general officers in the Air Force personally led their forces in combat. Ten were killed.

Mr. FORD. How many generals in the Ground Forces were there, who were flying from one place to another and who were not getting flight pay, who were also killed in flight accidents? I think that is the only way you can compare the situation.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Can the gentleman tell the committee how much hazardous-

duty pay the Infantry officers received during the war from the second lieutenants on up?

Mr. FORD. I am quite sure that everyone knows that the Infantry did not receive hazardous-duty pay for their valiant services. I say we ought to compensate the people who fly in combat, but we should not give extra hazardous-duty pay to those flag officers, rear admiral and above, who are simply doing routine flying.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, this bill contains a provision under which in the future all of this hazardous-duty pay can be suspended in time of war. It is discretionary with the President, but he would have the power hereafter to put all branches of the service on the same plane when it came to hazardous pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 28, noes 71.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 40, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: On page 19, line 17, after the word "of" strike out "\$100" and insert "\$50."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take time on this, because it is exactly the same amendment that has just been defeated. The reasoning is exactly the same, the only difference being that in this case it seeks to make it \$50 a month for both officers and enlisted men. The reasoning is exactly the same with regard to both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 48, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL PAY—DIVING DUTY

SEC. 205. (a) An enlisted person of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and assigned to the duty of diving shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive special pay, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, at the rate of not less than \$5 per month and not exceeding \$30 per month.

(b) Members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and employed as divers in actual salvage or repair operations

in depths of over 90 feet, or in depths of less than 90 feet, when the officer in charge of the salvage or repair operation shall find, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, that extraordinary hazardous conditions exist, shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive the sum of \$5 per hour for each hour or fraction thereof while so employed. The amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to this subsection shall, in the case of enlisted persons, be in addition to the amounts authorized pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(c) No member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive the special pay authorized pursuant to this section in addition to hazardous-duty pay authorized pursuant to section 204 of this act.

(d) The President may, in time of war, suspend the payment of diving duty pay.

SPECIAL PAY—SEA AND FOREIGN DUTY

SEC. 206. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted persons of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall, in addition thereto, while on sea duty or while on duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, be entitled to receive pay at the following monthly rates:

Pay grades:	Monthly rates
E-7-----	\$22.50
E-6-----	20.00
E-5-----	16.00
E-4-----	13.00
E-3-----	9.00
E-2-----	8.00
E-1-----	8.00

SPECIAL PAY—REENLISTMENT BONUS

SEC. 207. (a) Members of the uniformed services who enlist under the conditions set forth in subsection (b) of this section within 3 months from the date of their discharge or separation, or within such lesser period of time as the Secretary concerned may determine from time to time, shall be paid a lump sum reenlistment bonus of \$40, \$90, \$160, \$250, or \$360 upon enlistment for a period of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, respectively; and, upon enlistment for an unspecified period of time a lump sum reenlistment bonus of \$360 shall be paid, and, upon the completion of 6 years' enlisted service in such enlistment, for each year thereafter a lump-sum payment of \$60 shall be made, subject to the limitation that the total amount paid shall not exceed \$1,440. No reenlistment bonus shall be paid for more than four enlistments entered into after the effective date of this section: *Provided*, That the bonus to be paid in the case of a person reenlisting for a period which would extend the length of his active Federal service beyond 30 years shall be computed as if said reenlistment were for the minimum number of years necessary to permit such person to complete 30 years' active Federal service.

(b) For the purpose of payment of the reenlistment bonus authorized by subsection (a) of this section, enlistment in one of the Regular services following (1) compulsory or voluntary active duty in such service, or (2) extended active duty of 1 year or more in a Reserve component of such service, shall be considered a reenlistment.

(c) Enlisted persons of the uniformed services, who, prior to expiration of the period for which they have reenlisted, extend their reenlistment to any one of the longer enlistment periods mentioned in subsection (a) of this section, shall be paid the sum of \$20 for each year of such extension subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, a member of the uniformed services who reenlists within 3 months after being discharged from the enlistment entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act, or who reenlists within 3 months after being relieved from active service as a commissioned officer or warrant

officer under appointment made prior to the date of enactment of this act if such commissioned or warrant service immediately followed enlisted service, shall be entitled to receive either (1) enlistment allowances in the amount and under the provisions of law in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act, or (2) reenlistment bonus in the amount and under the provisions of this section, whichever is the greater amount: *Provided*, That the enlistment allowance payable under (1) hereunder shall in no event exceed \$300.

(e) The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section in his department.

TITLE III—PROVISIONS RELATING TO ALLOWANCES

BASIC ALLOWANCES FOR SUBSISTENCE

SEC. 301. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section or by any other provision of law, each member of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall be entitled to receive one basic allowance for subsistence in such amount and under such circumstances as are provided in, or may be prescribed pursuant to, this section.

(b) The President may, semiannually, prescribe the amounts which shall constitute the basic allowance for subsistence for officers and enlisted persons. For enlisted persons such allowance shall be one of three types: (1) when rations in kind are not available; (2) when permission to mess separately is granted; or (3) when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no Government messing facilities are available. Officers shall, at all times, be entitled to receive a subsistence allowance on a monthly basis. Enlisted persons shall be entitled to receive the appropriate allowance on a daily basis when rations in kind are not available, when permission to mess separately is granted, or when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no Government messing facilities are available.

(c) Enlisted persons shall be entitled to receive the appropriate basic allowance for subsistence while on an authorized leave of absence or while sick in hospital: *Provided*, That any such allowance shall not accrue when such persons are, in fact, being subsisted at Government expense.

(d) Payment of the basic allowance for subsistence, when authorized, may be made to enlisted persons in advance for a period of not exceeding 3 months.

(e) The President may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

(f) Until such time as the President shall prescribe the amounts of the basic allowance for subsistence pursuant to subsection (b) of this section and the regulations pursuant to subsections (a) and (e) of this section, members of the uniformed services otherwise entitled to receive such allowance pursuant to this section shall, subject to such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be entitled to receive the following amounts:

Officers	\$45 per month.
Enlisted persons when rations in kind are not available.	\$2.25 per day.
Enlisted persons when permission to mess separately is granted.	\$1.05 per day.
Enlisted persons when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no Government messing facilities are available.	Not to exceed \$3 per day as determined by the Secretary concerned.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS

SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section or by any other provision of law, members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall be entitled to receive a basic allowance for quar-

ters in such amount and under such circumstances as are provided in, or may be prescribed pursuant to, this section: *Provided*, That an enlisted member in grade E-4 (less than 7 years' service), E-3, E-2, and E-1, shall be considered at all times as a member without dependents for the purposes of this section.

(b) The President may, annually, prescribe the amounts which shall constitute the basic allowance for quarters for officers and enlisted persons.

(c) Except as otherwise provided by law, no basic allowance for quarters shall accrue to members of the uniformed services assigned to Government quarters or housing facilities under the jurisdiction of the uniformed services, appropriate to their rank, grade, or rating and adequate for themselves and dependents, if with dependents.

(d) No basic allowance for quarters shall accrue to any member of the uniformed services without dependents while on field duty, unless his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense, or while on sea duty: *Provided*, That field duty or sea duty for temporary periods of less than 3 months shall not be considered as field duty or sea duty for purposes of this subsection.

(e) No member of the uniformed services assigned to Government quarters or housing facilities under the jurisdiction of the uniformed services shall be denied his basic allowance for quarters if, by reason of orders of competent authority, his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

(f) The President may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section, and such regulations shall include, but not be limited to, definitions of the terms "field duty" and "sea duty."

(g) Until such time as the President prescribes the amounts of the basic allowances for quarters pursuant to subsection (b) of this section and the regulations pursuant to subsections (a) and (f) of this section, members of the uniformed services otherwise entitled to such allowance pursuant to this section shall, subject to such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be entitled to receive a basic allowance for quarters at the following monthly rates according to the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed for basic pay purposes:

Pay grade	With dependents	Without dependents
O-3	\$150.00	\$120.00
O-7	150.00	120.00
O-6	120.00	105.00
O-5	120.00	90.00
O-4	105.00	82.50
O-3	90.00	75.00
O-2	82.50	67.50
O-1	75.00	60.00
W-4	105.00	82.50
W-3	90.00	75.00
W-2	82.50	67.50
W-1	75.00	60.00
E-7	67.50	45.00
E-6	67.50	45.00
E-5	67.50	45.00
E-4 (7 or more years' service) ¹	67.50	45.00
E-4 (less than 7 years' service) ¹		45.00
E-3		45.00
E-2		45.00
E-1		45.00

¹ Service authorized to be credited in computation of basic pay pursuant to section 202 of this act.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

SEC. 303. (a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, members of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive travel and transportation allowances for travel performed or to be performed under competent orders (1) upon a change of permanent station, or otherwise, or when away from their designated posts of duty regardless of the length of time away from such designated posts of duty; (2) upon ap-

pointment, call to active duty, enlistment, or induction, from home or from the place from which ordered to active duty to first station; and (3) upon separation from the service, placement upon the temporary disability retired list, release from active duty, or retirement, from last duty station to home or to the place from which ordered to active duty, regardless of the fact that such member may not be a member of the uniformed services at the time his travel is performed or is to be performed. Allowances above authorized may be paid without regard to the comparative costs of the various modes of transportation. The respective Secretaries concerned may prescribe (1) the conditions under which travel and transportation allowances shall be authorized, including advance payments thereof, and (2) the allowances for types of travel not to exceed amounts herein authorized. The travel and transportation allowances which shall be authorized for each type of travel shall be limited to one of the following: (1) Transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or a monetary allowance in lieu of cost of transportation at a rate not in excess of 7 cents per mile based on distances established or to be established over the shortest usually traveled routes, in accordance with mileage tables prepared by the Chief of Finance of the Department of the Army under the direction of the Secretary of the Army; (2) transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or a monetary allowance as provided in (1) of this sentence, plus a per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed \$9 per day; or (3) for travel within the continental limits of the United States a mileage allowance of not exceeding 10 cents per mile based on distances established or to be established pursuant to existing law: *Provided*, That the travel and transportation allowances under conditions authorized herein for such members may be paid on separation from the service, or release from active duty, regardless of whether or not such member performs the travel involved.

(b) Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, the Secretaries of the uniformed services may authorize the payment to members of the uniformed services on duty outside the continental United States or in Alaska, whether or not in a travel status, of a per diem considering all elements of cost of living to members and their dependents, including the cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses: *Provided*, That dependents shall not be considered in determining per diem allowances for members in a travel status.

(c) In addition to the allowances authorized above, under such conditions and limitations and for such grades or ratings and to and from such locations as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, members of the uniformed services when ordered to make a change of permanent station shall be entitled to transportation in kind for dependents or to reimbursement therefor, or to a monetary allowance in lieu of such transportation in kind at a rate to be prescribed not in excess of the rate authorized in subsection (a) of this section, and in connection with a change of station (whether temporary or permanent), to transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, temporary storage, and unpacking) of baggage and household effects, or reimbursement therefor, to and from such locations and within such weight allowances as may be prescribed by the Secretaries, without regard to the comparative costs of the various modes of transportation. When orders directing a change of permanent station for the member concerned have not been issued, or when such orders have been issued but are of such a nature that they cannot be used as authority for transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects, the Secretaries

concerned may, nevertheless, authorize the movement of the dependents and baggage and household effects and prescribe transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or a monetary allowance in lieu thereof as authorized in this subsection, as the case may be, only under unusual or emergency circumstances, including but not limited to (1) circumstances when duty is being performed by such member at places designated by the Secretary concerned as within zones from which dependents should be evacuated, (2) circumstances when orders which direct temporary duty travel of such member do not provide for return to the permanent station or do not specify or imply any limit to the period of absence from the permanent station, or (3) circumstances when such members are serving on permanent duty at stations outside the continental United States or in Alaska, or on sea duty. The Secretary concerned shall define the term "permanent station," which definition shall include, but not be limited to, a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which a member of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of permanent station. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, transportation for dependents and baggage and household effects are authorized upon the death of a member of the uniformed services while entitled to receive basic pay pursuant to section 201 (e) of this act.

(d) A member of the uniformed services on duty with or under training for the Military Air Transport Service, Marine Corps Transport Squadrons, or Fleet Logistics Support Unit and away from his permanent station may be paid a per diem in lieu of subsistence in an amount not to exceed the amount to which he would be entitled if performing temporary duty travel, without in either case the issuance of orders for specific travel.

(e) Cadets of the United States Military Academy, midshipmen of the United States Naval Academy, cadets of the United States Coast Guard Academy, applicants for enlistment, rejected applicants, general prisoners, discharged prisoners, insane patients transferred from military hospitals to other hospitals or their home, and persons discharged from St. Elizabeths Hospital after transfer from one of the uniformed services, shall be entitled to receive such travel and transportation allowances as are provided in subsection (a) of this section, as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, due consideration being given to the rights of the Government as well as those of the individual in the promulgation of regulations prescribing said allowances.

(f) The Secretaries concerned in establishing the rates and types of allowances authorized by this section shall consider in prescribing (1) monetary allowance in lieu of transportation—average cost of first-class transportation including sleeping accommodations, (2) per diem rates—the current economic data on cost of subsistence (including lodging and other necessary incidental expenses related thereto), and (3) mileage rates—average cost of first-class transportation including sleeping accommodations and current economic data on cost of subsistence (including lodging and other necessary incidental expenses related thereto).

(g) The Secretaries concerned shall determine what shall constitute a travel status.

(h) Regulations shall be promulgated by the Secretaries of the uniformed services, as provided herein, and such regulations shall be uniform for all services insofar as practicable: *Provided*, That no provisions of this section shall become effective until such regulations have been issued: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall pre-

clude the payment of travel and transportation allowances under provisions of law in effect on the day prior to the effective date of this act, until such regulations are issued pursuant to this subsection.

PERSONAL MONEY ALLOWANCE

SEC. 304. (a) Officers entitled to receive basic pay shall, while serving in the grade of lieutenant general, vice admiral, or in an equivalent grade or rank, in addition to any other pay or allowance authorized by this act, be entitled to receive a personal money allowance of \$500 per annum.

(b) Officers entitled to receive basic pay shall, while serving in the grade of general, admiral, or in an equivalent grade or rank, in addition to any other pay or allowance authorized by this act, be entitled to receive a personal money allowance of \$2,200 per annum.

(c) Officers entitled to receive basic pay shall, while serving as the Chief of Staff of the Army, as the Chief of Naval Operations, as the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, as the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or as the Commandant of the Coast Guard, in lieu of any other personal money allowance authorized by this section, but in addition to any other pay or allowance authorized by this act, be entitled to receive a personal money allowance of \$4,000 per annum.

TITLE IV.—PROVISIONS RELATING TO RETIREMENT, RETIREMENT PAY, SEPARATION, AND SEVERANCE PAY FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST

SEC. 401. (a) Any member of the uniformed services found to be unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of physical disability and who otherwise qualifies as hereinafter provided may be retired or separated subject to the provisions of this title.

(b) The Secretary concerned shall establish for his uniformed service a temporary disability retired list, upon which shall be placed the names of all members of his service entitled to such placement pursuant to the provisions of this title. Such list shall be published annually in the official register or other official publication of the service concerned.

TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIREMENT, PHYSICAL DISABILITY RETIREMENT, AND DISABILITY RETIREMENT PAY

SEC. 402. (a) Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned (1) that a member of a Regular component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay, or a member of a Reserve component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay who has been called or ordered to extended active duty for a period in excess of 30 days, is unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, by reason of physical disability incurred while entitled to receive basic pay; (2) that such disability is not due to the misconduct or willful neglect of such member and that such disability was not incurred during a period of unauthorized absence of such member; (3) that such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; (4) that such disability was the proximate result of the direct performance of active duty; and (5) that accepted medical principles indicate that such disability may be of a permanent nature, the name of such member shall be placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service by the Secretary concerned and such member shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That if condition (5) above is met by a finding that such disability is of a permanent nature, such member may be retired by the Secretary concerned and, upon retirement, shall be en-

titled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That if condition (3) above is not met because the disability is determined to be less than 30 percent, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section. In lieu of any such retirement, such member may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned (1) that member of a Regular component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay, or a member of a Reserve component of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay who has been called or ordered to extended active duty for a period in excess of 30 days, is unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, by reason of physical disability incurred while entitled to receive basic pay; (2) that such disability is not due to the misconduct or willful neglect of such member and that such disability was not incurred during a period of unauthorized absence of such member; (3) that such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; (4) that such member has completed at least 8 years of active service as defined in section 412 of this title; and (5) that accepted medical principles indicate that such disability may be of a permanent nature, the name of such member shall be placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service by the Secretary concerned and such member shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That if condition (3) above is not met because the disability is determined to be less than 30 percent, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section. In lieu of any such retirement, such member may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title: *And provided further*, That regardless of the percentage of disability determined to have been incurred, if condition (4) above is not met because the member concerned has completed less than 8 years of active service as defined in section 412 of this title at the time he would otherwise have been retired pursuant to this subsection, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section. In lieu of any such retirement, such member may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title.

(c) Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned (1) that a member of the uniformed services, other than those members covered in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, is unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of physical disability resulting from an injury; (2) that such injury was not the result of the misconduct or willful neglect of such member; (3) that such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; (4) that such injury was the proximate result of the direct performance of active duty, full-time training duty, other full-time duty,

or inactive duty training, as the case may be; and (5) that accepted medical principles indicate that such disability may be of a permanent nature, the name of such member shall be placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service by the Secretary concerned and such member shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That if condition (5) above is met by a finding that such disability is of a permanent nature, such member may be retired by the Secretary concerned and, upon retirement, shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That if condition (3) above is not met because the disability is determined to be less than 30 percent, the member concerned shall not be eligible for any disability retirement provided in this section. In lieu of any such retirement, such member may be separated for physical disability from the service concerned and upon separation shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title.

(d) A member of the uniformed services whose name is placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service pursuant to subsections (a), (b), or (c) of this section, for the period during which his name is carried on such temporary disability retired list, but in no event to exceed a period of 5 years, or a member of the uniformed services who is retired pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay computed, at his election, by multiplying an amount equal to the monthly basic pay of the rank, grade, or rating held by him at the time of the placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his retirement, whichever is earlier, by (1) a number equal to the number of years of active service to which such member is entitled under the provisions of section 412 of this title, multiplied by $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent, or (2) the percentage of his physical disability as of the time his name was placed on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of retirement, whichever is earlier: *Provided*, That for the purpose of the computation of (1) above, fractions of one-half year or more of active service shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further*, That the disability retirement pay of any such member who shall have held a temporary rank, grade, or rating higher than the rank, grade, or rating held by him at the time of placement of his name upon the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his retirement, whichever is earlier, and who shall have served satisfactorily in such higher rank, grade, or rating as determined by the Secretary concerned, shall be computed on the basis of the monthly basic pay of such higher rank, grade, or rating to which he would have been entitled had he been serving on active duty in such higher rank, grade, or rating at the time of placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of retirement, whichever is earlier: *Provided further*, That in no case shall such disability retirement pay exceed 75 percent of the basic pay upon which the computation is based: *Provided further*, That if the physical disability entitling such member to disability retirement pay is found to exist as a result of a physical examination given in connection with effecting a permanent promotion or a temporary promotion where eligibility for such temporary promotion was required to have been based upon cumulative years of service or years of service in rank, grade, or rating, the disability retirement pay of such members shall be based upon the basic pay of the rank, grade, or rating to which such member would have been promoted but for such disability, if such rank, grade, or rating is higher than any other rank, grade, or rating upon which such pay is herein authorized to be computed and

which such member would have been entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, or rating: *And provided further*, That for any member who, for any reason, has been or hereafter may be retired or whose name is carried on a temporary disability retired list and who, while in such status, serves on active duty, and while so serving, incurs a physical disability of 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration or incurs a physical disability in addition to or an aggravation of the physical disability for which he was retired or for which his name was placed on the temporary disability retired list, shall, if qualified therefor pursuant to this title, be entitled, on his return to a retired status or to the temporary disability retired list, to receive either (1) disability retirement pay as provided in this section, using as factors the highest percentages or basic pay which he attained while serving on such active duty, or (2) retirement pay or retired pay, as the case may be, as provided by any law in effect at the time of his retirement; and, in addition thereto, if such member is, during such period of active duty, promoted to a rank, grade, or rating higher than that rank, grade, or rating on which his retired pay, retirement pay, or disability retirement pay was based, and has served satisfactorily in such higher rank, grade, or rating as determined by the Secretary concerned, be entitled, on his return to a retired status or to the temporary disability retired list, to receive such retirement pay, disability retirement pay, or retired pay computed on the basis of the higher rank, grade, or rating and which such member would be entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such higher rank, grade, or rating.

(e) A member of the uniformed services whose name has been placed upon the temporary disability retired list of his service shall be given periodic physical examinations, not less frequent than every 18 months, to determine whether the disability for which such member was temporarily retired has changed. If as a result of any such examinations, or upon the termination of a period of 5 years from the date of temporary disability retirement, it is determined (1) that the physical disability of such member is of permanent character and such disability is 30 percent or more in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration, the name of such member shall be removed from the temporary disability retired list of his service and such member shall be permanently retired for physical disability and he shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That for the purpose of computing such pay the percentage of his physical disability shall be determined as of the time of his permanent retirement; (2) that the physical disability of such member is less than 30 percent in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration, the name of such member shall be removed from the temporary disability retired list of the service concerned, and such member may be separated from the service concerned for physical disability and may receive disability severance pay as prescribed in section 403 of this title: *Provided further*, That at the end of a 5-year period during which the name of a member is carried on a temporary disability retired list, the Secretary concerned shall make a final determination of such member's case and shall cause such member to be retired, separated, or treated as provided in section 405 of this title.

(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any member of the uniformed services who shall have completed at least 20 years of active service as defined

in section 412 of this title, and who is otherwise qualified to be retired for physical disability except that his disability is less than 30 percent in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration, shall be retired and shall be entitled to receive disability retirement pay as prescribed in subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not be interpreted to limit the application of any provisions of law relating to voluntary or involuntary retirement.

(g) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, any member of the Army of the United States, Navy, Air Force of the United States, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, and all Regular and Reserve components thereof, who shall have completed at least 20 years of satisfactory Federal service in the uniformed services as defined in sections 302 and 300 of the act of July 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1087, 1089; 10 U. S. C. 1036a, 1036e), and who is otherwise qualified to be retired for physical disability except that his disability is less than 30 percent in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration may elect, in lieu of being separated and receiving disability severance pay pursuant to title IV of this act, to be transferred to the inactive status list of the uniformed service concerned pursuant to section 308 of the act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1090; 10 U. S. C. 1036g), and be granted retired pay upon attaining the age of 60 years if eligible in all other respects to be granted retired pay as provided in title III of that act.

(h) Disability retirement pay computed on the basis of years of active service shall not be deemed to be a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country within the meaning of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code.

SEPARATION AND SEVERANCE PAY FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

SEC. 403. A member of the uniformed services separated for physical disability pursuant to the provisions of section 402 of this title shall be entitled to receive disability severance pay computed as follows: An amount equal to 2 months' basic pay of the rank, grade, or rating held by such member at the time of the placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his separation, whichever is earlier, and which such member would be entitled to receive at the time of separation if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, or rating, multiplied by a number equal to the number of years of active service to which such member is entitled under the provisions of section 412 of this title but not to exceed a total of 2 years' basic pay: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this computation, fractions of one-half year or more of active service shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further*, That the disability severance pay of any such member who shall have held a temporary rank, grade, or rating higher than the rank, grade, or rating held by him at the time of the placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of his separation, whichever is earlier, and who shall have served satisfactorily in such higher rank, grade, or rating as determined by the Secretary concerned, shall be computed on the basis of the monthly basic pay of such higher rank, grade, or rating to which he would have been entitled had he been serving on active duty in such higher rank, grade, or rating at the time of placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of separation, whichever is earlier: *Provided further*, That if the physical disability entitling such member to disability severance pay is found to exist as a result of a physical

examination given in connection with effecting a permanent promotion or a temporary promotion where eligibility for such temporary promotion was required to have been based upon cumulative years of service or years of service in rank, grade, or rating, the disability severance pay of such member shall be based upon the rank, grade, or rating to which such member would have been promoted but for such disability, if such rank, grade, or rating is higher than any other rank, grade, or rating upon which such severance pay is herein authorized to be computed and which such member would be entitled to receive at the time of placement of his name on the temporary disability retired list or at the time of separation, whichever is earlier, if serving on active duty in the higher grade: *And provided further*, That in the case of a former member of the uniformed services who has received disability severance pay as provided in this section, the amount of such disability severance pay shall be deducted from any compensation for himself or his dependents to which he or they becomes entitled thereafter under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the same disability but no such deductions shall be made from any death compensation to which his dependents may become entitled subsequent to his death.

PERIODIC PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS

SEC. 404. (a) A member of the uniformed services whose name is hereafter placed upon the temporary disability retired list may be required to submit to periodic physical examinations during the period in which his name is carried on such list.

(b) A member of the uniformed services whose name is placed upon the temporary disability retired list and who is required to submit to a periodic physical examination shall, for travel performed, be entitled to receive the travel and transportation allowance authorized for the rank, grade, or rating in which retired for temporary duty travel performed while on active duty. Failure of any such member to report for any periodic physical examination after receipt of proper notification may be considered cause for terminating his disability retirement pay, except that such payments shall be reinstated at a later date if just cause existed for such failure to report, in which case payments may be retroactive for a period of not to exceed 1 year.

RECOVERY FROM PHYSICAL DISABILITY

SEC. 405. (a) If, as a result of a periodic physical examination, a member of a Regular component of the uniformed services whose name has been placed on the temporary disability retired list is found to be physically fit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, he shall, subject to his consent, if an officer, be called to active duty and, as soon thereafter as practicable, be reappointed, subject to the provisions of section 407 of this title, to the active list of his Regular component, or, if an enlisted person, be reenlisted in his Regular component.

(b) If, as a result of a periodic physical examination, a member of a Reserve component of the uniformed services whose name has been placed on the temporary disability retired list is found to be physically fit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, he shall, subject to his consent, be reappointed or reenlisted, as the case may be, in his Reserve component: *Provided*, That if the name of such member was placed on the temporary disability retired list for physical disability incurred while serving in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Air National Guard of the United States, he shall, subject to his consent, if not reappointed or reenlisted, as the case may be, in the component from which removed, be appointed, reappointed, enlisted, or reenlisted, as the case may be, in the Organized Reserve Corps or the Air Force Reserve.

(c) Any appointment, reappointment, enlistment, or reenlistment authorized pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section shall be in a rank, grade, or rating not lower than the rank, grade, or rating permanently held at the time of placement of the name of the member concerned upon the temporary disability retired list, and may be in the rank, grade, or rating immediately above the rank, grade, or rating permanently held at the time of placement of the name of the member concerned upon the temporary disability retired list. When seniority in rank, grade, or rating or years of service is an applicable factor in qualifying a member of the uniformed services for future promotion, such member who is being reappointed or reenlisted pursuant to this section shall, for the purpose of placement on a lineal list, promotion list, or other similar list, be given such seniority in rank, grade, or rating or be credited with such years of service as may be authorized by the Secretary concerned. Action under this subsection shall be taken on a fair and equitable basis, and regard shall be given to the probable opportunities for advancement and promotion to which such member might reasonably have become entitled but for placement of his name upon the temporary disability retired list.

TERMINATION OF DISABILITY RETIREMENT PAY

SEC. 406. (a) If, as a result of a periodic physical examination, a member of the uniformed services whose name appears on the temporary disability retired list is found to be physically fit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating, he shall—

(1) if an officer of a Regular component, have his disability retirement pay terminated upon the date of his recall to active duty and his status on the temporary disability retired list terminated on the date of his reappointment to the active list;

(2) if an enlisted person of a Regular component, have both his status on such temporary disability retired list and his disability retirement pay terminated on the date of his reenlistment in the Regular component from which placed on the temporary disability retired list; or

(3) if a member of a Reserve component, have such status and his disability retirement pay terminated on the date of his reappointment or reenlistment in a Reserve component, as the case may be.

(b) If any such member does not consent to any action taken pursuant to either subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 405 of this title, his status on the temporary disability retired list and his disability retirement pay shall be terminated as soon thereafter as practicable.

REAPPOINTMENT TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF OFFICERS PLACED ON THE TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST

SEC. 407. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to reappoint to the active list of the appropriate Regular component of the uniformed services those commissioned officers of the Regular components of the uniformed services whose names have been placed on the temporary disability retired list and who are subsequently found to be physically fit to perform the duties of their office, rank, grade, or rating on active duty. The President, or the Secretary concerned, as the case may be, is authorized to reappoint to the active list of the appropriate Regular component of the uniformed services those warrant officers of the Regular component of the uniformed services whose names have been placed on the temporary disability retired list and who are subsequently found to be physically fit to perform the duties of their office, rank, grade, or rating.

(b) Irrespective of any vacancy in a grade, the authorized number of officers in such grade shall be temporarily increased, if neces-

sary, to authorize appointments made pursuant to section 405 of this title.

PHYSICAL DISABILITY RESULTING FROM MISCONDUCT OR WILLFUL NEGLIGENCE

SEC. 408. When a member of the uniformed services incurs a physical disability which is determined to render him unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating and which is determined to have resulted from his misconduct or willful neglect, or was incurred during a period of unauthorized absence, such member shall be separated from his service without entitlement to any of the benefits of this title.

RANK OR GRADE IN WHICH RETIRED

SEC. 409. A member of the uniformed services who is retired pursuant to this title shall be retired in the rank, grade, or rating upon which his disability retirement pay is based or in such higher rank, grade, or rating as may be authorized by law at time of retirement.

CESSATION OF BENEFITS UPON SEPARATION

SEC. 410. Any former member who has been separated for physical disability from any of the uniformed services and paid disability severance pay pursuant to this title shall not thereafter, unless such former member again becomes a member of the uniformed services, be entitled to receive from the service from which such former member was separated any payment for any monetary obligation provided under any provision of law administered by any uniformed service or for such uniformed service by any other uniformed service on account of or arising out of such former member's service on or prior to such separation: *Provided*, That such separation shall not operate to bar the former member concerned from receiving or the service concerned from paying any moneys due and payable on the date of separation, or any moneys that become due as a result of a valid claim processed against the Government pursuant to any provisions of law.

MEMBERS OR FORMER MEMBERS HERETOFORE RETIRED FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY

SEC. 411. Pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, (1) any member or former member of the uniformed services heretofore retired by reason of physical disability and now receiving or entitled to receive retired or retirement pay; (2) any former member of the uniformed services heretofore granted or entitled to receive retirement pay for physical disability; (3) any member of the Army Nurse Corps or any person entitled to the rights, privileges, and benefits of members of the Army Nurse Corps, retired for disability under the act of June 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 790), as amended; and (4) any member of the Navy Nurse Corps, or any person entitled to the rights, privileges, and benefits of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, retired for disability prior to December 23, 1942, under the act of June 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 790), as amended, may elect within the 5-year period following the effective date of this title, (A) to qualify for disability retirement pay under the provisions of this act and, dependent on his qualification, shall be entitled to receive either the disability retirement pay or the disability severance pay prescribed in this title: *Provided*, That the determination of the percentage of disability as prescribed in sections 402 (a) (3), 402 (b) (3), or 402 (c) (3), as applicable, shall be based upon the disability of such member, former member, or person, as of the time he was last retired or as of the time he was granted retirement pay, as the case may be, and the percentage of such disability will be determined in accordance with the standard schedule of rating disabilities in current use by the Veterans' Administration; or (B) to receive retired pay or retirement pay computed by one of the two methods contained in section 512 of this

act: *Provided further*, That the retired or retirement pay of each person referred to in (3) and (4) above shall, unless a higher rank or grade is authorized by any provision of law, be based upon the commissioned officer rank or grade authorized for such persons by the act of May 7, 1948 (Pub. Law 517, 80th Cong.)

DEFINITION OF ACTIVE SERVICE

SEC. 412. For the purposes of this title, the term "active service" shall be interpreted to mean (1) for members of the Regular components of the uniformed services and for those members, former members, and persons referred to in section 411 (1), (3), and (4), all service as a member of the uniformed services, or as a nurse, or as a contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, or as a reserve nurse subsequent to February 2, 1901, or as a contract surgeon, or as a contract dental surgeon, or as an acting dental surgeon, or as a veterinarian in the Quartermaster Department, Cavalry, or Field Artillery, or as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Army Quartermaster Corps, while on the active list or on active duty or while participating in full-time training or other full-time duty provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performances of the duties provided for by sections 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or all service which such member, former member, or person has or is deemed to have pursuant to law for the purpose of separation or mandatory elimination from the active list of his uniformed service; and (2) for members of the reserve components of the uniformed services, and for former members referred to in section 411 (2) that service which is equal to the number of years which would be used by such members or former members as a multiplier in the computation of their retired pay pursuant to section 303 of the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 708, 62 Stat. 1088).

REGULATIONS

SEC. 413. The Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this title within his department or agency, including regulations which shall provide that no member of the uniformed services shall be separated or retired for physical disability without a full and fair hearing if such member shall demand it.

POWERS, DUTIES, AND FUNCTIONS

SEC. 414. (a) All duties, powers, and functions incident to the determination of fitness for active service, percentage of disability at the time of separation from active service, and suitability for reenlistment into active service and entitlement to and payment of disability severance pay shall be vested in the Secretary concerned.

(b) All duties, powers, and functions incident to payments of disability retirement pay, hospitalization, and reexaminations shall be vested in the Secretary concerned or in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under regulations promulgated by the President.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

TRAINING DUTY WITH OR WITHOUT PAY OF RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL

SEC. 501. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, and to the extent provided for by law and by appropriations, members of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of

one-thirtieth of the basic pay authorized for such members of the uniformed services when entitled to receive basic pay, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That for each of the several classes of organizations prescribed for the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, the rules applicable to each of which services and classes within service may differ, the Secretary concerned—

(1) shall prescribe minimum standards which must be met before an assembly for drill or other equivalent period of training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties may be credited for pay purposes, which minimum standards may require the presence for duty of officers and enlisted personnel equal to or in excess of a minimum number or percentage of unit strength for a specified period of time with participation in a prescribed character of training;

(2) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which may be counted for pay purposes in each fiscal year;

(3) shall prescribe the maximum number of assemblies, or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties which can be counted for pay purposes in lesser periods of time; and

(4) shall prescribe the minimum number of assemblies or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties, which must be completed in stated periods of time before the personnel of organizations or units can qualify for pay.

(b) Members of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, may be given additional training or other duty as provided for by law, without pay, as may be authorized by the Secretary concerned, with their consent, and when such authorized training or other duty without pay is performed they may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be furnished with transportation to and from such duty, with subsistence en route, and, during the performance of such duty, be furnished with subsistence and quarters in kind or commutation thereof at a rate to be fixed from time to time by the Secretary concerned.

(c) In addition to pay provided in subsection (a) of this section, officers of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, commanding organizations having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, be entitled to receive not more than \$240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe; and for the purpose of determining how much shall be paid to such officers so performing such functions, the Secretary concerned may, from time to time, divide them into classes

and fix the amount payable to the officers in each class.

(d) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe and to the extent provided for by appropriations, members of the National Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, Organized Reserve Corps, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service entitled to receive compensation pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall, when required by competent orders to perform any hazardous duty prescribed by or pursuant to section 204 of this Act for members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and when in consequence of such orders they do perform any hazardous duty so prescribed, be entitled to receive an increase in compensation equal to one-thirtieth of the monthly special pay authorized by section 204 of this Act for the performance of such hazardous duty by members of the uniformed services of corresponding grades entitled to receive basic pay, such increase to be paid to such members, as long as they are qualified to receive such increase, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which they shall have been engaged for not less than 2 hours, including those performed on Sundays and holidays, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, or duty or appropriate duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(e) The provision of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall not apply when such members are entitled to receive basic pay as provided for in title II of this Act.

(f) (1) Section 55a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 422), is hereby amended by striking out the words "subsection (c), section 14, Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended," appearing in the third proviso thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection (a) of section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949."

(2) Sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out the words "section 14 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended," wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949".

(3) Section 501 of this act and sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That all references in section 501 of this act and sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Regular Army, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, shall be construed for the purpose of interpreting section 501 of this act and sections 55a, 109, and 110 of the National Defense Act, as amended, as likewise referring to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, the Regular Air Force, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Air Force Reserve, the officers' section of the Air Force Reserve, the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve, and personnel of the Organized Reserves transferred to the Department of the Air Force, respectively.

ACTIVE SERVICE CREDIT IN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

SEC. 502. Active service in the Coast and Geodetic Survey as deck officer or junior engineer and active service counted on June 30,

1922, for longevity pay, shall be credited to commissioned officers as active commissioned service for purposes of pay, allowances, retirement and retirement pay.

PAYMENTS BASED ON PURPORTED MARRIAGES

SEC. 503. Payments of allowances based on a purported marriage and made prior to judicial annulment of termination of such marriage which have been or which hereafter may be made under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, or under this act are valid: *Provided*, That it is adjudged or decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction that the marriage was entered into in good faith on the part of the spouse in the uniformed services or that, in the absence of such a judgment or decree, such finding of good faith is made by the Secretary concerned or by such person as he may designate for the purpose.

CONTRACT SURGEONS

SEC. 504. Contract surgeons who are serving full time with any of the uniformed services shall be entitled to be paid the minimum basic pay, the basic allowances, and such other allowances as are authorized by this act to be paid to commissioned officers in pay grade O-2. Contract surgeons who are serving part time with any of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive the allowances for travel and transportation prescribed pursuant to this act under the same conditions and in the same amount as are applicable to commissioned officers.

ENLISTED PERSONS—CLOTHING ALLOWANCE

SEC. 505. The President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the National Guard, the Air National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, the Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

ALLOWANCE—SHORE PATROL DUTY

SEC. 506. Officers, midshipmen, and cadets of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard when absent from a vessel or designated post of duty while assigned to shore patrol duty may be paid their actual expenses.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES—ENLISTED MEN—PHILIPPINE SCOUTS—INSULAR FORCE OF THE NAVY

SEC. 507. (a) The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Army and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

(b) The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy, and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Navy.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES—CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN

SEC. 508. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to receive pay at the rate of \$936 per annum, and to receive allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman.

ASSIMILATION TO PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

SEC. 509. The provisions of titles II and III of this act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in any of the uniformed services, but whose pay or allowances, or both, under existing law are assimilated to the pay and allowances of a commissioned officer of any grade or rank of any of the uniformed services.

DAILY RATE OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 510. Members of the uniformed services who shall become entitled to receive any pay and allowances authorized by this act for a continuous period of less than 1 month shall be entitled to receive such pay and allowances for each day of such period at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly amount of such pay and allowances, and the 31st day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

TERMINATION OF WAR—SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1942, AS AMENDED

SEC. 511. On the date of enactment of this act, the present war shall be considered as terminated for purposes of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, and the 6 months immediately following the termination of the present war shall be considered to be terminated for the purposes of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, on that date which is the last day of the sixth calendar month following the month during which this act is enacted: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the foregoing, the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, shall remain in effect during a period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted by any enlisted person prior to July 1, 1946, except for the period of extension of an enlistment contracted for on or subsequent to July 1, 1946: *Provided further*, That in the case of any enlisted person on active duty on the date of enactment of this act whose total pay and allowances, including the amount of the Government's contribution to his dependents under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, on the day immediately preceding the date of enactment of this act, exceeds the amount of basic pay and allowances to which he becomes entitled after the elimination of the monthly family allowance pursuant to the enactment of this section, shall, if application is made within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, be discharged by the Secretary concerned.

RETIRED AND RETAINER PAY OF MEMBERS ON RETIRED LISTS OR RECEIVING RETAINER PAY

SEC. 512. On and after the effective date of this section (1) members of the uniformed services heretofore retired for reasons other than for physical disability, (2) members heretofore transferred to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and (3) members of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps heretofore retired under the act of May 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 513), shall be entitled to receive retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, in the amount whichever is the greater, computed by one of the following methods: (a) The monthly retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay in the amount authorized for such members and former members by provisions of law in effect on the day immediately preceding the date of enactment of this act, or (b) monthly retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay equal to 2½ percent of the monthly basic pay of the highest federally recognized rank, grade, or rating, whether under a permanent or temporary appointment, satisfactorily held, by such member or former member, as determined by the Secretary concerned, and which such member, former member, or person

would be entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, or rating, multiplied by the number of years of active service creditable to him: *Provided*, That for the purpose of the computation of (b) above, fractions of one-half year or more of active service shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further*, That in no case shall such retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay exceed 75 percent of the monthly basic pay upon which the computation is based: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section, the term "active service" as used herein shall mean all service as a member or as a former member of the uniformed services, or as a nurse, or as a contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, or as a reserve nurse subsequent to February 2, 1901, or as a contract surgeon, or as a contract dental surgeon, or as an acting dental surgeon, or as a veterinarian in the Quartermaster Department, Cavalry, or Field Artillery, or as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Army Quartermaster Corps, while on the active list or on active duty or while participating in full-time training or other full-time duty provided for or authorized in the National Defense Act, as amended, the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or in other provisions of law, including participation in exercises or performance of the duties provided for by sections 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, and in the case of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, that service which is creditable pursuant to part (3) of section 412 of this act: *Provided further*, That the retired or retirement pay of each member referred to in (3) above shall, unless a higher rank or grade is authorized by any provision of law, be based upon the commissioned-officer grade authorized for such member by the act of May 7, 1948 (Public Law 517, 80th Cong.): *Provided further*, That (a) enlisted persons or former enlisted persons of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force who have been transferred prior to the effective date of this section to the Enlisted Reserve Corps or to the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve and placed on the retired list of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force, respectively, under the provisions of section 4 of the act of October 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 539; 10 U. S. C. 948), as amended, and (b) enlisted persons or former enlisted persons of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps who have been transferred prior to the effective date of this section to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve under the provisions of title II of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, shall not be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay computed on the basis of the highest officer or warrant-officer grade held by them as authorized by this section until they have completed 30 years of service, to include the sum of their active service and their service on the retired list or in the Fleet Reserve or in the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, as required by existing law: *And provided further*, That enlisted persons and warrant officers of the uniformed services, heretofore or hereafter advanced on the retired list to a higher officer rank or grade pursuant to any provision of law shall, if application therefor is made to the Secretary concerned within 1 year from the effective date of this section or within 1 year after the date of advancement on the retired list, whichever is the later, and subject to the approval of the Secretary concerned, be restored to their former retired enlisted or warrant-officer status, as the case may be, and shall thereafter be deemed to be enlisted or warrant-officer personnel, as appropriate, for all purposes, including the computation of their retired pay based on such enlisted or warrant-officer rank, grade, or rating, as the case may be.

RETIRED PAY OF MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

SEC. 513. On and after the effective date of this section, any person who heretofore has been granted retired pay or who hereafter is granted retired pay pursuant to title III of the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 708, 62 Stat. 1087), shall have his retired pay computed as authorized by the aforesaid title III on the basis of the pay provided for in this act: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 305 of the act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1089), any member or former member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve heretofore placed on the Honorary Retired List of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve with pay as provided in sections 309 and 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1183; 34 U. S. C. 855h, 1), as amended, shall be entitled to have such pay computed as provided in this section.

RETIRED PAY GRADE OF CERTAIN WARRANT OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONS

SEC. 514. Any enlisted person or warrant officer of the uniformed services who served in World War I, heretofore or hereafter retired for any reason, shall (1) be advanced on the retired list of the service concerned to the highest federally recognized officer rank or grade satisfactorily held by such enlisted person or warrant officer under a permanent or temporary appointment for any period of service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and (2) if not entitled to receive retired pay or disability retirement pay based on a higher officer rank or grade by some other provision of law, be entitled to receive retired pay or disability retirement pay computed on the basis of the officer rank or grade to which previously advanced on a retired list or computed on the basis of the officer grade or rank authorized by this section: *Provided*, That enlisted persons and warrant officers of the uniformed services, heretofore or hereafter advanced on the retired list to a higher officer rank or grade pursuant to any provision of law shall, if application therefor is made to the Secretary concerned within 1 year from the effective date of this section or within 1 year after the date of advancement on the retired list, whichever is the later, and subject to the approval of the Secretary concerned, be restored to their former retired enlisted or warrant-officer status, as the case may be, and shall thereafter be deemed to be enlisted or warrant-officer personnel, as appropriate, for all purposes, including the computation of their retired pay based on such enlisted or warrant-officer rank, grade, or rating, as the case may be.

RETIRED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY

SEC. 515. Retired members and former members of the uniformed services, including members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall, when serving on active duty, be entitled to receive the pay and allowances to which entitled by the provisions of this act for the grade or rank in which they are serving on such active duty, and shall, when on such active-duty status, have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or while sick as members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay of similar grade or rank, and, if death occurs when on active-duty status, while on leave of absence, or while sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of any of the benefits provided in the act of December 17, 1919 (41 Stat. 367; 10 U. S. C. 903), as amended, and in the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824; 34 U. S. C. 943), as amended.

SAVING PROVISION TO RETAIN PRESENT COMPENSATION

SEC. 516. No member serving on active duty on the effective date of title II of this act

shall, prior to the expiration of a period of 3 years from such effective date and while serving on continuous active duty, including for the purpose of such continuous active duty service in a reenlistment entered into within 3 months from the date of last discharge, suffer any reduction by reason of this act in the total compensation which he is entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day immediately preceding such effective date: *Provided*, That (a) the provisions of this section shall cease to apply to such member whenever he shall become entitled to receive total compensation in excess of the amount to which he was entitled on the day preceding such effective date; and (b) the provisions of this section shall cease to apply to any part of such total compensation upon the failure of such member to qualify therefor: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section such total compensation shall not include contributions by the Government under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, travel and transportation allowances, per diem and station allowances, pay of court stenographers of the Army and Air Force, enlistment allowance, or reenlistment bonuses.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO INCREASE OF RETIRED PAY BY ACTIVE DUTY

SEC. 517. Members and former members of the uniformed services, including members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, who have been, or may hereafter be, retired or transferred to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and entitled to receive retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay computed under the provisions of this or any other act, shall be entitled, subject to the provisions hereinafter listed, to receive increases in such retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay for all active duty performed after retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve: *Provided*, That the retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay to which such member or former member shall be entitled upon his release from active duty shall be computed by multiplying the years of service creditable to him for purposes of computing retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay at the time of his retirement or transfer plus the number of years of subsequent active duty performed by him by $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent, and by multiplying the product thus obtained by the base and longevity pay or the basic pay, as the case may be, of the rank or grade in which he would be eligible, at the time of his release from active duty, to be retired or transferred except for the fact that he is already a retired person or a member of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve: *Provided*, That for the purpose of computing increases in retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay of any member or former member, fractions of one-half year or more of active duty performed subsequent to retirement or transfer by such member or former member shall be counted as a whole year: *Provided further*, That in the case of an officer heretofore retired with pay computed at a rate of either 3 or 4 percent as the multiplier for each year of service allowed in the computation of the retired pay, active duty performed subsequent to the effective date of this section shall not increase the retired or retirement pay for such officer upon his return to retired status unless such officer elects to have his retired or retirement pay computed by one of the two methods provided in section 512 of this act, subject to the limitations imposed therein: *And provided further*, That in no event shall retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay or basic pay which such person would be entitled to receive if he were serving on active duty in

the rank or grade which is the basis for the computation of his retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay.

SAVING PROVISION AND AMENDMENTS RELATING TO MEMBERS OF THE MARINE BAND

SEC. 518. (a) Section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925, as amended by section 1 (c) of the act of June 29, 1948 (60 Stat. 343; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. The band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader, who shall be paid the basic pay, the basic allowances, and such other allowances as are authorized by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to be paid to commissioned officers in pay grade O-3 and with the same number of cumulative years of service; one second leader, who shall be paid the basic pay, the basic allowances, and such other allowances as are authorized by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to be paid to warrant officers in pay grade W-3 and with the same number of cumulative years of service, and such other personnel in such numbers and distributed in such grades and ranks as the Secretary of the Navy may determine necessary and appropriate: *Provided*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, personnel of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances."

(b) Personnel of the band of the United States Marine Corps serving under appointments authorized by law in effect on the date of enactment of this act who may be appointed to appropriate grades or ranks in consequence of the amendment of such law by subsection (a) of this section shall not suffer by reason of such appointment any reduction in the pay and allowances to which they would have been entitled either in their current enlistment or during any subsequent enlistment or after transfer to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve or to the retired list. No former member of the band of the United States Marine Corps who has been heretofore retired or heretofore transferred to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall suffer any reduction in retirement or retainer pay to which he would otherwise have been entitled but for enactment of this act.

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE AND FORMER BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION PERSONNEL

SEC. 519. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to diminish any of the rights, benefits, and privileges authorized and conferred—

(1) by the act of August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1216), as amended by the act of June 24, 1948 (Public Law 761, 80th Cong.), upon personnel of the former Lighthouse Service; and

(2) by the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 411), for personnel of the categories described in sections 3 (6), 5 (7), and 6 (5) of said act, who were commissioned, appointed, or enlisted in the Regular Coast Guard pursuant to said acts of August 5, 1939, and July 23, 1947, respectively.

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS RECEIVING RETIREMENT PAY ON DATE OF ENACTMENT OF THIS ACT

SEC. 520. Any member or former member of the uniformed services or any person entitled to the rights, benefits, and privileges of a member or former member of the uniformed services, including any person entitled to the benefits provided in the act of May 7, 1948 (62 Stat. 211), who on the date of enactment of this act, is receiving or is entitled to receive retired or retirement pay pursuant to any provision of law, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of this act, be entitled to continue to receive or shall continue his entitlement to receive that retired or retirement pay which such member or former member is entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day preceding date of enactment of this act.

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO LAWS PROVIDING FOR PAY REPEALED BY THIS ACT

SEC. 521. Any provision of law which, on the date of enactment of this act, entitles any person to be retired, to receive pay, retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay, or other monetary benefit, and which is directly repealed, impliedly repealed, or amended by the provisions of this act, shall, if the entitlement of such person to such retirement, pay, retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or other monetary benefit is saved by the provisions of this act, be continued in full force and effect for such entitlement and for such a time as such entitlement may exist.

PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AMENDED AND REPEALED

SEC. 522. The following sections, subsections, and other provisions of the act of July 1, 1914 (ch. 373, 53 Stat. 682), as amended, are amended or repealed as hereinafter in this section indicated:

(a) Wherever the words "pay and pay period" appear in subsection (d) of section 207, such words shall be deleted and the words "basic pay" shall be substituted in lieu thereof.

(b) Subsections (b) and (d) of section 208 are repealed. Subsections (c), (e), (f), (g), and (h) of said section are redesignated as subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively. Subsection (a) and the subsection herein redesignated as subsection (e) of said section are amended as follows:

"(a) Commissioned officers of the Regular and Reserve Corps shall be entitled to receive such pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be authorized by law.

"(e) Whenever any noncommissioned officer or other employee of the Service is assigned for duty which the Surgeon General finds requires intimate contact with persons afflicted with leprosy, he may be entitled to receive, as provided by regulations of the President, in addition to any pay or compensation to which he may otherwise be entitled, not more than one-half of such pay or compensation."

(c) Subsection (g) of section 210 is amended by deleting therefrom the words "incurred in line of duty" wherever they appear.

(d) Section 211 is amended by repealing subsection (a) thereof; by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) thereof as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and by changing "subsection (c)" to "subsection (b)" in the subsection hereby redesignated as subsection (a). The subsections hereby redesignated as subsections (b), (c), and (g) of said section are amended to read:

"(b) (1) Any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps who at the time of his original appointment was more than 45 years of age shall upon his retirement for age pursuant to subsection (a) of this section be entitled to retired pay at the rate of 4 percent of his active pay at the time of such retirement for each 12 months of active commissioned service, including any such service in the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, but in no case more than 75 percent of such active pay.

"(2) The retired pay of an officer, who is retired pursuant to subsection (a) of this section or pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection and who has served 4 years or more as Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General, shall be based on the pay of the highest grade held by him as such Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General.

"(c) In time of war, a commissioned officer who has been retired under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section may, in accordance with regulations of the President, be recalled to active duty.

"(g) A commissioned officer shall be retired or separated from the Service for phy-

sical disability depending upon his eligibility for such retirement or separation under other provisions of law and be paid such retirement or such severance pay to which he may be entitled under such other provisions of law."

(e) Subsection (d) of section 214 is amended by deleting therefrom the words "longevity pay" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "the computation of basic pay."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 215 is amended by deleting therefrom the words, "travel, transportation of household goods and effects, and."

(g) Section 706 is amended by deleting the words "subsection (c) (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection (b) (1)" and by deleting the words "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subsection (a)."

PROVISIONS RELATING TO RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS SPECIALLY COMMEDED FOR PERFORMANCE OF DUTY IN COMBAT

SEC. 523. (a) Section 412 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is hereby amended by deleting the words "and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement" as they appear in lines 8 and 9 of the said section on page 874, volume 61, Statutes at Large.

(b) The act of June 6, 1942 (ch. 383, 56 Stat. 328; 14 U. S. C. 174a; 33 U. S. C. 864e), is hereby amended by striking out the words "and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "Provided, That the provisions of this act shall not apply in the case of any officer who has been so commended if the act or service justifying the commendation was performed after December 31, 1946."

(c) Nothing contained in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be held to reduce the retired pay of any officer placed on a retired list prior to the effective date of this section, nor shall the provisions of section 412 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, or the act of June 6, 1942 (ch. 383, 56 Stat. 328), as amended by subsection (b) of this section, be construed as granting any increased retired pay to any person by virtue of the higher grade or rank to which such person is or may become entitled to pursuant to such provisions of law.

AMENDMENT OF THE SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1942, AS AMENDED

SEC. 524. Section 108 (b) of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(b) Basic allowance for quarters for enlisted men with dependents authorized by section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 shall not be payable for any period with respect to which family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the fourth (seven or more years' service), fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grades are being paid. An enlisted man of the fourth (seven or more years' service), fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grade may at his option receive either the basic allowance for quarters for dependents or have his dependents become entitled to receive family allowance. No dependents of any enlisted man shall be entitled to family allowance for any period for which such basic allowance is paid to the enlisted man. The Secretary of the Department concerned is authorized to exercise the option on behalf of the enlisted man in any case in which he deems it desirable and finds it impracticable for the enlisted man to exercise his option, subject to termination at a later date upon specific request of the enlisted man. Whenever any option under this subsection is exercised, payments pursuant thereto shall begin at a date to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned. The

monthly pay of any enlisted man of the fourth (seven or more years' service), fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grade who is provided with public quarters for his dependents and any of whose dependents is receiving a family allowance shall be reduced by, or charged with, 90 cents per day."

AMENDMENTS OF THE ACT OF JUNE 3, 1916 (39 STAT. 190; 41 STAT. 776)

SEC. 525. (a) Section 30 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 187; 10 U. S. C. 658), as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom the third, the seventh, and the ninth sentences of the first paragraph.

(b) Section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, is amended by inserting a period after the words "and length of active service" and deleting the rest of said section.

(c) Section 33 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, is amended by deleting the following words therefrom: "and mileage from his home to his first station and from his last station to his home."

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 18, 1946 (60 STAT. 20)

SEC. 526. That part of title II of the act of February 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 20; 37 U. S. C. 112c), which authorizes transportation of dependents and household effects of civilian and naval personnel of the Naval Establishment stationed outside continental United States is amended by deleting therefrom all reference to naval personnel.

AMENDMENTS OF THE ACT OF JUNE 5, 1942 (56 STAT. 315)

SEC. 527. (a) Subsection (e) of section 4 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314), as added by section 4 of the act of February 12, 1946 (60 Stat. 5; 50 App. U. S. C. 764 (e)), as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom the reference to section 4 (a), 4 (b), and 4 (c).

(b) Section 5 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 316; 50 App. U. S. C. 765), is amended by deleting therefrom all reference to military personnel.

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF MAY 27, 1908 (35 STAT. 418)

SEC. 528. Paragraph 23, heading "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 418; 39 U. S. C. 134), as amended, is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 OF THE NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942 (56 STAT. 737)

SEC. 529. Section 4 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 737; 34 U. S. C. 850c), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Aviation cadets, while on active duty, shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of \$105 per month, which pay shall include extra pay for flying. They shall be entitled to receive, in addition, the same allowance for subsistence as is now or may hereafter be authorized for officers of the Navy, and shall, while on active duty, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization, and shall be issued uniforms, clothing, and equipment at Government expense. When traveling under orders, aviation cadets shall be entitled to receive transportation and other necessary expenses incident to such travel, or cash in lieu thereof on the same basis and at the same rates as are now or may hereafter be prescribed for enlisted personnel of the Navy."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 OF THE ARMY AVIATION CADET ACT (55 STAT. 240)

SEC. 530. The first five sentences of section 4 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act (55 Stat. 240; 10 U. S. C. 303, 304, 304b), as amended, are hereby further amended as follows:

"Aviation cadets, while on active duty, shall be entitled to be paid at the rate of \$105 per month, which pay shall include extra pay for flying. They shall be entitled

to receive, in addition, the same allowance for subsistence as is now or may hereafter be authorized for officers of the Army, and shall, while on active duty, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization, and shall be issued uniforms, clothing, and equipment at Government expense. When traveling under orders, aviation cadets shall be entitled to receive transportation and other necessary expenses incident to such travel, or cash in lieu thereof, on the same basis and at the same rates as are now or may hereafter be prescribed for enlisted personnel of the Army."

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1941 (55 STAT. 394)

SEC. 531. The act of June 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 394; 10 U. S. C. 656, 939, 982a), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting therefrom sections 1, 2, and 3.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

SEC. 532. (a) Section 71 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 4b), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "and, in addition thereto, shall include any officer of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or of the District of Columbia who has been temporarily extended Federal recognition by the Secretary of the Army under such regulations as he may prescribe, and who shall have successfully passed the examination prescribed in section 75 of the National Defense Act, as amended, pending final determination of his eligibility for, and his appointment as, an officer of the National Guard of the United States in the grade concerned, and if and when so appointed the appointment shall be dated and shall be deemed to have been effective from the date of such recognition, however, such temporary extension of Federal recognition shall be granted only when such officer takes oath that during such recognition he will perform all Federal duties and obligations required of him the same as though he were appointed as an officer of the National Guard of the United States in such grade, and such temporary recognition may be withdrawn at any time and if not sooner withdrawn or replaced by permanent recognition as an officer of the National Guard of the United States in such grade it shall automatically terminate 6 months after its effective date."

(b) The foregoing amendment in subsection (a) of this section and section 1 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall apply to the Department of the Air Force and to the Regular and Reserve components of the Air Force in the same manner that it would so apply had it been enacted prior to the enactment of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress, approved July 26, 1947).

ACTS AND PARTS OF ACTS REPEALED

SEC. 533. (a) All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed on the date such provisions of this act become effective, and the provisions of this act shall be in effect in lieu thereof, and such repeal shall include, but shall not be limited to, the acts and parts of acts repealed in subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

(b) The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

- (1) Section 1245 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 931).
- (2) Section 1251 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 933).
- (3) Section 1252 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 934).
- (4) Section 1253 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 966).
- (5) That part of section 1261 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 692) which provides additional pay for aids to brigadier generals and major generals.

(6) Section 1454 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 418), as amended.

(7) Section 1588 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 991) as amended.

(8) Section 1612 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 971).

(9) Section 1613 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 972).

(10) The third proviso of section 3 of the act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 562; 10 U. S. C. 932).

(11) Section 6 of the act of April 12, 1902 (32 Stat. 101; 14 U. S. C. 169), as amended.

(12) That part of paragraph 3, heading "Marine Corps," of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1200; 34 U. S. C. 973) which provides additional pay for privates of the Marine Corps regularly detailed and serving as cooks.

(13) That part of paragraph 3, heading "Pay of enlisted men," of the act of May 11, 1908 (35 Stat. 108; 10 U. S. C. 803), as amended, which authorizes additional pay to an officer of the Army below the grade of major required to be mounted who provides himself with suitable mounts at his own expense.

(14) That part of paragraph 2, heading "Pay of the Navy," of the act of May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 128; 34 U. S. C. 867), which provides additional pay for aides to rear admirals of the Navy.

(15) That part of paragraph 14, heading "Miscellaneous," of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 575; 10 U. S. C. 644), which authorizes additional pay for enlisted men of the Army detailed to serve as stenographic reporters.

(16) That part of section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1063; 10 U. S. C. 750a), as amended, which relates to expenses of officers abroad as observers of foreign armies at war.

(17) That part of section 127a of the act of June 3, 1916, as added by section 51 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 785; 10 U. S. C. 301), which relates to additional pay for military aviators and junior military aviators.

(18) That part of section 127a of the act of June 3, 1916, as added by section 51 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 785, 37 U. S. C. 4b), which provides for longevity pay for service in the Regular, provisional, or temporary forces.

(19) That part of section 1 of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 629; 10 U. S. C. 935), as amended, which reads as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Army shall make a list of all officers of the Army who have been placed on the retired list for disability and shall cause such officers to be examined at intervals as may be advisable, and such officers as shall be found to have recovered from such disabilities or to be able to perform service of value to the Government sufficient to warrant such action shall be assigned to such duty as the Secretary of the Army may approve."

(20) Paragraph 4, heading "Medals of Honor, Distinguished Service Crosses, and Distinguished Service Medals," of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 871; 10 U. S. C. 696).

(21) That part of subchapter IX of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 882, 10 U. S. C. 276), which relates to pay and allowances of warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service.

(22) Section 4 of the act of February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056) as renumbered section 6 and amended by section 1 of the act of August 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 744; 34 U. S. C. 357).

(23) Section 13 of the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 789; 10 U. S. C. 1430; 34 U. S. C. 364b).

(24) The act of April 9, 1928 (ch. 327, 45 Stat. 412; 34 U. S. C. 886), as amended.

(25) Section 10 of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 307; 37 U. S. C. 29a).

(26) The act of August 25, 1937 (ch. 769, 50 Stat. 805; 10 U. S. C. 699).

(27) That part of the act of October 15, 1940 (ch. 885, 54 Stat. 1177; 10 U. S. C. 276, 277), which relates to pay and allowances of warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service.

(28) That part of section 6 of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350e), as amended, which relates to pay and allowances, and section 8 of such act (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350g), as amended.

(29) Section 2 of the act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 629; 37 U. S. C. 16a), as amended.

(30) That part of section 1 of the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 651; 10 U. S. C. 593a), relating to base pay and allowances for warrant officers in the Army of the United States which precedes the proviso, and also all of said section 1 following the colon preceding the proviso.

(31) Section 7 of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 8; 33 U. S. C. 864d), as amended.

(32) So much of the second proviso of section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 7; 33 U. S. C. 854a), as relates to pay, longevity pay, allowances, and retirement.

(33) Section 1 of the act of May 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 266; 37 U. S. C. 18a).

(34) The act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 359), as amended, except section 12 of such act, as amended, except that part of paragraph 1 of section 10 of such act, as amended, which relates to enlisted personnel in a travel status, and except paragraph 4 of section 15 of such act, as amended.

(35) The act of April 10, 1943 (ch. 47, 57 Stat. 62; 37 U. S. C. 118b), as amended.

(36) The act of June 30, 1944 (ch. 335, 58 Stat. 648; 10 U. S. C. 1430a), as amended.

(37) The act of July 6, 1945 (ch. 279, 59 Stat. 462; 10 U. S. C. 1430b), as amended.

(38) Section 5 of the act of June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 345; 37 U. S. C. 101a).

(39) The act of March 6, 1946 (ch. 49, 60 Stat. 32; 37 U. S. C. 103b), as amended.

(40) Section 14 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 854; 34 U. S. C. 889).

(41) Sections 14, 15, and 16 (b) of the act of June 3, 1948 (ch. 390, 62 Stat. 299, 300).

(c) The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(1) That part of section 1 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 286; 34 U. S. C. 892), which relates to officers of the Navy traveling abroad under orders.

(2) That part of section 1 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 456; 10 U. S. C. 747), which relates to computation of mileage and necessity for travel by officers of the Army.

(3) Paragraph 21, heading "Miscellaneous," of the act of June 12, 1906 (34 Stat. 246; 10 U. S. C. 743, 748, 870), as amended.

(4) That part of paragraph 6, heading "Marine Corps," of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 774; 34 U. S. C. 977), which provides for settlement of traveling expense claims.

(5) That part of the act of March 23, 1910 (36 Stat. 255; 10 U. S. C. 821), under the heading "Quartermaster's Department", sub-heading "Transportation of the Army and its supplies", which relates to reimbursement of the Government for excess baggage carried.

(6) Section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 217; 10 U. S. C. 752; 14 U. S. C. 138; 34 U. S. C. 895), as amended.

(7) That part of section 1 of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 633; 10 U. S. C. 823), as amended, which relates to transportation of baggage of enlisted men discharged for disability in line of duty.

(8) That part of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 860; 10 U. S. C. 754), as amended, which relates to travel expenses of enlisted men incident to entry on or relief from active duty.

(9) The act of September 29, 1919 (ch. 65, 41 Stat. 288; 10 U. S. C. 753).

(10) The first paragraph of section 5 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1190; 10 U. S. C. 306; 34 U. S. C. 893), as amended.

(11) Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 4 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 315; 50 App. U. S. C. 764 (a), (b), (c), and (d)), as amended.

(12) That part of paragraph 1 of section 10 of the act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), as amended, which relates to enlisted personnel in a travel status, and section 12 of such act (56 Stat. 364; 37 U. S. C. 112), as amended.

(13) The act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786; 50 App. U. S. C. 831, 832, and 833), as amended.

(14) The act of October 29, 1942 (ch. 631, 56 Stat. 1011; 34 U. S. C. 899).

(15) So much of section 1 of the acts of June 26, 1943 (ch. 147, 57 Stat. 204), June 22, 1944 (ch. 269, 58 Stat. 309), May 29, 1945 (ch. 130, 59 Stat. 209), and section 101 of the act of July 8, 1946 (ch. 543, 60 Stat. 488; 37 U. S. C. 112b), as relates to per diem allowances for naval officers traveling between places in the same vicinity, naval personnel on special duty in foreign countries and naval personnel of the Naval Air Transport Service.

(16) The act of November 28, 1943 (ch. 330, 57 Stat. 593; 50 App. U. S. C. 833 a, b, c, d, e, and f), as amended.

(17) Section 1 of the act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 392; 37 U. S. C. 117b).

(18) Section 6 of the act of October 6, 1945 (ch. 393, 59 Stat. 539; 10 U. S. C. 751a; 34 U. S. C. 895a), as amended.

(19) The act of April 27, 1946 (60 Stat. 126, 127; 37 U. S. C. 112d-112i), as amended.

(20) The act of March 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 23; 10 U. S. C. 760).

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 534. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 535. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this act shall become effective on October 1, 1949, and no pay, allowances, or benefits provided herein shall accrue to any person for any period prior thereto.

(b) Section 511 of this act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Subsection (c) of section 533 of this act shall become effective on January 1, 1950.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining portion of the bill that has not been read be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has generally agreed not to move to close debate on us. If he follows that course and gives us ample time to debate the provisions of the bill I will not object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I would not deny any Member full opportunity, or the committee full opportunity, to discuss any amendment. We have ample time to discuss every amendment. All we are doing is saving the reading of about 106 pages. We will gain a little time, but the Members will have ample opportunity to offer amendments and have them considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, to be printed in the Rec-

ORD at this point and open to amendment.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining committee amendments, which are all technical and clarifying, be considered en bloc and agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I assume these are the committee amendments which are listed on pages 1, 2, and 3 of the report.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the remaining committee amendments be considered en bloc.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 21, strike out the word "when" and insert in lieu thereof the word "where."

Page 30, line 15, strike out the word "grades" and insert in lieu thereof the words "ranks, grades."

Page 33, line 3, insert the word "are" immediately after the word "as."

Page 37, line 1, (a) strike out the period after the word "section" and insert a comma in lieu thereof; (b) strike out the words "In lieu of any such retirement, such member" and insert in lieu thereof the word "but."

Page 37, line 6, insert the word "a" immediately after the word "that."

Page 38, lines 10 and 11, (a) strike out the period after the word "section" and insert a comma in lieu thereof; (b) strike out the words "In lieu of any such retirement, such member" and insert in lieu thereof the word "but."

Page 38, line 16, strike out the word "haven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "have."

Page 38, lines 21 and 22, (a) strike out the period after the word "section" and insert a comma in lieu thereof; (b) strike out the words "In lieu of any such retirement, such member" and insert in lieu thereof the word "but."

Page 40, lines 2 and 3, (a) strike out the period after the word "section" and insert a comma in lieu thereof; (b) strike out the words "In lieu of any such retirement, such member" and insert in lieu thereof the word "but."

Page 42, line 20, strike out the word "factors" and insert in lieu thereof the word "multipliers."

Page 42, line 21, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Page 44, line 11, strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon separation shall be entitled to."

Page 46, line 9, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", as amended."

Page 52, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "grade or rating" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or grade."

Page 53, line 3, strike out the words "grade, or rating" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or grade."

Page 54, line 25, insert a comma immediately after the word "Corps."

Page 57, line 2, strike out the word "and."

Page 57, line 3, insert after the word "services" the words ", other than commissioned officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service."

Page 57, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "; and (3) for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, heretofore retired for physical disability or hereafter retired or separated for physical disability pursuant to this

act, in addition to the service creditable as active service under (1) above, their service, other than commissioner service, with the Public Health Service."

Page 64, line 7, strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

Page 69, line 3, strike out the word "equivalent" and insert in lieu thereof the word "equivalent."

Page 85, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "of the fourth (seven or more years' service), fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grades" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in pay grade E-4 (seven or more years' service), E-5, E-6, or E-7."

Page 85, lines 18 and 19, strike out the words "of the fourth (seven or more years' service), fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grade" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in pay grade E-4 (seven or more years' service), E-5, E-6, or E-7."

Page 86, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "of the fourth (seven or more years' service), fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grade" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in pay grade E-4 (seven or more years' service), E-5, E-6, or E-7."

Page 88, line 23, insert the words "to read" after the words "further amended."

Page 92, line 21, strike out the word "aides" and insert in lieu thereof the word "aids."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARROLL: On page 69, line 2, after the word "enacted", strike out the balance of line 2 and everything down to and including line 20 and insert in lieu thereof: "Provided, That notwithstanding the foregoing, the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, shall remain in effect for the dependent or dependents of an enlisted man until the expiration of the enlistment or reenlistment period for which he has contracted prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or of an enlisted person inducted into any of the uniformed services prior to the date of the enactment of this act until the expiration of his compulsory period of active service."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one that I have discussed generally several times during the debate. I think it is a very important amendment, and I wish to ask a few questions of the committee in order that we can explain the purport of the amendment as we go along.

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

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This amendment provides for the carrying out of the Government's obligation under the contract during the enlistment for which a soldier is enlisted?

Mr. CARROLL. That is exactly right. I am going to explain that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It does not affect the case of reenlistment after this enlistment runs out.

Mr. CARROLL. That is exactly right.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Also those who happen to be serving by reason of the draft.

Mr. CARROLL. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a very simple one and I think most equitable. When this measure was presented before the Armed Services Committee, it will be found by reference to page 1384

of the hearings, under section 615, this very provision was in the bill. What has happened? Evidently as committee members went along they found that they could get rid of some of the people whom the recruiting officers had permitted to come into the service. The gentleman from Texas has said some of these men have families of 13 and 14 children. Whose fault is it that they got into the Army in the first place? It is the fault of the recruiting officers that they permitted those people to come into the Army. As I stated, the purpose of my amendment is a very equitable one.

What right do we have to accept the enlistment of men into the armed services, then after we have induced them to come in, after we have given them a family allowance and other inducements to enter the service, we pass a bill which abrogates a contract and we say to them: "You can be discharged."

What type of civilian economy are these people going to enter? Unemployment is growing steadily. What about these men who have 5 or 6 children? Where are they going to get a job? I do not think that it is fair to change the rules in the middle of the game.

I want to put at this point a few questions. Let us assume, for example, that in enlisted grade 7 a recruit living on the post has a wife. Under present law his base pay is \$75; is that right?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. You deduct \$22 from that pay which makes it \$53, but under the present law you have an allowance to the wife of \$50, so that makes his total pay \$103.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Under this bill the base pay for that recruit is \$75. There is a \$28 loss under the bill we have under consideration at this time.

Let us take the situation of an enlisted man, grade 7, living on a post and having a wife and child. Under present law his salary is \$133. When we pass this bill, what is his base pay? \$75.

It is well for you to keep that in mind. You are cutting that particular individual some \$53 or \$54.

Let us consider the case of an enlisted man who has two children. You reduce his pay from \$153 to \$75 under the bill now being considered.

Let us continue with grade 7. We are still dealing with the lowest man, the recruit. Under present law, with a dependency allowance for a wife, plus subsistence, the pay is \$134.50. Under the present bill it is \$106.50.

I think all of these matters should be properly considered. I am much impressed with the argument that you are giving all of the increases to the brass. I think we better consider what we are doing to those down below.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, let us go to grade 6. Under grade 6, as I under-

stand it, the man is no longer a recruit. His base pay under present law is \$80 a month. This is for a man living on an Army post and who has a wife but no children. He gets \$108 a month under present law. What does he get under the present bill? He gets \$82.50. That is a substantial cut to a low group in the Army and it is to be considered in light of the substantial increase that you are giving to a high group in the Army. I wonder how we are going to justify these things when we pass this bill, when the real cut becomes readily discernible as affecting only those in the enlisted ranks.

Let us talk about a man in grade 6, living on a post and married, with 10 years of service. Under existing law he gets \$120 a month. Under the present bill he also gets \$120 a month.

Is that not right, may I ask the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to have to discuss it in detail later, because there are certain things that the gentleman is confused about.

Mr. CARROLL. I want the gentleman to stop me. Have I confused the issue anywhere with reference to the enlisted men in grade 7?

Mr. KILDAY. The thing where the gentleman is confused is that the tables which appear in the report indicate that persons under the first three grades draw subsistence and quarters allowance on the basis of dependents. That is not correct. Only the first three grades at this time draw subsistence and quarters allowance. If the recruit is not provided with barracks and a mess, he gets an allowance for himself, but that is not on the basis of dependents. Only a master sergeant, the technical sergeant, and another one are now drawing subsistence and quarters, but it is not proper to figure in those allowances now, because you do not have recruits with wives and children living on the post. There have not been any taken in since last September. If they did have wives and children they could not live on the post.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the point. You do not bring these grades in unless they are on special duty and have the consent of the commanding officer.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. Actually, while I have been directing my remarks to the effect of the proposed bill upon enlisted men with dependents, the real gist of this amendment is simple. We are now saying, if we adopt this amendment, that whenever the Government enters into a contract with an enlisted man, whenever the Government of the United States offers an inducement to the enlisted man, then the Government must fulfill that contract. We should not dump these men out into a declining economy. The only effect of this amendment would be to protect them during the remaining portion of their present enlistment. As a matter of fact, the committee itself recognized the equity of this situation, since the bill provides that those who enlisted prior to 1946 shall be entitled to dependency allowances. It is only those men who have come in after 1946 that the committee would penalize. I say this treatment is unfair; it is inequitable and should not be permitted.

As a matter of fact, this amendment is not original with me. I have taken this amendment from the original bill which came before the Committee on Armed Services, and I sincerely hope that as a matter of fairness, of fair dealing with these family groups, that we ought to give them this sort of continued protection.

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

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has covered the situation that I was going to emphasize. But, I wonder if the gentleman from Texas will admit that this bill would reduce the pay of family men after they have entered the Army under a contract with the Government.

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to have to answer the gentleman in my own time, because he referred to contracts and things of that kind. I am going to have to answer him in my own time rather than answer some individual question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. When a man enlists for a certain pay in the Army, does the gentleman not think that is a contract between him and the Government?

Mr. CARROLL. Unquestionably—as a matter of fact the Committee on Armed Services recognizes that such a contractual relationship exists for in this bill there is frequent reference to contract of enlistment.

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

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman, can an enlisted man get the pay increases or the pay schedules provided in this legislation plus the family allowances?

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand, under this amendment as it was drawn, the increases apply to those men who are now serving out their present term of enlistment. If we change the provision of the pending bill we merely put all enlisted personnel in the same category.

Mr. TOWE. Under the gentleman's amendment you also retain the family allowances plus the pay schedules in the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. My amendment would place the man who enlisted since 1946 in the same category as all other people who came in prior to 1946. If they are entitled to family allowances, so ought the men who have entered the Army since 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two additional minutes to answer these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. My question is this: The gentleman has offered an amendment which retains family allowance in some respects. I should like to know whether or not if the amendment is agreed to all family allowances which come under

the terms of the gentleman's amendment would be retained, and would the men still get the pay schedule set forth in this proposed legislation?

Mr. CARROLL. I thought I had answered that question, but I will answer it again by asking the gentleman from Massachusetts, who asked for an extension of time for me, what is the category of the enlisted men who enlisted prior to 1946? What position are they in under this bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They may stay in the service until the time their enlistment expires, or ask for release.

Mr. CARROLL. Under the provisions of the act of 1942—

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. 1946.

Mr. CARROLL. I am talking about the act of 1942, which gave certain allowances.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is the family allowance.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. The men that came in prior to 1946 are entitled to those allowances.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The question the gentleman from New Jersey asked is whether or not the gentleman's amendment permitting the continuation of family allowances will also permit a man to draw the 30-percent increase in pay provided in this bill. The gentleman has not answered that question.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand the provisions of the act of 1942, that act provided for certain family allowances. Is that not so?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Those men who enlisted prior to 1946, as provided by the terms of the pending bill, are covered by the terms of the 1942 act. Is that not so?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. All I am saying, to answer this question, is that I want the men who enlisted after 1946 and entered their contract of enlistment then to be covered by the terms of the same law as those men who enlisted prior to 1946.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Then the question also is whether or not the gentleman wants those same men to continue receiving family allowances and also the 30-percent pay increase provided in this bill. The gentleman has not answered that question.

Mr. CARROLL. My answer is, if the men who entered the service before 1946 receive it, these men ought to receive it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We are trying to adjust this whole pay schedule so they will all be taken care of.

Mr. CARROLL. I think I have answered the question.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be a very fair, a very important, and a very necessary amendment to this bill. The bill appears to me to be, generally speaking, a good bill, and we ought to pass it, I think.

I served as a private and a corporal and a sergeant in World War I, but I certainly have no prejudice whatsoever against the so-called brass. We need those leaders and we need them badly

in the armed forces the same as we need leadership in civilian life, and I shall vote to increase their pay in this bill. I have no prejudice against them. I want to be fair with all our leaders. Most certainly if we are fair with them we ought to also be fair with the humble people, we ought to be fair with those in the very lowest ranks, we ought to be fair with everybody.

This idea of being prejudiced against some class is not right. We ought to get that out of our minds and our hearts, if we have any such prejudices. Let us not be prejudiced. Let us treat all our classes with fairness.

How can we treat these in the lower echelons, the lower income brackets, with fairness if we violate a contract we have with them? As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] suggested in his question a while ago, there was actually a contract, at least an implied contract, with these people who went into the Army that they would receive those family allowances during their enlistment and during the time for which they were called into the service.

I just believe that Uncle Sam ought to be the last entity in this world to violate a contract either actual or implied, or even to violate a moral obligation.

I do not think that we, as individuals, have the right to violate moral obligations. I think our Nation least of all entities in all of this world ought to ever violate a moral obligation. Without this amendment I rather think we are going a long way here, my friends, toward what I would term the violation, at least, of an implied contract and certainly of a moral agreement with these people who have gone into the service. I have voted against every amendment so far except the one which sought to raise the pay of the low-pay \$75 men. I voted for that and I voted against these others. I do believe that this is a good amendment and that we ought to support it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, for the greater portion of 3 days I have been in this House listening to gentlemen stand in the well of the House and beat their breasts and tear their hair because men who were receiving \$600, \$700, \$800, \$900, of \$1,000 a month were being mistreated and were not getting enough money. Well, perhaps they are not getting enough money. I do not care if we give them more money as far as that is concerned, but I have come to the well of the House today to talk about the man who is receiving \$100 or \$120 or even \$80 a month. If my colleagues have not already guessed it, I am going to let them in on a little secret today. Just rather frankly, sympathies are with the underdog. They go about 100 percent to the little fellow who always seems some way or another to get lost in the shuffle, and

who does not seem to have but few friends.

You know a little way north of St. Louis the Missouri River comes into the Mississippi, and it extends northwest clear into the top of the Rocky Mountains. That river valley constitutes an agricultural empire. I got a book the other day from the Department of Agriculture. That book says that that great valley, with all the lands and all the buildings and all the cattle and all the hogs and all the sheep and all the poultry is worth 9.1 billion dollars. I remained on the floor of the House hour after hour after hour to vote against every amendment that would cut the appropriation for the military. I voted for the appropriation in the final roll call. That appropriation was for almost 16 billion dollars, yet the whole Missouri River Valley is only 9.1 billion dollars. Now they come here and tell me that the Army is so poor, and Uncle Sam is so poor, that we can no longer afford to help an enlisted man feed his children.

If that is the God Almighty's truth, there are a lot of bills here that need cutting. There is no question about that. This House seems to be trying to fulfill prophecy. I do not know whether it is our prerogative to do that or not. I do not know whether we could avoid doing it or not if we tried. The Book says, "Unto him that hath it shall be given, that he may have in abundance; and from him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath." That is exactly what this bill seeks to do.

Now, I am not objecting to giving to the man that has, but I do not want to take away from the man that has not in order to do it, because we are not yet poor enough to have to do that. Uncle Sam, even with all this Democratic depression we have had for the last 16 years, has not sunk to the place where we have to violate a contract that Uncle Sam made with his enlisted men. I would rather be stripped, tarred, feathered, and hauled out of this town on a rail than to stand up here on the floor of this House and vote to take away the allowance of the family man in the Army. I know that science has proven that a healthy man and woman can live together and not produce a family. I know that. But the fact remains that there is just one place in this United States where the Army can find a soldier; there is just one place where the Navy can find a sailor; there is just one place where the Air Force can find a pilot; there is just one place where the Marines can go to get a "leatherneck." That is by dipping into the family of men and women who are willing to shoulder the responsibility and deny themselves of the pleasures of life that are necessary to produce a family in the United States. I would say about that man who had 10 or 11 children that I have heard so much about on this floor 5 or 6 times, it is not going to be very long until there are going to be some soldiers in that family. This United States is going to be owned, it is going to be populated, this House is going to be filled in 10 years, 20 years, 40 years, and 60 years from now by the sons and daughters of men and women who are willing to observe the

law of God; who refuse to sidestep the laws of nature, and who are willing to raise a family. If we destroy this family allowance, I turn to my colleagues on the right, and say to you, "If you do it, shame." I turn to the left and I say to you, "If you do it, shame." I turn to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, and I say again, "Shame."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CARROLL: On page 69, strike out lines 6 to 20 and insert: "Contracted by any enlisted person who is a member of the uniformed services prior to June 1, 1949, unless such person waives the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, the form and place of filing of such waiver to be substantially in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the one that I mentioned last week that I intended to offer at this time. In substance it is much the same as the one offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and a great part of the argument will be the same as the argument for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado and also the argument which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has just made.

I wish to explain what I have tried to do in this substitute. I realize that the Armed Services Committee is going to say that in many cases the men in the armed forces, even if they have children, are going to get more money under this new bill than they did under the family allowance system. That is why in this substitute I have included a provision which leaves it to the enlisted man or officer himself to choose which system he wishes to come under. If he decides he can get more money by coming under the provisions of this bill, he is allowed to file a waiver and come under it. On the other hand, if he wants to stay under the family allowance plan, he has that privilege. He makes a choice between the two.

The other day I told about the scandal of some high-ranking officers who had been retired for physical disability making a great deal of money in commercial life. I asked this question: Why cannot the committee do something about those officers who are making sometimes \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year while still drawing disability pay? The answer was that you could not do that because there was a legal contract with the officers. That may or may not be true; I am not prepared to argue that at this moment; but I do say, in line with what other Members have said, that there is just as much a contract of moral force with the men in the service who stayed in that service under the assumption that they were going to receive certain benefits. I know that many, many men shipped over or enlisted again because of what they were told; and they were told that they would

have these benefits. Now this Congress says we do not have to pay too much attention to that. I am not going to try to add to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] said, because I think he hit the nail right on the head in certain respects; but I do say that, assuming we cannot do anything about the scandalous injustice of retired officers drawing disability pay and going out and making ten or fifteen thousand a year, if we cannot do anything about that because of a legal contract, I say we can protect the moral contract this Government has with those enlisted men and officers still serving. As I pointed out the other day, when you get into the courts of law you have to pay attention to these legal things, but here in this body we have some obligation that is of a moral nature that should cause us to sustain the morally binding effect of the contracts—I call them contracts—that were made with the men in the service. Those contracts should be allowed to continue; we should not simply say to them that we are going to change the rules right in the middle of the game; that is neither fair nor just. If we accepted their enlistment under the family allowance plan and they want to continue it, they should be allowed to continue it. We have a moral responsibility to those men, and we should fulfill it, because we gave them to understand that that was one of the conditions of their enlistment.

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. So we may understand the gentleman's substitute, will the gentleman explain it very briefly? I do not understand what its effect will be.

Mr. FURCOLO. The substitute attempts to say that as far as those men are concerned who are in the service at the present time who came in under the Family Allowance Act, that if they want to stay under that act they may, or if they want to come under the provisions of this bill, they may. It gives them a choice to take that which they feel is most beneficial, but principally it carries out our obligation to them under the Family Allowance Act if they want to continue under it. If they do not want the family allowance provisions but prefer to come under the terms of the bill, they file a waiver and say they want to come under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, the gentleman's substitute is designed to give the greatest benefit under either the act of 1942 or the provision of this bill.

Mr. FURCOLO. The very same thing, in effect, as the gentleman from Colorado wants to do, plus the fact that they may waive the provisions of the Family Allowance Act if they want to come under the terms of this bill, which your amendment does not cover.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What does the gentleman's amendment do as far as reenlistments are concerned?

Mr. FURCOLO. My amendment is simply designed to take care of those

men who presently find themselves in the service at the time this bill goes into effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the full force of this argument about fulfilling a contract and in my remarks the other day I called attention to that matter. At the same time, I have been consistently trying to present to the Committee in its consideration of this bill the dollars which are involved.

I have before me a chart which was prepared by the Office of the Budget, Secretary of Defense, on the 29th of April 1949 which gives the estimated cost of dependents' allowances. This gives the figures for the 1950 budget, the effect of the proposed bill for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and all. I will just give the total figure because that is enough for the present.

At the present time the 1950 budget calls for \$314,000,000 for dependents' allowances. Under the proposed bill it would drop to \$123,000,000. In other words, to maintain the dependency allowances on the scale that they are in the 1950 budget and keep in the pay-increases and quarters benefits for the same people would require an additional \$191,000,000 on an annual basis.

As I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], his amendment would not maintain dependency allowances after June 1, 1949, for new recruits, but what I point out would be the situation if an amendment were adopted that would maintain the dependency allowances in peacetime on the scale that was established in wartime when we were drafting boys and men and saying: "You have got to come into the service." We knew it was not fair at that time to say, "You have got to come into the Army and leave your family behind." So we provided for families and that was the justification for the wartime dependency allowance.

If we should adopt the amendment which would establish that for all peacetime recruitment, and keep the quarters allowances and pay increases it would cost \$191,000,000 more than is proposed by this committee bill. Let us be careful and know just what we are doing. The committee bill itself is going to cost \$406,000,000 more each year if the armed services are maintained as at present at the existing size. If you maintain the dependency allowances on that same scale you will add to the bill another \$191,000,000, which will bring the cost of the bill up to \$600,000,000.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. When we passed the family allowance or dependency allowance bill it was expressly provided that it would terminate 6 months after the war was over. The Congress contemplated that only as a temporary war measure and this is a good chance to change it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. I do not want to break a contract

with any of the boys now in the service, but I hope as we pick between the amendments we will keep clearly in mind that we do not want to establish dependency allowances on a peacetime basis for new enlistments plus the other benefits in this bill unless we are prepared to add about \$200,000,000 more to the cost of this bill every year.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I agree with the gentleman and I agree with the policy set by the committee that we should terminate this family and dependency allowance as soon as possible. The point of my amendment is that these men have enlisted or reenlisted and, therefore, they have had a certain inducement to come in, and out of equity we ought to permit them to conclude their enlistment term.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I hope that when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] takes the floor he will make clear what the bill does in that regard. I have never considered it was a proper thing for the Congress to take money from the dependency allowances and use that to pay for an increase to the officers. That is a position I have consistently taken throughout this debate. I do not think we are in the position of doing that now, but I want the committee to know and be sure just what it is doing.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was more than glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the gentleman from South Dakota who preceded me, because it seems as though it has become a habit whenever I am working on a bill in the House that I follow some gentleman from Missouri. Heretofore it has been the gentleman from Missouri on my left [Mr. SHORT]; now we have the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], and both generally leave the House in roars of laughter when I come up to follow them. So, I was glad to get as much space between us as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot permit the debate to terminate on this issue with statements that there is any attempt to violate a contract, either express or implied. There is no one in a position to contend or to believe that family allowance constituted any contract with him. As a matter of fact, the serviceman himself need not even apply for family allowances. Anyone can apply, the wife, or members of the family. So, it is not a part of his compensation. It is not paid to him. It is paid directly to the members of the family or to the dependent who has been recognized as such. The law is perfectly clear, as was read here today by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], that those who enlisted prior to July 1, 1946, would receive it for the term of the enlistment; that those who thereafter enlisted could look forward to it for such period as might be 6 months after the war was declared to be at an end. It is an appealing argu-

ment, I grant you, that there is the intention to violate a contract. However, I do not believe that the membership believes that the 28 members of the Committee on the Armed Services who voted for this provision were in any way contemplating the violation of a contract, either express or implied.

But, I do want you to understand what will happen if either of these amendments is adopted. Of course, the one offered by the gentleman from Colorado would produce a staggering impact on the economy and the expenditures under the bill, because not only would it continue these large payments now being made on the basis of the number of mothers-in-law and fathers-in-law, and brothers and sisters, and all those collateral relatives, but it would grant in addition the pay increases contemplated under this bill.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I recognize that it would have some impact and I recognize that the members of the Committee on the Armed Services worked very hard on this bill. But, the fact remains that the committee itself has set the standard, and the standard it set in this bill is that any enlistment contract prior to July 1, 1946, shall not be applicable under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. We did not put that in this bill. We copied that from Public Law 625 of the Seventy-seventh Congress in which the man had the absolute contract by his enlistment that the family allowances would be continued for the period of that enlistment, provided he enlisted before July 1, 1946. We realize that was a contract, and we recognized it as such. In the provision now in the bill the only contract that any man could have is recognized, and all of the talk that we have heard here and the implication that officers have contracts and enlisted men do not, stands on poor ground. I was a little surprised that the gentleman made that argument. I thought it was unworthy of him.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman admits in this bill that there is a contract of enlistment.

Mr. KILDAY. No, we do not.

Mr. CARROLL. I say that you had a contract after 1946, and you ought to give credit to that contract.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman and I have argued about this ever since the beginning of this debate, and we cannot convince one another. This other amendment is better than the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, because under his amendment, you see, a man cannot at the present time, nor under his amendment, draw both quarters allowances and family allowances. There would be the choice to be made. But over and above everything else, it is a bill set up on a career basis, with compensation for service and responsibility within the framework of the economy in which we can sustain it. That is the important thing.

The analysis the gentleman from Colorado gave about certain pay categories,

suffering those losses, is not the correct result of this bill, because only your first three grades draw quarters allowances at this time, and under this bill, the fourth grade is going to get it. You just cannot put the figures together that you find in that report and bring out an exact result. What I have told you from the beginning is correct, the man with four or less dependents gets more money under this bill than he does with a family allowance, unless he is one of the three bottom grades.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to follow all the debate in the 3 days this bill has been under consideration. I am frank to say that one of the things which troubles me very deeply is the very situation we have before us. I have extreme affection for practically every member of the Committee on Armed Services, but one of the things which compels me to be against this bill is the mental operations we seem to go through in connection with the consideration and treatment we are according enlisted men.

I am not one of those who criticize the brass. I know there are good and there are bad officers. Many generals are underpaid and some of them are overpaid. But unless we are going to have a "Mexican army," and by that I mean one composed entirely of generals and colonels, we had better approach the problem of our enlisted men on a fair basis.

You are giving the enlisted man a pitance and removing the family allowance. I confess that we cannot proceed in the matter of family allowances for enlisted men as we did on the war basis, when we were drafting men, but I say that you are saying in effect what is immoral, you are saying to the enlisted man who has a wife and a family, "Get out of the Army." You are saying to the other enlisted men, "Do not get married and do not have children, because they are not going to get humane or decent consideration from the Congress of the United States."

I say that is wrong. I am just as concerned about the enlisted men having decent pay and decent living conditions as I am about the officers having decent pay and living conditions. From my own experience, which goes back a long time, to World War I, I know that the men who are commissioned but who get the least consideration yet are the most valuable are the junior officers. However, I am not more concerned about them than I am about the enlisted men. But I say to you, if this bill passes in the form it is in now, and the word gets down very quickly to the enlisted men that the bill the committee has reported out represents the consideration we are giving to our fine enlisted men who are married and who have children, and who are not living under very happy circumstances in the quarters that are provided for them, we will be doing an injustice to the solidarity of the armed services of the United States and doing a serious injustice by saying to them, I repeat, "If you are married and have children, get out. If you expect to stay in the Army,

either do not get married or do not have children." In my judgment, that is exactly what is said in this bill, and I think it is unfair. I think it is immoral of us to take that viewpoint, and as one Member of Congress I do not intend to go along with it.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. In reply to your observations on marriage and children, I refer you to the testimony given by Father Cavanaugh, president of the University of Notre Dame, in which he stated that such was definitely not the result of the bill, but that the bill was designed to and would promote not only marriages, but good marriages.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say, as the only alumnus in the House of Representatives from the University of Notre Dame that if that is Father Cavanaugh's observation, I should like to take him out and show him some of the places where enlisted men live and where their families live and have him, after that, say to me that that is his observation, if you are correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I congratulate my colleague upon the splendid address that he has made to the House. I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FURCOLO) there were—ayes 51, noes 58.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 90, noes 69.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Are there any further amendments at the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 34, line 11, strike out section 304.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to point out to this Committee another reason why this bill should be recommitted.

Section 304 is a personal money allowance on top of salaries, on top of special privileges. It offers to an officer of the grade of lieutenant-general a personal

money allowance of \$500 per year. It offers to an officer with the grade of general, admiral, or equivalent grade or rank, a personal money allowance of \$2,200 a year on top of his salary. It offers to an officer with the rank of Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff, naval operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, commandant of the Marine Corps, and commandant of the Coast Guard a personal money allowance of \$4,000 on top of his salary.

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

Mr. SUTTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman forgot to state that the personal money allowance to a five-star general is \$5,000, just to keep the record straight.

Mr. SUTTON. That is fine. I appreciate the chairman helping me. But this is just to point out what I have been saying since last Friday, that it is not an equitable pay bill. I am for a pay bill. I have said that ever since last Friday. I am for a raise for the armed services, but I am for a raise where it should be. Your enlisted men and your junior officers are the boys who need it most. In addition to that, a pay raise for the others, commensurate with what they need. However, I still maintain that the generals and admirals, with due respect to them, are not just getting \$8,800. In addition to what I pointed out, a private chauffeur and an automobile and servants—I used to be chauffeur for a captain in the Navy, so I know they have them, too. On top of the PX and on top of the private plane that they have at their disposal to go on trips; on top of all those things that I have enumerated there is another thing that they cover up and hide. Maybe I should not mention it on the floor because somebody will want it investigated. Sometimes I think it should be investigated. That is what we call the contingency fund. I have specific examples where officers of the Army—and I can call names—have sent flowers to girl friends, charged to the contingency fund of the Army. That is on top of this \$500 for a lieutenant general and \$2,000 for generals and admirals and \$4,000 for the chiefs of staff and \$5,000 for the five-star generals, as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee pointed out.

I maintain that this bill should go back to the committee so that the committee can work out an equitable pay raise, where we can give the enlisted men and junior officers what they need, and cut down what we have in this bill for the top officers.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. If the Committee adopted the gentleman's views and re-committed this bill, section 304 would still be the same, because it is the law today.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. It has been on the statute books for about 12 years.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman there, but I am just pointing out to the gentleman that it is erroneous

to say that the generals get only \$8,800 and do not get extra allowances or anything; I am just pointing out some of the fallacies of the bill in an effort to make a contribution.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Let me state for the benefit of the gentleman and for the information of the House that in hearings now going on before the Committee on the Civil Service it has been shown that there are 3,157 civilian employees who draw \$10,000.

Mr. SUTTON. I am glad the gentleman brought up the Committee on the Civil Service.

Mr. VINSON. There is not an Army officer or a Navy officer whose base salary is over \$8,800.

Mr. SUTTON. I am glad the gentleman brought that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. When the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done a wonderful job, was talking some time ago about the pay raises I pointed out on page 6110 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12 a little article from the Bureau of the Budget that was inserted by Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont. In every instance the comparison between the military pay and the pay of the classified civilian Government employee, in every instance with the exception of three—one of them being the major general who gets \$70 less than the classified civilian of the same status, another the corporal, who gets \$34 less than the civilian classified in the same category, and another, the private, who gets \$14 less than the civilian in the same category—other than those three, according to the Bureau of the Budget, the military personnel gets in excess of the civilian personnel.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. That statement shows, I believe, that the CAF-15 is rated with a major general.

Mr. SUTTON. Less \$70.

Mr. KILDAY. But they contend that they were of comparable rank.

Mr. SUTTON. That I believe is correct; no; it is GS-18.

Mr. VINSON. And Major General Hughes, the Chief of Ordnance, has 16 of that classification working under him.

Mr. SUTTON. Another reason why I say we are top-heavy in the upper brackets.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to the officers of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps, in all fairness to the enlisted men, in all fairness to the Members of this Congress, I think we should recommit this bill and let the Committee on the Armed Serv-

ices, a committee in which I have great interest even though I am not on it, a committee that has the respect of the country, the respect of Members of Congress, let them report a bill that will provide a pay raise equitable to all branches of the armed services from the recruit up to the five-star general and the five-star admiral. When you do that the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services will not have to make a personal appeal to get it out unanimously; he will get it out unanimously without making a personal issue of it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will recommend this bill and bring out a pay-raise measure that is fair and equitable to all members of the armed services.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is not voted on today and comes up for final action on Thursday, I will unfortunately be unable to be present for the vote.

Mr. Chairman, an enlisted man came to me yesterday, stating that he represented many enlisted men from my district. He said: "Mrs. ROGERS, will you please vote for the bill now before the Congress? It is not perfect for the enlisted men, but we feel it is much better than the present conditions that exist so far as the enlisted men are concerned. We believe if the bill is recommitted we will get no increase and no better conditions under which to work."

Then he went on to say that they did not begrudge the generals more pay. He felt that General Patton was perhaps one of the greatest generals in the world and there may be a general like him among the officers of today. There was General Eisenhower, and there was Gen. Mark Clark, and General Bradley.

He said, "We enlisted men realize the enormous responsibility of the generals and the colonels. We are unable to take over the responsibility of leadership. This must be performed by the officers. We feel they should have an increase in pay."

In addition to our great generals, we are all aware of the accomplishments of our fine admirals. The names of such great men as Halsey, Spruance, Nimitz, and others, will always be fresh in our memory. Certainly the officers as well as the enlisted men throughout our military services are deserving of adequate pay. Personally, I am very sorry that more is not done for the colonels, the majors, the captains, lieutenants, and enlisted men, but we can probably do no more at this time.

I think it would be pleasing to Mr. Forrestal, if he were alive, if the House today, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and other members of the Armed Services Committee passed legislation providing adequate increases in pay for both officers and enlisted men. The officers and men of our armed services should have sufficient pay to permit them to live comfortably and in keeping with their responsibilities. Although I do not consider this bill before the House adequate from many points of view, nevertheless I believe it is an effort in the right

direction and represents an improvement over the present pay situation. I shall therefore support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 76, line 6, strike out "three" and insert "one."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, please observe the language appearing on page 76 of the bill wherein it is stated that—

No member serving on active duty on the effective date of title II of this act shall, prior to the expiration of a period of 3 years from such effective date and while serving on continuous active duty, including for the purpose of such continuous active duty service in a reenlistment entered into within 3 months from the date of last discharge, suffer any reduction by reason of this act in the total compensation which he is entitled to receive under any provision of law in effect on the day immediately preceding such effective date.

Mr. Chairman, we have in this bill set up a new base pay schedule according to the responsibilities of the officer and enlisted man.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The committee has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: On page 24, line 14, strike out the period after the word "section" add a colon and the following: "Provided, That enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard heretofore or hereafter retired from active service with credit for 30 years' service shall, in addition to retired pay, be entitled to allowances of \$30 per month in lieu of allowances in kind heretofore authorized under provisions of the act of 1885 establishing military retirement."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I appear in behalf of the retired enlisted men. I offered a similar amendment last year, and we came within a few votes of adopting it, so I hope there has been a sufficient change of heart that this time we will do justice and accept it. I want to say that these men are the truly forgotten men. They were promised certain allowances and subsistence, and so forth, under the laws when they enlisted, and in 1942 were forgotten.

The only argument which the committee has ever advanced in opposition to granting allowances is an untenable argument.

They claim that when the Government broke its solemn unilateral contract with enlisted men and took from them their allowances, that in lieu of this, the Con-

gress granted them increases in pay to counterbalance the repealed allowances.

This argument is true for Army retired enlisted men, but absolutely not in accordance with facts, for enlisted men retired from the Navy and Marine Corps.

In the act of 1942, which took away from retired enlisted men their allowances, 7,000 retired men of the Navy and Marine Corps received no increase in pay whatsoever; 20,000 or more similar Navy men, with 20 or more years' service received an increased only of \$1.21 per month.

From the foregoing it is proof convincing that when Congress repealed the allowances which had been in effect since 1885, then did not compensate for this by giving these thousands of men increases in pay equivalent to the allowances arbitrarily then taken from them.

HISTORICAL FACTS

Following the Civil War it was difficult for the Army to obtain the necessary enlisted men to serve in the Indian campaigns of the West, primarily because of the hard service and the low pay received at that time.

Accordingly, in order to prevail upon enlisted men to remain in the service, and as an inducement to entice men to enlist, the Congress in the act of February 14, 1885 (25 Stat. 305), provided that enlisted men of the Army, after 30 years' service, would be entitled to retirement, and that upon retirement, they would be entitled to three-fourths of the pay of their active service rank, plus allowances for rations, clothing, quarters, fuel, and light.

In the act of 1916 establishing the Fleet and Marine Corps Reserve, Congress provided that where an enlisted man had a total active (and inactive) service in the Reserve of 30 years, he was to be entitled to allowances on parity with allowances paid to enlisted men of the armed services who had 30 years of active service.

Enlisted men who retired after 1885 after 30 years' service were given three-fourths of the pay of their rank, plus allowances in kind, to wit, food, clothing, and so forth. These allowances in kind continued until about 1894, when the allowances in kind were changed to cash allowances instead of in kind.

As the retired list increased, it was found inconvenient to grant allowances in kind and as a consequence the payment of cash allowances to retired enlisted men continued from 1894 to July 1, 1942, when they were arbitrarily repealed in the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942.

Up to July 1, 1942, every department of the armed services, in soliciting men to enlist and reenlist, furnished them with official publications promising them if they served to retirement that they would receive three-fourths of the pay of their rank on retirement, plus allowances. The armed services thus pledged themselves in a unilateral contract to pay three-fourths of the pay of the rank, plus allowances to all who retired after stipulated service.

We repeat: Allowances were first established in kind, then were changed

to \$6.25 per month. They were later changed to \$9.25 per month, and in the act of March 2, 1907, the allowances were increased from \$9.25 per month to \$15.75 per month, which was the amount of the allowances received by retired enlisted men when the allowances were repealed in the act of June 16, 1942.

These increases in allowances through the years were predicated upon the increased cost of living and it is on this basis that it is provided in H. R. 1150 to now pay \$30 per month allowances instead of the amount of \$15.75 which was authorized in the act of March 2, 1907.

RETIRED ENLISTED MEN ARE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

The United States Code shows that retired enlisted men, even though they occupy an inactive status, are in fact members of the armed services and are subject to the same laws and regulations as are enlisted men in active service. If physically fit they are subject to recall for active duty.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Enlisted men of the first three grades in active service are by law entitled to allowances for quarters, subsistence, clothing, and so forth. All other enlisted men are entitled to allowances of clothing, subsistence, and quarters, but in lesser amount than that paid to those of the first three grades. Retired enlisted men of all grades were promised and received allowances on the same basis as the allowances paid to the active service but these allowances were commuted at \$15.75 per month under the act of March 2, 1907, for all grades on the retired list.

From the date of the enactment of the Retirement Act of February 14, 1885, all enlisted men were granted allowances as we here show. Those in active service, some received allowances in kind and some in cash, and those on the retired list all received allowances in cash.

As this unilateral contract continued for 55 years, and as allowances were promised and pledged to those who remained to retirement, the breach of the Government's unilateral contract with all enlisted men who enlisted prior to July 1, 1942, is decidedly discriminatory against the retired enlisted men who were promised and pledged these allowances if they would serve to retirement.

OFFICERS' ALLOWANCES INCREASED, RETIRED ENLISTED MEN'S ALLOWANCES REPEALED

In the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, on the urge of the War Department, subsistence and quarters allowances to officers in the active service were increased, while the same act took from retired enlisted men entirely the allowances of \$15.75 per month which they had been receiving for 55 years under a unilateral contract which the Government consummated with them at their enlistment and reenlistment. In other words, it appeared that the officers provided for themselves in this increase in allowances for their group at the expense of the aged and disabled retired enlisted men of long service.

WHAT H. R. 1150 PROVIDES

This bill provides restoration of cash allowances to retired enlisted men to the

amount of \$30 per month in all instances where they are credited with 30 years of honorable service.

The first paragraph of this bill provides that no enlisted man shall receive retired pay in excess of the retired pay received by warrant officers, junior grade, of equal length of service.

The second paragraph of this bill provides that enlisted men of the armed services transferred to the Reserve after stipulated active service shall be entitled to these allowances of \$30 per month when their total active and inactive service totals 30 years. This provision is in accordance with the act of Congress of 1916 establishing the Fleet and Marine Corps Reserve.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON CERTAIN ALLOWANCES

Under the proposed pay increase as recommended by the Hook Commission, the first three grades enlisted men will receive allowances for subsistence and quarters of \$99 per month, with a maximum pay of \$300 per month, thus giving to such individual a total cash income of \$399 per month, plus allowances for clothing, free medical attention, and so forth. Comparatively the retired enlisted man of the first three grades on the retired list will receive as low as \$174.34 per month retired pay without any allowances for subsistence, quarters or clothing. In addition, if he requires medical attention, Army men must pay when such treatment is accorded them in Army hospitals.

From this comparison it can readily be seen that a man in active service has a cash advantage of \$174 per month over the retired enlisted man of equal grade and length of service.

HOW ENLISTED MEN SUFFER

In the last report of the Navy Department there were approximately 7,000 enlisted men on the retired list of the Navy who have either not received a single cent of increase in pay since 1922, or who, if they received an increase, received less than \$7 per month increase.

In other words, approximately 7,000 retired enlisted men of the Navy receive less than \$96.25 per month, and some as low as \$50 to \$60 per month retired pay.

RECOMMENDATION OF HOOK COMMISSION

If the recommendation of the Hook Commission pertaining to changes in pay of the enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps is adopted, thousands of those men will receive little or no increase in pay under the proposed pay increase. Inasmuch as the increase which the Hook Commission proposes will be taken from them under the same Hook report which advocates taking from these men the extra pay they now receive because of good conduct or extraordinary heroism.

Finally, the unilateral contract under which enlisted men were induced into enlisting, and reenlisting, to serve to retirement, and which covers every man who retired from the service prior to July 1, 1942, clearly provided three-fourths of the pay and allowances of their respective grades after 30 years' service.

No one can deny that Congress has the right to increase, or decrease, the pay

of the armed services; no one can deny that Congress has the right to increase, or decrease, the allowances to enlisted men of the armed services.

However, it is clearly discriminatory and unfair that Congress should single out only the retired enlisted men to take from them their allowances, while at the same time allowances were increased for enlisted men of the active service and while they were munificently increased at the same time for officers of the active service. Not only did Congress break a unilateral contract when it took from retired enlisted men their allowances, but it discriminated against one group—the aged and disabled group—who had earned their retirement, who had consummated their contract with the Government, only to find the Congress repudiating the official pledge of the armed services as it appealed to them to enlist in the yesterdays.

It is on the basis of restoring the unilateral contract rights to retired enlisted men, and to remove the discrimination on the receipt of allowances against only this group of the armed services, that the above facts are submitted to your Committee for your consideration and adjustment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the Committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been considered by the committee on several occasions. As the gentleman from North Dakota announced, it was considered last year by the House and rejected. In 1942, when the pay bill was written, instead of granting allowances as such we lumped it all into pay. It is a matter that has been advocated through the intervening years by one individual in the United States, as far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make an inquiry of the committee. On page 76, in line 6, the phrase "three years" appears. The "three" has been changed to "one" but the "years" remains unchanged.

Mr. KILDAY. We intended it to read "one year." Mr. Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent that the word "years" be stricken out and the word "year" be inserted in lieu thereof.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RABAUT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4591) to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the Na-

tional Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 223, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member desire to offer a motion to recommit without reservation? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from South Dakota is the only Member that qualifies under the circumstances.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Case of South Dakota moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services for further study.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 163, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—227

Abernethy	Chipperfield	Graham
Addonizio	Christopher	Granahan
Albert	Chudoff	Granger
Andersen,	Church	Gregory
H. Carl	Cole, Kans.	Gross
Andersen,	Colmer	Gwinn
August H.	Cotton	Hale
Andrews	Coudert	Hall,
Angell	Crawford	Leonard W.
Auchincloss	Crook	Hand
Baring	Cunningham	Harden
Barrett, Pa.	Curtis	Harrison
Barrett, Wyo.	Dague	Hart
Beall	Davis, N. Y.	Harvey
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Ga.	Hays, Ohio
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Heller
Biemiller	Delaney	Herlong
Boggs, La.	Dollinger	Herter
Bolling	Dondero	Heselton
Bolton, Md.	Donohue	Hill
Bolton, Ohio	Douglas	Hoeven
Bosone	Eaton	Hoffman, Ill.
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Hoffman, Mich.
Breen	Engel, Mich.	Hollfield
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Hope
Bryson	Feighan	Horan
Buchanan	Fellows	Howell
Buckley, Ill.	Flood	Huber
Burdick	Fogarty	Irving
Burke	Forand	Jackson, Calif.
Burleson	Frazier	Jackson, Wash.
Burnside	Furcolo	Jacobs
Byrnes, Wis.	Gamble	James
Canfield	Garmatz	Javits
Cannon	Gathings	Jenison
Carlyle	Gillette	Jenkins
Carnahan	Golden	Jensen
Carroll	Goodwin	Jonas
Case, S. Dak.	Gore	Jones, Mo.
Chelf	Gorski, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.
Chesney	Gossett	Judd

Karst	Murphy	Scrivner
Kean	Murray, Tenn.	Scudder
Keating	Murray, Wis.	Secrest
Kelley	Nelson	Sikes
Kirwan	Nicholson	Simpson, Ill.
Kruse	Nixon	Sims
Lane	Noland	Smathers
LeCompte	Norblad	Smith, Kans.
LeFevre	Norton	Smith, Va.
Lemke	O'Brien, Ill.	Steed
Linehan	O'Brien, Mich.	Stefan
Lovre	O'Hara, Ill.	Stockman
Lynch	O'Hara, Minn.	Sullivan
McCarthy	O'Konski	Sutton
McCulloch	Passman	Taber
McDonough	Phillips, Calif.	Tackett
McGrath	Pickett	Talle
McGuire	Polk	Tauriello
McMillan, S. C.	Poulson	Teague
McMillen, Ill.	Powell	Velde
Mack, Wash.	Quinn	Vorys
Macy	Rabaut	Vursell
Madden	Rankin	Wagner
Magee	Redden	Weichel
Mansfield	Reed, N. Y.	Welch, Mo.
Marcantonio	Rees	Werdell
Martin, Mass.	Rhodes	Wheeler
Mason	Ribicoff	Whitten
Merrow	Richards	Wier
Meyer	Rodino	Wigglesworth
Michener	Sadlak	Williams
Miller, Nebr.	Sadowski	Willis
Mills	St. George	Withrow
Mitchell	Sanborn	Wolcott
Morgan	Scott,	Yates
Moulder	Hugh D., Jr.	Young

NAYS—163

Abbitt	Gordon	Patten
Allen, Calif.	Gorski, Ill.	Patterson
Allen, Ill.	Green	Perkins
Allen, La.	Halleck	Peterson
Anderson, Calif.	Hardy	Pfeiffer,
Aspinall	Hare	Joseph L.
Bailey	Harris	Philbin
Barden	Havenner	Poage
Bates, Ky.	Hays, Ark.	Potter
Bates, Mass.	Hébert	Preston
Battle	Hedrick	Price
Beckworth	Heffernan	Priest
Bentsen	Hinshaw	Rains
Bishop	Hobbs	Ramsay
Blackney	Holmes	Reed, Ill.
Bland	Johnson	Rivers
Boggs, Del.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Boykin	Karsten	Rogers, Mass.
Brehm	Kearney	Rooney
Brooks	Kearns	Sasser
Brown, Ga.	Kee	Scott, Hardie
Burton	Kennedy	Shafer
Byrne, N. Y.	Keogh	Sheppard
Camp	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Cavalcante	Kilburn	Spence
Celler	Kilday	Staggers
Chatham	King	Stigler
Clemente	Kunkel	Thomas, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Lanham	Thompson
Cooper	Larcade	Thornberry
Corbett	Latham	Tollefson
Cox	Lesinski	Towe
Crosser	Lind	Trimble
Davenport	Lodge	Underwood
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Van Zandt
Dawson	Lyle	Vinson
Deane	McCormack	Wadsworth
DeGraffenried	McGregor	Walsh
Denton	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Dingell	Mahon	Welch, Calif.
Doughton	Marsalis	Whitaker
Doyle	Martin, Iowa	White, Calif.
Durham	Miles	Whittington
Eberhart	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Elliott	Monroney	Wilson, Ind.
Elston	Morris	Wilson, Okla.
Engle, Calif.	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Fenton	Morton	Winstead
Fernandez	Multer	Wolverton
Fisher	Murdoch	Wood
Ford	Norrell	Woodhouse
Fugate	O'Neill	Woodruff
Fulton	O'Sullivan	Worley
Gary	O'Toole	Zablocki
Gavin	Face	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rich

NOT VOTING—40

Arends	Combs	Hagen
Blatnik	Cooley	Hall,
Bonner	D'Ewart	Edwin Arthur
Buckley, N. Y.	Dolliver	Hull
Bulwinkle	Evins	Jennings
Case, N. J.	Gilmer	Keefe
Clevenger	Grant	Klein

Lichtenwalter	Pfeiffer,	Short
McConnell	William L.	Smith, Ohio
McKinnon	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.
McSweeney	Plumley	Stanley
Marshall	Regan	Taylor
Miller, Md.	Riehlman	Thomas, N. J.
Patman	Sabath	White, Idaho

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rich for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Riehlman against.
Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Case of New Jersey against.
Mr. Keefe for, with Mr. Patman against.
Mr. Grant for, with Mr. Gilmer against.
Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Marshall with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. CELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANGELL, Mr. HALE, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SHORT. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HOOR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next at 10 o'clock. I make the further announcement that in the event the bill which will come up on that day is disposed of, the House will then meet on Friday merely to adjourn until the following Tuesday.

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

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION TO SWISS GOVERNMENT

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 4392, an act to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States Armed Forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEE, RICHARDS, GORDON, EATON, and VORYS.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, to investigate certain economic problems.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation into the following problems of the economy:

(1) The problem of investment, including, but not limited to, (A) the role of investment institutions in the investment markets, in industry, and in the economy generally; (B) changes in sources of investment funds and the reason therefor; (C) availability and character of investment funds for national, local, and independent enterprise and the effect of such investment or lack of investment upon different classes or size groups in industry; (D) and needs, by industry, for various types of capital.

(2) The problem of the effectiveness and coordination of monetary, credit, and fiscal policies in dealing with general economic policy.

(3) The problem of low-income families in relation to economic instability.

(4) The problem of unemployment trends and their significance in current economic analysis.

Sec. 2. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1949, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties; and (2) to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress prior to January 1, 1950; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per one hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$30,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the

House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House concurrent resolution was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAX BILL

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3704) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 658)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3704) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, and 137, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out "\$1.50" wherever it appears in the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof: "\$1.25"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 505. Subsection (a) of section 23 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 23 (a) There shall be levied, collected and paid on all of the following-named beverages manufactured by a holder of a manufacturer's license and on all of the said beverages imported or brought into the District of Columbia by a holder of a wholesaler's license, except beverages as may be sold to a dealer licensed under the laws of any State or Territory of the United States and not licensed under this Act, and on all beverages imported or brought into the District of Columbia by a holder of a retailer's license, a tax at the following rates to be paid by the licensee in the manner hereinafter provided:

"(1) A tax of 15 cents on every wine-gallon of wine containing more than 14 per centum of alcohol by volume, except champagne or sparkling wine or any wine artificially car-

bonated, and a proportionate tax at a like rate on all fractional parts of such gallon; (2) a tax of 22½ cents on every wine-gallon of champagne or sparkling wine or any wine artificially carbonated, and a proportionate tax at a like rate on all fractional parts of such gallon; (3) a tax of 75 cents on every wine-gallon of spirits and a proportionate tax at a like rate on all fractional parts of such gallon; (4) and a tax of \$1.25 on every wine-gallon of alcohol and a proportionate tax at a like rate on all fractional parts of such gallon."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JNO. L. McMILLAN,
HOWARD W. SMITH,
PAUL C. JONES,
GEORGE J. BATES,
JOS. P. O'HARA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LESTER C. HUNT,
J. HOWARD MCGRAH,
JOE MCCARTHY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3704) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1-18, 22-34, 40-121, 123-125, 134-137: These are technical amendments changing the title and section numbers of the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, 21: The House bill defined "semipublic institution" (sales to which are exempted under the bill) to mean any corporation, and any community chest, fund, or foundation organized exclusively on a nonprofit basis for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, including hospitals. Senate amendments Nos. 19 and 21 strike out the phrase "on a nonprofit basis" and substitute the phrase "no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual" as one of the elements of the definition. Senate amendment No. 20 adds scientific institutions to the classes of institutions included within the definition. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 35: The Senate amendment exempts from the imposition of the sales tax sales of any food sold for human consumption in hotels, restaurants, cafes, bars, and other establishments where the sales price of the food furnished each individual patron (including any cover, minimum, entertainment, or other charge) is \$1.50 or less. If the sales price is more than \$1.50 the entire sales price is subject to the tax. The House recedes with an amendment which makes such exemption applicable only to such sales of food the price of which is \$1.25 or less.

Amendment No. 36: The Senate amendment exempts publications of semipublic institutions from the imposition of the sales tax. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 37: The House bill exempted from the tax sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs made on prescriptions of duly licensed physicians and surgeons and general and special practitioners of the healing arts. The Senate amendment provides that the sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs shall be exempt whether or not made on prescription. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 38: This is a technical amendment to correct a typographical error. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 39: The Senate amendment exempts from the sales tax sales of cigarettes, which are subjected to a special

tax under title VI of the bill (added by Senate amendments Nos. 132 and 133). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 122: The Senate amendment amends section 11 (k) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act relating to alcoholic beverage solicitors' licenses. Under the present law a solicitor may represent more than one vendor under such a license. The Senate amendment would require that a solicitor have a separate license for each vendor he represents. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 126 and 131: The Senate amendment No. 126 strikes out the language of the House bill fixing the effective date of title V of the bill. Senate amendment No. 131 restores the identical language at the end of the amendments added by the Senate to title V. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 127: The House bill contained no provisions for raising existing gallonage taxes on alcoholic beverages. The Senate amendment provides for substantial increases in all such taxes. The House recedes with an amendment. The following table shows the tax per gallon under existing law, under the Senate amendment, and under the conference substitute:

	Existing law	Senate amendment	Conference substitute
Alcohol	\$1.10	\$2.20	\$1.25
Whisky, gin, rum, and other spirits	.50	1.00	.75
Champagne and wine artificially carbonated	.15	.30	.22½
Other sparkling wine containing more than 14 percent of alcohol	.10	.30	.22½
Other sparkling wine containing 14 percent or less of alcohol	None	.30	.22½
Still wine containing more than 14 percent of alcohol	.10	.20	.15

Amendments Nos. 128 and 129: The Senate amendments contain provisions relating to the transition from the existing rates for the gallonage taxes on alcoholic beverages to the new rates. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 130: The Senate amendment increases the existing tax on each barrel of beer from 50 cents to \$1. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 132 and 133. Under the provisions of the House bill the 2 per centum tax imposed on the gross receipts of vendors was applicable with respect to cigarettes. Senate amendment numbered 39 exempts the sale of cigarettes from such tax. Senate amendments numbered 132 and 133 add a new title VI to the bill, to be known as the "District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act." Under the provisions of such Senate amendments a tax is imposed on the sale of cigarettes to consumers at the rate of one cent on each twenty cigarettes or fractional part thereof. The Senate amendments also provide that no person shall manufacture for sale, keep for sale, sell, or offer to sell cigarettes, or display cigarettes for sale in vending machines without having first obtained a license or licenses. The licenses are to be of three kinds: retailer's, vending machine operator's, and wholesaler's. The Commissioners shall fix the fees for such licenses, but the rate shall not exceed \$5 for each retail establishment in the case of a retailer's license, \$5 for each vending machine in the case of a vending machine operator's license, and \$50 in the case of a wholesaler's license. The Senate amendments also provide criminal penalties for violations of the provisions of the new title VI, as added by the Senate amendments. The House recedes.

For the information of the Members of the House there is included the following esti-

mate of financial status of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1950 under the provisions of H. R. 3704, as recommended by the conference committee:

Estimated obligations, 1950

Amount requested of Senate:	
Recommended in H. R. 3082	\$83,371,470
Restorations requested by Commissioners	3,200,742
Amendments requested by Commissioners	546,300
	\$87,118,512
Estimated deficiencies and supplementals	1,000,000
Estimated pay increases retroactive to July 1, 1948	10,669,403
Total, estimated obligations, 1950	98,787,915

Estimated revenue availability, 1950

Unappropriated surplus at beginning of year	\$600,000
Unobligated balances released to surplus	1,700,000
Revenues from present legislation:	
Property taxes:	
Realty	\$32,500,000
Personal, tangible	5,600,000
Motor vehicle, personal	2,500,000
Penalties and interest	225,000
	\$40,825,000
Sales and gross receipts:	
Alcoholic beverages	2,000,000
Beer	300,000
Insurance	1,450,000
Public utilities, banks, etc.	4,200,000
	7,950,000
Licenses and permits	2,700,000
Individual income	4,200,000
Unincorporated business income	800,000
Corporation net income and franchise taxes	5,600,000
Inheritance and estate	1,500,000
Earnings and miscellaneous	4,075,000
Total, estimated revenue collections from present legislation	67,650,000
Federal payment	11,000,000
Estimated revenues under H. R. 3704 (as amended):	
Sales and use tax (before amendments)	\$15,345,000
Decrease in estimate resulting from amendment exempting restaurant meals up to \$1.25	\$1,225,000
Decrease in estimate resulting from Senate amendment exempting all drugs	400,000
Total decreases by amendments	1,625,000
Total sales and use tax estimate for 1 year as recommended by conference committee	13,620,000
Decrease in estimate as result of collections beginning 1 month after beginning of fiscal year	1,289,000
Total	12,331,000
Increase by amendment on alcoholic beverages	\$1,000,000
Increase by Senate amendment on beer	300,000
Increase by Senate amendment of 1 cent excise per package of cigarettes	\$800,000
Decrease by removal of cigarettes from sales tax	250,000
Total increase by Senate amendment of 1 cent excise on cigarettes	550,000
Total increase by amendments	1,850,000
Total	14,281,000
Real-estate increase from 2 to 2.15 percent	2,400,000
Unincorporated business tax amendment	800,000
Alcoholic beverage, license increase	490,000
Total estimates under H. R. 3704 (as amended)	17,971,000
Total, estimated revenue availability	98,921,000
Surplus	33,085

JNO. L. McMILLAN,
HOWARD W. SMITH,
PAUL C. JONES,
GEORGE J. BATES,
JOS. P. O'HARA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the acceptance of the conference report be postponed until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New Orleans Item.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. James P. McGranery.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. HELLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to address the House on Thursday next for 10 minutes following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. McDONOUGH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials from the Christian Science Monitor and one from the Washington Post.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. HUBER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by General Romulo. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds by a quarter of a page the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and that the total cost for printing the speech will be \$168. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the excess, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY REPORT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill (H. R. 4754), the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, that was reported out last night by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from

Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE LATE JAMES V. FORRESTAL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning, amidst the beautiful blooming green of a Washington spring, a great American goes to his rest in peaceful Arlington. Deeply, very deeply, do we feel his passing from our associations and his great work here to his eternal peace. James Forrestal, the late Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of Defense, was a humble, courageous, and brilliant man. It was indeed an honor to know him well and many of us here in the Congress knew him well and experienced the high honor of his association and friendship. This friendship and work together we know has enriched our lives and we will cherish it as long as we live.

Having the trust of public office throughout the war and during these hard days of peace is a heavy responsibility. All of you will agree with me that only those who have borne the responsibility know its weight and strain. It is an easy act to stand on the sidelines and hold forth with criticism. Fairness of discussion regarding the great issues of our time is constructive. Honest differences of opinion is an oasis in which strength and power for our free way of life is born. Decisions—right decisions—evolve from this respected American process. If our Nation is to live, truth must be the basis of our decisions and the foundation upon which we build and progress. Personal criticism just for the sake of criticism; vindictiveness for the purpose of ruination; maliciousness for the purpose of character destruction is unjust and is of no value in the American system of life and enterprise. It has no place in our respected system of justice. Anyone who resorts to this method of viciousness illustrates beyond a doubt that they have no knowledge of the complexity, seriousness, and pressure of public responsibility during these difficult years. Those of us honored with the trust of serving the people of America today, shoulder the burden of the knowledge that all of our acts and decisions over this period in the history of our country affects the lives of generations upon generations yet to come. Together with Secretary Forrestal all of us here know the significance and meaning of this great responsibility.

Character is the backbone of American life. The character of an individual is not born overnight. Character is that powerful force born in our hearts and souls. It rises and develops as we move forward through life. Character born and molded on the anvil of truth, duty, responsibility, and service is stronger than steel, stronger than Gibraltar, stronger than any earthly conception, because character is inspired by God and exists in the hearts and souls of mankind. Anyone who deliberately and intentionally attempts to injure and destroy another person's character commits a crime to the import of a felony. Too much—far too much—of this shameless vilification is permitted today. Character cannot be assassinated.

Character cannot be destroyed. Character lives beyond life itself. This great man who is leaving us now possessed character, and we all bow our heads in recognition and respect to its nobility and fineness.

The illustrious pages of American history will record the great contributions Secretary Forrestal has so generously given to his country. Completely unselfish, possessing the highest concept of duty, this distinguished American gave all of his energy and strength to the service of his country. As the first chief administrator of all of our military services, his job was tremendous, and perhaps too great in labor and responsibility for one man to have. He saw it through; he did the job. He has molded our military services into a cooperative unit. He has tried to set the pattern. In doing this he gave his strength, his energy, his life to his country. Can anyone do more with only one life to give? To James Forrestal, the distinguished first Secretary of Defense, whose intense loyalty, devotion to duty, unselfish service, and love of country—all reflected in the accomplishments of his hard labor—a grateful country gives thanks. In the name of God, the Father of us all, we wish him eternal peace.

SENATE BILLS, A JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

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

S. 266. An act modifying a limitation affecting pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 276. An act to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 885. An act to provide for the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 930. An act to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreement with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1080. An act for the relief of James A. Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1138. An act for the relief of John W. Crumpacker, commander, United States Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1167. An act for the relief of the estate of Marion Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1296. An act for the relief of Murphy & Wischmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1324. An act to provide for the modification of the Corps of Engineers flood-control project on the Heart River at Mandan, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1483. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 2312 and 2313, so as to include thereunder motor vehicles and aircraft which have been embezzled, feloniously converted, or feloniously taken by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1557. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile

court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1577. An act to revive and reenact, as amended, the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1580. An act concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1659. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest-fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1760. An act to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734; 7 U. S. C. 429); to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20 of each year as Emblem Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 55. An act to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Alaska;

H. R. 603. An act for the relief of Jephtha R. Macfarlane;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of B. G. Jones;

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Mark B. Craig and others;

H. R. 681. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Generazzo;

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of John P. Reilly;

H. R. 692. An act for the relief of Joseph Thompson;

H. R. 738. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Catherine S. Tremayne and A. I. Lang;

H. R. 967. An act for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 1037. An act for the relief of Samuel Ensler and Louis Puccinelli;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Hal W. Cline;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of William Price;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Eva C. Netzel Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzel and Sarah C. Stuff;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly;

H. R. 2285. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works;

H. R. 2566. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

H. R. 2812. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Kaknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America;

H. R. 2906. An act to provide a 1-year extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers;

H. R. 3259. An act to add to the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, Ky., certain land acquired by the United States for that purpose;

H. R. 3396. An act to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin;

H. R. 3663. An act for the relief of Lawrence Reves; and

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

649. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, and lists or schedules, or parts of lists or schedules, covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 12. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 667). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 241. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Cas-

mir Pulaski; with an amendment (Rept. No. 668). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROOK: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3826. A bill to amend the act of January 16, 1883, an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4754. A bill to simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, to reorganize certain agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 601. A bill for the relief of Kenelm E. Rucker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Lander Thomas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Romulus Oscar Bean, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Fruman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Jack Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur; without amendment (Rept. No. 664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2224. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Lester B. McAllister and others; with an amendment (Rept. No. 666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4837. A bill to provide electric typewriters for veterans of World War II, who by reason of the loss of an arm, have suffered an impairment in their ability to write; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4838. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4839. A bill to provide that no contract shall be made for time studies of jobs of employees of the Navy, to provide that certain premiums shall not be paid to such employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4840. A bill to provide for a survey of sickness in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4841. A bill to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons, and others; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4842. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for a term of the United States district court at Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4843. A bill to amend section 3A of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to grant Members of Congress certain retirement benefits granted to other Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 4844. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property for the use and benefit of the Colorado River Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4845. A bill to permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical research purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4846. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4847. A bill to authorize the Maritime Commission to make certain provisions for water transportation to and from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4848. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4849. A bill to establish the decoration Medal for Valor for award to persons serving or acting for the United States in secret or under-cover activity to aid the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4850. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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 Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the 75-cent minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to install a system of flood control with facilities for the production of power on the Virgin River in the States of Nevada and Arizona; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 4851. A bill for the relief of Gay Street Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4852. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Venus Sarkisian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4853. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4854. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Miriam G. Wornum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4855. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, and Cooke Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, as receiver for said Trent Trust Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4856. A bill for the relief of Tevfik Kamil Kutay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 4858. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

943. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. B. E. Hanna, Jr., and citizens of Oskaloosa and University Park, Iowa, expressing their objection to H. R. 4238 and 4349; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

944. By Mr. PETERSON: Memorial of the Senate of the Legislature of Florida, memorializing the Congress to convene a constitutional convention for the purpose of determining the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing the United States to participate in a limited world federal government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

945. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Dental Hygienists' Association, Washington, D. C., requesting the Congress not to enact any legislation which will hamper the freedom of individual initiative, such as current proposals of compulsory health insurance contain; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

946. Also, petition of American Veterinary Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., requesting to go on record as being opposed to any system of compulsory health insurance or political medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

947. Also, petition of the Bar Association of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., requesting the Attorney General make an investigation of the Communists and national labor leaders in the Territory of Hawaii and that there be published the conclusions of such investigation; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

948. Also, petition of Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas, V. I., protesting against the methods used by the Department of the Interior in formulating the legislative program for the Virgin Islands without giving the people an opportunity to participate therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

949. Also, petition of S. F. Matthews and others, Homestead, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

950. Also, petition of Mrs. Alda L. Stevens and others, Zephyrhills Townsend Club, No. 1, Zephyrhills, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

951. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Norton and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, May 23, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Ralph Candler John, assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou hope of the ends of the earth, source of all strength, font of all love, we bring our purposes, our deeds, our all, at the beginning of this day, for the refining influence of Thy divine grace. We beseech Thee to remove from our hearts and minds the dross of impure thoughts and unkind motives, and that Thou wilt place in their stead a quality of life, expressed in that which we both intend and do, which is worthy of those who claim Thy name.

Thou hast given us a land full of promise for ourselves and for the whole world. Thou hast vested in the Members of this body a special place in the unfolding of the destiny of mankind. Stand Thou among us, in Thy redeeming power. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 24, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 24, 1949, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 392. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett; and S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution for the relief of the First Citizens Bank & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4392) to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during