

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7575

Waggoner  
Wallhauser  
Watson  
Weaver  
Westland  
Whalley

Wharton  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Wildall  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob

Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Wyder  
Wyman  
Younger

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.  
Mr. Harsha for, with Mr. Shelley against.  
Mr. Anderson for, with Mr. Cooley against.  
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Steed with Mrs. Kee.  
Mr. Scott with Mr. Ichord.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Grant.  
Mr. Harris with Mr. Forrester.

Messrs. ROBERTS of Texas, PASS-MAN, WAGGONNER, and ROGERS of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### MILITARY PAY INCREASE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 335 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 335 provides for consideration of H.R. 5555, a bill to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 5555 is to provide increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances; to establish a new method of adjusting retirement pay; and to provide other benefits, for members of the uniformed services.

The last basic pay increase for members of the uniformed services became effective on June 1, 1958. Classified employees of the Federal Government received pay increases in 1958, 1960, 1962, and will receive another increase on January 1, 1964.

The average earnings of manufacturing—production workers, a group usually associated with enlisted personnel—has increase by 44.8 percent since 1952. The cumulative average increase for classified civil service employees in the past 10 years totals 39.8 percent. For members of the uniformed services, the overall average increase in compensation since 1952, including the recent increase in basic allowance for quarters, is 16.2 percent. Even with the increases recommended in H.R. 5555, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will still be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in private industry and civil service employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 335.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], a member of the Committee on Rules, has explained this resolution which makes in order the consideration of H.R. 5555, under 2 hours of general debate and an open rule, for the purpose of increasing the base pay of those in the armed services of the United States, for making adjustments in the subsistence allowances and adjustments in some other benefits and allowances due those in the armed services, or who have retired therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this legislation is long overdue. There have been several increases in pay granted to the classified employees of this Government, and many increases in pay to the various workers and employees in private industry, since Congress last adjusted the pay of those who bear the arms of the United States in defense of this Republic. In my opinion this action is not only long overdue, but is a very, very meager as far as the total pay increase is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the average increase in base pay, as provided under this bill for all those in the armed services is about 12.6 percent. In addition, of course, there is some increase provided for the subsistence pay allowances given to enlisted men, and some to officers. In ad-

#### NAYS—190

|               |                 |                |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Addabbo       | Hansen          | Philbin        |
| Albert        | Harding         | Pike           |
| Andrews       | Hardy           | Pilcher        |
| Ashley        | Hawkins         | Poage          |
| Barrett       | Hays            | Powell         |
| Bass          | Hébert          | Price          |
| Beckworth     | Hechler         | Pucinski       |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hemphill        | Purcell        |
| Blatnik       | Hollfield       | Randall        |
| Boggs         | Holland         | Reuss          |
| Boland        | Hull            | Rhodes, Pa.    |
| Bonner        | Jarman          | Rivers, Alaska |
| Brademas      | Jennings        | Rivers, S.C.   |
| Brooks        | Joelson         | Roberts, Ala.  |
| Brown, Calif. | Johnson, Calif. | Rodino         |
| Burke         | Johnson, Wis.   | Rogers, Colo.  |
| Burkhalter    | Jones, Ala.     | Rooney         |
| Byrne, Pa.    | Jones, Mo.      | Rosenthal      |
| Cameron       | Karsten         | Rostenkowski   |
| Carey         | Karth           | Roush          |
| Chelf         | Kastenmeier     | Roybal         |
| Clark         | Kelly           | Ryan, Mich.    |
| Cohelan       | King, Calif.    | Ryan, N.Y.     |
| Corman        | Kirwan          | St. Germain    |
| Daddario      | Kluczynski      | St. Onge       |
| Daniels       | Landrum         | Secrest        |
| Davis, Ga.    | Lankford        | Selden         |
| Davis, Tenn.  | Leggett         | Senner         |
| Dawson        | Lesinski        | Sheppard       |
| Delaney       | Libonati        | Shipley        |
| Dent          | Long, La.       | Sickles        |
| Denton        | Long, Md.       | Sikes          |
| Diggs         | McDowell        | Slack          |
| Dingell       | McFall          | Smith, Iowa    |
| Donohue       | Macdonald       | Staebler       |
| Dulski        | Madden          | Staggers       |
| Duncan        | Mahon           | Stephens       |
| Edmondson     | Matsunaga       | Stratton       |
| Edwards       | Matthews        | Stubblefield   |
| Elliott       | Mills           | Sullivan       |
| Everett       | Minish          | Thomas         |
| Evins         | Monagan         | Thompson, La.  |
| Fallon        | Montoya         | Thompson, N.J. |
| Farbstein     | Moorhead        | Thompson, Tex. |
| Fascell       | Morgan          | Thornberry     |
| Feighan       | Morrison        | Toll           |
| Finnegan      | Moss            | Trimble        |
| Flood         | Multer          | Tuten          |
| Fraser        | Murphy, Ill.    | Udall          |
| Friedel       | Murphy, N.Y.    | Ullman         |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Natcher         | Van Deerlin    |
| Gallagher     | Nedzi           | Vanik          |
| Garmatz       | Nix             | Vinson         |
| Gathings      | O'Brien, Ill.   | Watts          |
| Gialmo        | O'Brien, N.Y.   | Weltner        |
| Gilbert       | O'Hara, Ill.    | White          |
| Gill          | O'Hara, Mich.   | Wickersham     |
| Gonzalez      | Olsen, Mont.    | Willis         |
| Grabowski     | Olson, Minn.    | Wilson         |
| Gray          | O'Neill         | Charles H.     |
| Green, Oreg.  | Patman          | Wright         |
| Griffiths     | Patten          | Young          |
| Hagen, Calif. | Pepper          | Zablocki       |
| Hanna         | Perkins         |                |

#### NOT VOTING—36

|          |            |                |
|----------|------------|----------------|
| Adair    | Fogarty    | Ichord         |
| Anderson | Forrester  | /Kee           |
| Aspinall | Gary       | Keogh          |
| Ayres    | Grant      | Miller, Calif. |
| Beermann | Green, Pa. | Morton         |
| Bolling  | Hagan, Ga. | Rains          |
| Buckley  | Halpern    | Roosevelt      |
| Celler   | Harris     | Scott          |
| Collier  | Harsha     | Shelley        |
| Conte    | Healey     | Sisk           |
| Cooley   | Hoeven     | Steed          |
| Fino     | Hosmer     | Walter         |

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
Mr. Beermann for, with Mr. Walter against.  
Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Celler against.  
Mr. Morton of Maryland for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Aspinall against.  
Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Buckley against.  
Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Rains against.

dition, as I said a moment ago, there are other adjustments being made by this legislation in connection with retirement benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the total cost of this legislation will be a little under \$1 billion for the first fiscal year, and the increases over the next 5-year period will bring the average cost up to about \$1¼ billion annually, which is somewhat less than originally estimated when the legislation was first proposed by the President of the United States, whose message was sent to Congress on the subject.

But in considering this bill, it is my understanding there will be, after general debate is concluded, and the 5-minute rule is put into effect, several important amendments offered which may be far reaching in their effect. Frankly, I have endeavored to study some of the proposed amendments and am somewhat perplexed in my own mind as to just what they may do or may not do if they become a part of the law, as a part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest very respectfully to my colleagues that they pay close attention to the explanations and to the debate on these particular amendments as the discussion proceeds during the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONGRESSIONAL WEEKEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak about the forthcoming congressional weekend. Therefore, I apologize to the Members of the House for taking this time on a matter of minor importance when we are about to consider a bill of such major importance.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this year the congressional weekend will start on Friday, May 17, and continue through Sunday, May 19.

Mr. Speaker, this year, unlike prior years, the New York City congressional delegation will play the part of the host.

I want to emphasize that this costs no money to the Congress or the Government. Members pay their own way as well as that of their families and friends.

Mr. Speaker, we have a full and interesting program arranged for all those who plan to go on the tour.

We will leave here Friday morning at 9:45 and the Members will return Sunday night by train. There is some confusion about reservations because some Members have already contacted members of the New York delegation or myself, as I have been acting as chairman of the group, indicating a desire to go. Others have written directly to the mayor of the city of New York accepting his invitation to be there. That, how-

ever, does not make their reservations firm.

In order to make firm reservations and to get their railroad tickets and their hotel reservations, it is important that Members immediately send in their checks for themselves and as many members of their family and friends as will attend. No reservations can be made except upon payment. Checks should be made payable to "Congressional Weekend" and sent to my office.

I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, 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 consideration of the bill H.R. 5555, with Mr. Boggs in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored today to begin debate on the bill H.R. 5555, a bill to increase the basic pay of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

This bill increases the basic pay of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service—all of the uniformed services.

I do not think it is necessary for me to remind this committee that the military pay has not been increased since 1958, nor is it necessary for me to remind this committee that the Civil Service pay was increased in 1958, 1960, 1962, and will be increased again in 1964.

In that regard I would like to remind the committee that the Congress last year, when it passed the Postal and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, revised the salary schedule and the effective dates proposed by the President.

I recognize this is not very dramatic, talking about pay. But somebody has to do it, so I am the one, and I will do the very best I can. I am not much to look at but I have a pretty good story for you to listen to. Furthermore, these people of whom I speak have done a pretty good job for your country and mine. So I hope you will listen. I want you to listen.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. My distinguished friend has stated that his remarks are not

dramatic. What the gentleman is saying is dramatic, highly dramatic. He is discussing something essential to the defense of this Nation, and I do not know of any subject more dramatic than the successful defense of America and the free world. The gentleman's committee has brought to the floor a measure which will help to insure that those who wear the uniform of the Nation will be able to keep their heads above water financially, will be able to live as we want Americans to live, to be able to live as other Americans live. Now assuredly this is something they are entitled to, something they have long been entitled to. This bill should have been enacted a year ago, when civilian personnel were given a pay raise. I want to commend the gentleman, who is one of the great leaders of this Congress, for his important work in the field of defense and I commend the Committee on Armed Services for their work in bringing this needed measure to the floor. There is much to be said on the need for a military pay raise—the best way to say it is by a solid vote for passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. When these other pay bills came up they contained an effective date recommended by the President. The House of Representatives paid no attention to that recommendation. They suggested the first day of the month after the bill was passed. We did the same, in the subcommittee, but the full committee decided otherwise, and we have gone along with the full committee, naturally, and made the effective date October 1, 1963, the one suggested by the President.

But listen to the increases they made on civil service pay increases. We went \$280 million over what was suggested by the administration for fiscal 1963, \$227 million over what the administration asked for 1964, and \$111 million over what the administration asked for in 1965, and nobody blinked an eye.

I should also emphasize the fact that the civil service increase last year went to 1,550,000 Federal employees with an eventual cost of \$1 billion annually, whereas our proposal of \$1,191,694,000 annual increase applies not only to 1,868,000 of the 2,700,000 active members of the armed services but also includes pay for 900,000 members of the Reserve components and 411,000 retired personnel. I know we will not now become economy minded to those who maintain our National Guard, particularly since we did not have the same concern last year over another piece of legislation.

The total cost of this bill is \$1,191,694,000. This is \$46,832,000 under the proposal submitted by the administration and the Department of Defense. The President in his budget message requested \$900 million for the remainder of this year for the proposed increase. That was based upon the assumption that the pay increase would take effect on October 1, 1963. We have reluctantly accepted this proposed effective date, and as a result of the reduction we have made in the proposed legislation, the cost for the remainder of 1964, starting October 1, will be \$892 million or \$8 mil-

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7577

lion under what the Department of Defense requested for the remainder of this year.

I would be less than candid, however, if I did not say this to you. The subcommittee of which I have the great honor to be chairman contemplated an effective date of July 1, and an annual expenditure of \$1,547 million for all the uniformed services. This was \$278 million over the budget. We figured that the military should be paid with the same spoon that the other of our children we have created are paid; namely, the civil service and postal employees. But in the wisdom of the full committee, we decided on another course. Our subcommittee felt that our proposal would come closer to resolving a vital question, that of the retention of the quality problems that exist today in the military of our country. However, I do recognize the facts of life and I am practical enough to realize that this bill does involve an increase in pay and allowances for military personnel of almost \$1,200 million annually and this represents a very substantial increase in the total cost of pay and allowances for all of our uniformed services. As a matter of fact, the present cost of basic pay and allowances for members of the armed services today is \$9,952 million and an additional \$900 million is spent on subsistence for enlisted personnel. To this total, we seek to add \$1,200. Thus, the amounts that are recommended in this bill are less than the amounts that many of us felt were very, very necessary. Nevertheless we realize that they are substantial and will, of course, go a long ways toward solving some of the problems that confront very materially the military today.

The bill originally submitted by the Department of Defense was complex.

When I say "complex," that is an understatement. It contained many provisions which we not only did not approve but we felt did not belong in the bill and we cut them out.

We are concerned with two problems, and keep this uppermost in your minds. The first is the problem of retention. We want to retain these highly trained technical people on active duty. The second is quality. First, retention and second, quality. These are the things we want to accomplish.

Our training costs for the Armed Forces last year was \$2½ billion, just to train these people. A billion dollars of this was in the technical area alone.

Our retention rates; that is, our reenlistment rates, are considerably under what they should be if we are to reduce those training costs and at the same time improve the combat efficiency of the armed services. We have an overall enlistment rate of only 53 percent. In the first term reenlistment grades, 24.1 percent. But in some of the most difficult skills our reenlistments are only 15 percent. This is also true among our officers. Only about 35 percent of the officers who enter on active duty remain at the end of their obligated period. The services today have to accept between 95 and 98 percent of all of the officers who apply for retention on active duty. It is

obvious to me, and it should be to you, that if 95 to 98 percent of every 100 officers who apply for extended duty, active duty, must be accepted in order to provide the necessary officers for leadership and management in our armed services, then there will be a gap in the future, and no degree of selectivity whatsoever. If this is to continue, it is equally obvious that in the years ahead we will have many mediocre officers and we will not have the kind of leadership and management that all of us realize is not only vital but is necessary for the maintenance of a good military regime.

We are spending \$50 to \$60 billion a year, on our defense budget. In many areas we would have a quality of management that is not good for the country or the military.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina. I am in favor of the bill, including the Rivers amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, what does this bill do? The bill is not very long. This is what it does:

First of all, it provides basic pay for all members of the armed services who have completed more than 2 years of active duty for pay purposes. The bill submitted by the Department of Defense proposes increases for all members of the armed service. This action of the committee reduced the cost \$134,226,000.

The Department of Defense proposed elimination of foreign duty and sea pay which has been in effect for over 20 years. Of course we did not accept that. If you abolish foreign duty and sea pay, you would not have any Navy to start with. We did not buy that. Bear in mind that foreign duty and sea pay applies only to enlisted men. No officers get this. We do not pay foreign duty and sea pay to officers. We refused to repeal the law on foreign duty and sea pay. This immediately added \$127 million to the bill.

Another major item in the bill was in the area of subsistence allowance. The Department of Defense recommended that we increase the subsistence allowance for officers from \$47.88 a month to \$77 a month.

However, the Department of Defense did not recommend any increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel. The increase from \$47.88 to \$77 recommended by the Department of Defense for officers amounted to \$120 million a year. We could not approve this approach to the problem. Instead, we increased the subsistence allowances for officers by the amount of the increase in the cost of food since 1952, namely, 6.6 percent, and this suggests an increase in subsistence allowances for officers of \$3.12 a month.

Now I want to make it clear that as a result of what we propose as an increase in subsistence allowances for officers we have reduced the take-home pay of officers by \$26 a month below that which

the Department of Defense recommended. At the same time we have increased the take-home pay of enlisted personnel in subsistence allowances by \$77 million a year. The Department of Defense did not have anything for these people, so we increased it \$77 million, which was the only honorable and just thing to do.

We have also made some slight modification in submarine pay to take care of the crewmembers of conventional submarines who go to nuclear training schools to learn the complexities of nuclear submarines.

We have also added a new type of hazardous incentive pay for those who work in high-pressure chambers.

In addition, we allow an individual to draw two incentive pays if he is performing two hazardous duties on a full-time basis. The amounts of money involved in these last three changes are very small compared to the total cost of the bill. For example, the double incentive payment provision involves a cost of \$1,941,000 annually; the submarine pay for training duty involves \$2,065,000 annually, and the high-pressure chamber incentive pay adds a cost of \$145,000 a year. Now, if you do not know what double incentive pay is, let's say a man is a paratrooper and he has to jump out of a plane and when he hits the ground he has to perform some other duty. We take care of the entire mission. That is what this means.

Now, the committee has also provided a new allowance for members of the uniformed services who are permitted by law to transport their dependents and household effects to new duty assignments, but are precluded from having their dependents with them. This is known as the family separation allowance. The reason for doing this is fairly simple and it is based on pure economics. When the head of a household is away from his family for long periods of time it is obvious that the cost of maintaining the household increases. In other words, when the head of the household is not there to shovel snow or cut the grass or to repair leaky faucets or to do the multitude of chores that fall upon every head of a household, then his wife usually must hire someone to do these jobs. These are the people who do not occupy Government quarters.

In addition, in the cold war situation which has faced us in the past—do you know how long it will go? I do not—and will undoubtedly continue to face us, there are more and more cases of men being separated from their families for long periods of time. This is having a serious effect upon our retention rates. Some of these people are away 50 percent of the time and others are away 326 days out of 365. These things are having a serious repercussion on the retention rates in the military.

We are trying to do something about it, because these men require terrific training. As I told you, \$2,500 million is for training. We have many areas where the head of the household is separated from his family in remote areas, when they are on duty at sea or when they are assigned to areas where their families

cannot handle these conditions. I might say that of all the provisions in this bill this is the most exciting and enthusiastic provision other than the increase in basic pay, as far as the dependents and the military generally are concerned. The total cost of this provision is estimated to be \$41,979,000 for a full fiscal year, of which \$37,658,000 will be paid to enlisted personnel and \$4,331,000 to officers.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains other sections which I might mention briefly. One of them is the repeal of the authority to provide responsibility payments. This type of pay was authorized for captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and for colonels back in 1958. It has never been implemented. So we repeal it.

In addition, we have eliminated the State of Hawaii as an area in which foreign duty pay would be authorized. By doing this we need a savings clause so that some of these enlisted men who are there now would not be deprived of this benefit. This was the honorable thing to do.

We also have a provision in the bill that permits anyone who retires during this fiscal year, 1963, to be affected under the provisions of this bill. We did that for this reason. Many people when they know the effective date is coming, for some reason or other will try to stay on until the effective date. We have cured all of this jumping around and trying to stay on active duty. Therefore anyone who retires in 1963 will come under the provisions of this bill. I think that is the only way to do it.

There is another technical provision in the bill which protects the widows and dependents of service personnel who have died on active duty or who die as the result of a service-connected disability. This is also necessary because in the past we have eliminated certain increments in basic pay, and we have done this in the proposed legislation. Without this savings provision, some individuals might take a reduction in their dependency and indemnity compensation.

These increments and provisions of law are very difficult to explain. But they have gone on over the years and we have had to protect these people, certainly the widows and orphans are protected. Without a savings clause, a retired second lieutenant in this category would have taken a reduction in pay and as a result his widow would suffer this reduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the last and probably the most controversial part of the bill, this question of retirement pay. I hope the Members of the House will listen to this explanation.

Back in 1958 when we enacted the Pay Act of 1958, we decided that we would depart from the traditional concept of applying retirement pay to existing pay scales.

I am sure that each Member of the House has received a lot of correspondence on this and I shall try to explain it.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I would merely like to emphasize at this point that the gentleman from South Carolina is making a very important statement at this time, which has to do with an important amendment that will be offered later in the debate. I sincerely hope that the gentleman will have the undivided attention of the Members of the House because of the importance of his statement, and it certainly merits it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Back in 1958—and I have sat on all the pay bills for 23 years—we passed the 1958 act. At that time there was a law on the books which gave every man on active duty, officer and enlisted man, the right to recompute his pay if he was retired, on the pay scales of any new legislation. You may say, "Well, he went from one to the other," but he did not. They do not live between these pay scales too long, I can tell you that.

This law, with the exception of a brief period in the 1920's has been on the books for 100 years and every man, upon retirement, was not only led to believe that he was going to have his retirement pay recomputed, but it was the law. But the Congress in its wisdom abruptly cut this off and denied this to them in 1958, without any notice whatever. As a matter of fact the law even stated that the retirement pay would be based on whatever pay scales were in effect.

The reason the Congress gave in 1958 was that the rising cost of military retirement was becoming very noticeable and they wanted to do something about it; so—bam—went the law, without notice.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it happens that I served on the Committee on Armed Services at that time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And let me state that no more distinguished Member ever served on this committee than the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman will remember that at that time there had been the Cordiner report which never had been officially presented to the Congress but had been allowed to leak. This was part of the Cordiner report recommendation to reduce the retirement pay and take it away from the active scale, the one that had been in effect for 100 years. And it was only after a fight that we got a 6 percent limitation on it. This has not been to the credit of this Congress since, that we have allowed this condition to continue.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman and I thank him.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GUBSER. A moment ago the gentleman was quoting, I believe, title X, section 6149, of the United States Code and cited the law, that new basic rates would be taken into consideration in a recomputation of retired pay. Is this statement not true, that in 1958 Congress did not bother to repeal that law and it is still on the books? It only denied the beneficiaries of retirement pay prior to 1958 the right of applying this law to the new pay scale?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would say the gentleman is substantially correct.

Mr. GUBSER. It is still on the books and is still the law; we did not repeal it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The Department of Defense recognized this inequity, this miserable inequity, if you will permit me to say so. They recommended that those persons who retired prior to June 1, 1958, the effective date of the 1958 Pay Act, be permitted to recompute under the 1958 pay scales.

In addition, they were to also receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase. The cost of recomputing for those retired prior to June 1958, and the fiscal year 1964 would have been \$30 million.

Mr. Chairman, all of you have undoubtedly received extensive correspondence from retired personnel who urged the Congress to go back to the traditional concept of recomputing, or computing, retired pay. The committee, after careful consideration of this problem, came to the conclusion that it should adhere to the 1958 act. I would be less than candid with you and positively not fair to myself if I did not say this to you, that the committee, in my opinion, made a mistake. I had an amendment in the committee and it was defeated in committee, but when this amendment is offered you will be able to express your will today to right this wrong. I propose to offer an amendment that will give you the right and the opportunity, with us who are similarly minded, to right this wrong, with the understanding, as the Department of Defense has urged us to do, that this is the end; give them notice that in the future there will be no recomputing. Instead, we will give them notice, under the cost-of-living index section when it amounts to 3 percent, that it will be automatically adjusted.

President Eisenhower suggested this, President Kennedy both as Senator and as President, Secretary McNamara, the Bureau of the Budget, all people have recommended it. Further, back in 1960 the House Armed Services Committee recommended it. You who were here then helped us pass this recomputation. I know that many of you would prefer to continue the traditional method of recomputation, but since this matter of retirement is getting so large I am willing now to accept the fact that we should change the law and right this wrong today.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has made a significant statement here. Can the gentlemen tell the House whether or not workers in industry who have retired can recompute their pensions? Can they recompute their pay when they retire, and their factories work under new scales?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The whole concept of military pay is below that of civilians, even including the so-called fringe benefits. I may say this to the gentleman since he has brought that up, and I am glad he has, that the taxpayers of America also pay the civil service increases. There was a time when we had comparability between the military and industry. We tried to keep our military salaries at a level where industry would not take our best trained people. There was what was called comparability. That is gone. But we always had a comparability, we thought, by these things the gentleman mentions, between the military and the civil servants, and that is even gone. We have had cases of colonels with over 25 years of service having civil service men employed under them making more than they.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Can civil service employees under the Government Pay Acts recompute?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think there is a great deal of merit to the gentleman's argument, but I am at a loss to understand how I can explain to the working people of my district that we permit the military people to recompute when we cannot permit the working people, who pay the taxes, to recompute their pensions to meet the rising cost of living. How can I explain that to the workingman who has retired and is also faced with the increased cost of living?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Because the civil service employees get about five times faster increases in their salaries. Since 1958 they have had four increases and the military none. For between 40 and 50 years flag officers in this country did not get any increase in salaries. Everything went to the lower echelons. The civil service employees are way ahead of the military, and in the gentleman's lifetime the military will never catch up with the civil service. So recomputation cannot be compared. You cannot do that. It is a theoretical question.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is it not true that the military men were promised this by law when they went on active duty?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This was the law then, and military pay scales have always been made low because of these benefits. For instance, in industry there was a time when there might have been a disparity when the military had all these hospital rights and everything, but industry has 10 times the rights that military people have in this hospitalization area and with this "space available" concept and all these things

that exist today. We have this industrial management concept today, and when you compare that with the matter of military dependents riding on planes and such things as that, the rights of the military have been whittled away and whittled away and whittled away until today they do not even exist.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Is it not accurate to say that those who are on the retired rolls today are still subject to recall to active duty at any time? Also, is it not true that the Federal judges are also subject to recall and, thus, they have their retirement pay adjusted according to the pay of active duty judges?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think that is correct.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to make one point in answer to a question raised by the gentleman from Illinois. From 1908 to 1946, a span of 38 years, commissioned officers in the U.S. Army and Navy did not get a single increase, yet, at the same time the national wage index rose from 100 in 1908 as a base to 581.1.

I might also point out, according to the comparability tables which exist today, after allowing a weight for non-contributory retirements and other fringe benefits, a colonel gets \$200 less than his civil service counterpart. That is the situation that exists today.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would also like to say we are not the only taxpayers. The military pays some taxes too. They are not exempt from the income tax.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I promised to yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], then, of course, I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question not pertaining to this matter or recomputation. I would be glad to wait until the gentleman is finished with that subject before asking the question I have in mind. If the gentleman from New York has a question on the subject of recomputation, I would ask my colleague from South Carolina to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Does the gentleman from New York have a question on the subject of recomputation?

Mr. BECKER. Yes, I do. You were talking a few minutes ago about how a man could go back home and explain to the people, civil service people and others why they could not recompute their pay the same as the military. I would say very simply and certainly not at all facetiously that if it were not for the dedicated military leaders who remain in the service for 20 years or more, we would not have any kind of homefront

or any kind of retirement to be worried about.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I heard a distinguished American one time say something about this situation where people are worried about the budget, but this distinguished American in speaking about this concern that our expenditures of \$54 billion a year for the military might bankrupt this country said, he would rather be a live American with an empty pocketbook rather than be a dead American with a full pocketbook. Those are my sentiments.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman spoke about hazardous duty pay and work in decompression chambers and so on. But the gentleman did not mention what to me is the most hazardous duty of all, and that is serving under enemy shell fire. Would the gentleman tell the committee what happened as far as this provision is concerned, with reference to extra pay for combat missions?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My colleague knows as well as I do that that was not accepted by the full committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I know, but I am not sure all the Members of the House know that. I understand an amendment will be offered to put that provision back in the bill providing for extra duty pay for the most hazardous duty that there is. I might say it amazed me that the committee would take that out.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to summarize what we have done. We have provided basic increases in pay for 1,868,000 of the personnel of the uniformed services. There are 812,000 people with under 2 years of service for pay purposes who will not receive any increase.

Typical increases are as follows: A 5-percent cost-of-living increase for generals and other flag officers running from \$60 a month for a brigadier general to \$95 a month for a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

A 10-percent increase for colonels, an average of \$92 a month.

A 15-percent increase for majors, an average of \$93 a month.

A 17.8-percent increase for captains, an average of \$85 a month.

A 16.4-percent increase for first lieutenants, an average of \$50 a month.

A 5.4-percent increase for second lieutenants, an average of \$14 a month.

The percentage increases for second lieutenants apparently are low because 35,000 of these are with less than 2 years of service, and they do not receive any increase in basic pay because they have an obligated service. The service may want them and may not. But the average increase, roughly, for the rest is \$43 a month. The great percentage increases are in the grades of first lieutenants, captains, and majors.

There is the point where we are getting hurt. We want these officers. We want them to make a decision as to whether they are going to make the service a career or not. These boys are needed badly. We have spent an awful lot of money on them.

The average increase for warrant officers, one, two, three, and four, is roughly 15 percent, running from \$49 a month for a W-1 to \$97 a month for a W-4. The overall increase for officers is 14.3 percent, an average of \$71 a month.

Among the enlisted personnel the increases run from 14 percent a month for E-9's, an average of \$63 a month, to a maximum of \$120; 16 percent for E-8's, averaging \$60 a month, with a maximum of \$120. The E-9's and E-8's are very special people. They have done a very outstanding service. There are not too many of those.

It is 15 percent for an E-4, an average of \$25 a month, and a maximum of \$30 a month; 10.7 percent for the E-3's, averaging \$12 a month, with a maximum of \$24 a month, and one-half of 1 percent in the E-1's, an average of 42 cents a month, with a maximum of \$5 a month.

Almost all of these E-1's have less than 2 years of service. They are of an unknown quantity. They are required to serve, and when they get 2 years of service they get the increase.

We have captains with less than 2 years that get nothing. For instance, doctors coming in with less than 2 years' service, receive no increases.

The total increase in the basic pay is \$847,498,000.

Where is the rest of the money in the bill? The family separation allowance will cost approximately \$42 million a year. Increases in subsistence allowance for enlisted personnel, will cost \$77 million.

As I told you, the Department of Defense did not have anything for the enlisted men. We put in \$77 million a year. There is a small increase in subsistence allowance for officers, only \$13 million a year. There is a 5-percent increase in retirement pay, \$52 million a year; increased retirement costs to those who retire in the calendar year 1963 will roughly be \$9 million for 1964.

The increase for submarine pay, high pressure chamber duty, and double incentive payments amounts to \$4 million.

Terminal leave payments, social security, death gratuities, and re-enlistment bonuses, all of which are affected by the changes in basic pay, involve an additional \$75 million annually.

This gives us a grand total of \$1,191,694,000 which would be the full 1964 fiscal year cost for the Department of Defense.

As a result, however, of the proposed effective date of October 1, 1963, the fiscal 1964 cost for the Department of Defense will be \$892 million, which is \$8 million below the amount requested by the President for the Department of Defense, and \$46,832,000 below the full fiscal year cost proposed by the Department of Defense.

Finally, I would like to tell you how these increases will be distributed between officers and enlisted personnel.

On the basis of a full fiscal year, involving an annual cost of \$1,191,694,000 for the Department of Defense, \$383 million will be paid to officers and \$808.6 million will be paid to enlisted personnel. This is the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have several questions. I am only going to ask one; I will ask the others during general debate. Will the gentleman tell me how he arrived at this family separation pay of \$30 a month for the enlisted man and \$53 a month for the officer, based on the fact that the man is away from home and she has to hire somebody to cut the grass and fix the leaks and so forth? Do you think that there would be any more occasion for that to happen in the officer's family than in the enlisted man's family?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think it will happen to anybody away from home. I know I am away from home a good deal and I do not have the luxury of living with my family.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Why do you make a distinction between \$30 a month for the enlisted man and \$53 a month for the officer, when the officer has the higher pay?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It works out on the quarters allowance. It is one-third of the quarters allowances paid to bachelor officers. That is the way we arrive at it. Now, repairing a leaky faucet or mowing the grass or something of that sort requires money, but these people do not live in Government quarters, and these are the people we are trying to take care of. This is a retention bill. If you have a highly technical and accomplished officer or enlisted man, he is the one we want to keep in the service.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am talking about the difference in pay. You are not touching on the difference at all between \$30 and \$53.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is the minimum. It is based on the minimum cost of the bachelor officer's allowance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. A bachelor officer would not have any family separation, would he?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We use the smallest amount.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are not going to have family separations with bachelor officers, I hope.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am trying to show you the yardstick we used. If you want to have it for some officer with eight dependents, put in the amendment. We tried to save as much as we could, and we adjusted it. That is my answer.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Would not the gentleman agree with me that the expenses of repairs and obsolescence around the home when an officer is absent on duty would be more expensive in more expensive quarters than in less expensive quarters? Therefore, there is a basic reason for having a percentage figure of the quarters allowances. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina is that not the reasonable explanation?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me in order to permit me to answer that argument?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Why, certainly I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri for anything.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In the first place, this staff officer will have servants to do this job. He would not be doing the job himself. There is not money for it. The enlisted man does that work, and that is why.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I assume that there are people around who do not agree with you. We are trying to keep these people on active duty.

We are checking that figure to try to keep this cost down.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I certainly yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina on his clear analysis of a very, very complicated bill. I want to compliment not only the gentleman from South Carolina but his subcommittee for the hard work and the weeks and months which they have devoted to this bill. The gentleman deserves the thanks not only of the Armed Services Committee but of the House itself.

Now, then, the question I want to ask the gentleman is this—

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood it, the gentleman said concerning recomputation that he was going to offer an amendment to extend recomputation to those who retired prior to 1958 and that that would be the end of the recomputation, as I understood the gentleman. Is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Well, if the—

Mr. VINSON. The question I would like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me answer the chairman. If the amendment carries.

Mr. VINSON. I understand.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. But as long as it is a law on the books I am dedicated to following it.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield further, then he proposes after 1958 to stop the recomputation? Would it not merely magnify and create more inequities than already exist today? What about the man who retired in 1959? What about the man who retired in 1962, or 1961? Is he not entitled to the same principle being applied to him that you

apply to the man who retired prior to 1958? I want to be logical, and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina is very, very logical ordinarily. But I do not think he was quite as logical in that statement as he was in other statements which he has made on this bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Does the chairman want me to answer his question?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, please.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Why, positively not, positively not. We are giving him notice today. You did not give him any notice in 1958. We lowered the boom on him in 1958.

Mr. VINSON. We gave him notice.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And the law was on the books in 1958 and except for just a brief period in the 1920's it had been on the books for 100 long years.

Mr. VINSON. We stopped it in 1958.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We stopped it in the most outrageous manner, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. But you propose to continue this.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is why I am sure the chairman voted with us in that unanimous report from the committee and the unanimous decision of the House to right it, and the bill was passed in 1960.

Mr. VINSON. You propose to give to this group who retired prior to 1958 the right to recompute, but you do not propose to give those who retire after 1958 this recomputation in the 1963 bill. Why should you make fish of one and fowl of the other? If we are on sound ground in one instance why not extend it on to those who retire after 1958?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me respond to my distinguished chairman. I said a while ago it does not take me long to understand when I walk into a stone wall. I recognize the wall is there after a while. But we face the facts of life, and I am willing, despite the fact that I do not agree that we should not give them that right, because age catches up with them.

Mr. VINSON. Will we not have just as much justification—

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am willing to accept it now even though I think they should have it.

Mr. VINSON. Do they not have just as much justification, those who retire under the new pay bill, the 1963 pay bill, to claim the same rights as you are giving those under the amendment with reference to the pre-1958 retirees?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If the gentleman agrees that the basic law was wrong in its inception. I do not agree.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is trying to make the point that we did not know it. It has been on the books for 5 years. We stopped it and denied it in 1958. If we are going to open it up, open it up in its entirety. Is the reason why he wants to stop it in the future because he is apprehensive about the rising cost of retired pay? Was he worried in 1958 when we cut it off?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. However, we did not have too much concern for that in 1958 when the House unanimously passed the bill trying to right this terrible law. I know you agree with me that it is a terrible law. We are not putting them under this act. We are putting them under the act on the books in 1958. For the future we have an escalator clause, when the cost of living goes up 3 percent; and we give them notice. It becomes effective automatically.

William Jennings Bryan once said this—if he did not he should have said it—

The humblest citizen in the land clad in the armor of right can prevail against a whole host of error.

I would rather be wrong on the right side than right on the wrong side.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I certainly approve of recomputation, as the gentleman from South Carolina has outlined, and I feel certain that most Members of the House will look sympathetically upon that question.

Mr. Chairman, the most attractive financial inducement for the services of military personnel is the liberal retirement pattern. A part of this pattern has been for many years the privilege of having retirement benefits tied to the pay of personnel on active duty. It has become usual to say that this principle is so expensive that it will eventually jeopardize the entire retirement program. I think this is a misleading statement; for the only thing that can imperil the retirement program is Congress itself. The principle is a generous one but I think it should be maintained not only for those who retired in 1958 but also for subsequent retirees as well. It is a necessary part of our national defense to have a liberal retirement program as this is the method we chiefly use to give adequate financial incentive for military service. I sincerely hope that Congress will approve continuing this principle of computation on the basis of current active duty pay scales.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my endorsement of the bill H.R. 5555; the proposed military pay increase for members of the uniformed services.

The proposal has been thoroughly discussed by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina, and I will not attempt to add to the detailed explanation.

I would like to point out that in my opinion this bill, if enacted, should go a long way toward solving the serious retention problem in our uniformed services, particularly for those who have acquired skills that are vital to our national defense.

There has been much criticism of some of the actions taken by the committee

and much of it concerns the cost of the proposed measure.

Some persons feel that the bill is inadequate; others are concerned about the increased cost to the Government.

First, I think I should mention that today the cost of pay and allowances for the armed services, exclusive of subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel, on an annual basis involves an expenditure in excess of \$9,952 million.

The proposal before us would increase the cost of basic pay alone by \$847,498,000 on a full fiscal year basis. It will also increase subsistence allowances by about \$13 million a year for officers and \$77 million a year for enlisted personnel.

You will recall that the President recommended enactment of legislation which would have involved an annual expenditure of \$1,238,526,000 for the Department of Defense.

The bill before us involves a cost of \$1,191,694,000.

The subcommittee that considered the proposal under the distinguished chairman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], reported a bill to the full committee that would have involved an annual expenditure for the Department of Defense of \$1,517 million, which was substantially above that recommended by the Department of Defense.

But in addition, it must be remembered that in the President's military budget message he requested only \$900 million for the proposed pay increase for fiscal 1964, since he recommended an October 1, 1963, effective date.

In simple mathematics, the President's budget contained only \$900 million, but the subcommittee's recommendation contemplated a fiscal 1964 expenditure of \$1,517 million, because it contemplated a July 1, 1963, effective date.

We are all concerned, of course, with the cost of Government and deficit financing, and the pay increase recommended by the subcommittee exceeded the President's budget for military pay by some \$617 million for fiscal 1964.

At this point, the committee realized that a \$600 million increase in the President's budget might seriously jeopardize the favorable consideration of this very important pay increase.

As a result, the committee made several substantial changes in the subcommittee proposal.

By eliminating increases for those with under 2 years of service, the subcommittee proposal was reduced by almost \$136 million.

By eliminating a \$30 additional increase across the board for all officers, over and above that recommended by the Department of Defense, another \$111,495,000 was removed from the subcommittee proposal.

Another substantial savings of some \$32 million came about by committee action providing a straight 5 percent increase in retirement pay, and eliminating the recomputation proposal suggested by the Department of Defense.

All together, the actions of the full committee reduced the subcommittee proposal by \$325,489,000 and reduced the

overall cost of the bill, on an annual basis, from \$1,517 million to \$1,191,694,000.

Since the Department proposal originally contemplated an annual expenditure of \$1,238 million, you can see that the committee proposal is \$46,832,000 under the cost of the Department's proposal.

Finally, because the President had only requested \$900 million for the remainder of fiscal 1964, the committee adopted an October 1, 1963 effective date, at a cost of \$891,521,000 for the remainder of fiscal 1964, which is \$8 million under the President's budget for fiscal 1964.

I think we must bear in mind that while there are some persons who feel that this pay proposal is inadequate, nevertheless it is substantial. It is particularly substantial at the important retention points in our armed services.

You might be interested to know something about the cost of the bill by grade distribution.

For example, the entire cost of the proposed increase for four-star generals and admirals involves an increased expenditure of \$32,000.

The cost of the proposed pay increase for three-star admirals and generals is \$95,000 annually.

For major generals it is \$406,000 annually.

For brigadier generals it is \$474,000 annually.

For colonels and Navy captains it is \$16,815,000 annually.

For lieutenant colonels and commanders, \$40,934,000.

At the important retention grade of major, the cost goes to \$63,280,000 annually.

For captains and lieutenants, which is one of the most serious retention points, the cost goes to \$92,319,000, and for 1st lieutenants and lieutenants, junior grade, the cost is \$31,424,000.

Among the enlisted personnel, you will be interested to learn that the increase for E-9's, that is the sergeant majors and master chief petty officers, involves an annual expenditure of \$10,317,000.

For master sergeants and senior chief petty officers, the E-8's, the annual increased cost is \$24,367,000.

For E-7's it is \$43 million.

For E-6's, the staff sergeants, the cost is \$101,563,000.

For the very important retention points of E-5 and E-4, the cost is \$146,953,000 and \$135,582,000, respectively.

For E-3's, the cost is \$87,791,000.

Whenever we increase military pay scales, we must consider where the individuals are distributed by grade.

For example, there are 269,772 privates with under 2 years of service, and only 35,000 with over 2 and under 3 years of service.

On the other hand, there are only 42,000 E-4's with under 2 years of service, but there are 110,000 with over 2 years of service, 60,000 with over 3 years of service, and 89,000 with over 4 years of service. All together, there are 451,000 E-4's.

As you can see, when you increase pay scales by even \$1 a month in these grades, the cost goes up quite rapidly.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also mention another very important feature of the proposal and that is the proposed family separation allowance.

The cost involved here is relatively small, \$42 million a year. Of this amount, it is estimated that enlisted personnel will receive \$37,678,000 annually, while officers will receive only \$4,301,000.

This is a vital part of the bill before us, for it recognizes, for the first time, the costs involved to the family when the breadwinner is away from home for extended periods of time.

We know, and particularly Members of Congress should know, that maintaining two homes, or maintaining a home where the father is away, can be a very expensive proposition.

Today if you call a plumber to fix a leaky faucet, the cost can be rather substantial.

Most fathers when they are home can do minor repairs around the house, but whenever the father is away from home for a long period of time, one of two things happens: the repairs go unattended or the wife must pay for the cost of the repairs.

I sincerely hope that this new benefit which the committee recommends, will be overwhelpingly approved by the House.

The amount is not large, but it is at least a recognition on the part of the Congress that we sympathize with the wives of our service personnel who are faced with long separations from their husbands.

It has a double significance for it is not only a recognition of long separation, but also an allowance which will permit the service wife to maintain the household for her husband the way it would be maintained if he were home.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 5555 and hope that it will receive the overwhelming approval of the House.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I support this pay increase. It is long overdue. We must bear one thing in mind, we get what we pay for.

The last increase in basic pay for members of the uniformed services became effective June 1, 1958. Approximately 5 years have elapsed since this last increase in basic pay was enacted for members of the uniformed services.

Classified employees of the Federal Government, on the other hand, after receiving a pay increase in 1958, received additional increases in 1960 and 1962, and will receive another increase on January 1, 1964. Without question, the hearings conducted by the Armed Services Committee on the proposed legislation established an overwhelming need for an adjustment to the existing rates

of compensation for members of the uniformed services. Committee deliberations were almost exclusively concerned with the amount of increase which could logically be proposed and where the distribution of this increase would do the greatest good.

The purpose of H.R. 5555 is to provide increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances; to establish a new method of adjusting retired pay; and to provide other benefits for members of the uniformed services.

The most important single effect of H.R. 5555 is the general increase in basic rates of pay. This statement in no way depreciates the importance of other provisions of the bill but rather reflects the fact that the increases in basic pay apply to the greatest number of people and accounts for the major cost of the proposed bill.

These selective pay increases which would be provided by the bill are expressly designed to alleviate the enlisted and junior officer retention problems existing in the armed services today.

The critical enlisted retention problem in all the services is associated with retaining individuals in most of the technical occupations upon completion of their initial term of service.

The retention of officers beyond their obligated period of service also poses a serious problem for the services. Here the problem facing the Armed Forces is strictly a question of quality. Unless they can attract and retain more officer personnel with the necessary high degree of competence and dedication required, they are faced with a force structure of steadily declining quality completely incompatible with the increased technological and combat leadership demands being placed upon the Armed Forces.

Consequently, for enlisted members the largest percentage increases are provided at the critical retention points in pay grades E-3 and E-4. Substantial increases are also provided for enlisted members in pay grades E-8 and E-9 at the "over 22" and "over 26" years of service point as an incentive for longer career enlisted service.

For officers the largest percentage increases are in the lower grades of first lieutenant through major. The percentage increases are progressively smaller for the higher ranks, so that the percentage increase for flag and general officers is only 5 percent.

The increases in basic pay recommended in H.R. 5555 were originally contained in the proposal of the Department of Defense. However, the increases in basic pay for members with under 2 years of service proposed by the Department of Defense were not concurred in. As I have stated this pay proposal is a career proposal designed to encourage individuals to undertake or continue in a career status beyond the periods of obligated service required by law. Career service in the past, when the services were entirely manned by volunteers, commenced with an individual's initial entry into the Armed Forces. At the



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7583

present time, and for the foreseeable future, the large numbers of young men who are required to man our Armed Forces cannot be obtained solely from volunteers without the compulsion of selective service laws. Therefore, a dividing line between career service and non-career service has been drawn at the end of the 2-year obligated service period required by law. The action to limit increases in basic pay to those with 2 years and over reduced the total cost of the basic pay increase proposed by the Department of Defense for active duty personnel by \$134,226,000.

Aside from the selective increases which are calculated to improve retention there is a general increase in basic pay for all personnel with over 2 years' service. Since 1952 there has been a steady deterioration of the compensation provided members of the uniformed services. Between 1952 and 1962, the median earnings of professional, scientific, technical, and kindred workers, a group generally comparable to officer personnel has increased by 49 percent. During the same period the average earnings of manufacturing-production workers, a group usually associated with enlisted personnel, has increased by 44.8 percent. The cumulative average increase for classified civil service employees in the past 10 years totals 39.8 percent. For members of the uniformed services, on the other hand, the overall average increase in compensation since 1952, including the recent increase in basic allowance for quarters which became effective January 1, 1963, is 16.2 percent. Even with the increases recommended in the proposed legislation, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in the private economy and civil service employees.

Up to this point I have been discussing the details of the recommended increases in basic pay as well as the amounts attached thereto. But this pay increase involves more than just dollars and numbers of people. There is a principle which we should bear in mind.

There is no open market in most military skills, where they can be hired on an as-needed basis. Furthermore, a good many of the special burdens of military life are acceptable only to dedicated people and not subject to direct compensation. Nevertheless, we would be sadly mistaken if we concluded that military compensation is somehow immune from competition.

It takes cash income to support and rear a family. Every person in the Armed Forces knows whether he is living better or poorer than his friends in civil life.

We face two realities. First, there has been and it seems likely there will continue to be, a trend to increase individual compensation in both private and public employment; second, we consistently lag this trend in setting military pay scales.

We could, if we liked, let the gap grow wider. Underpaying military personnel saves money—at the moment. At a

given moment, the military force is a captive population, bound by terms of enlistment or, in the case of officers, by less specific but still effective commitments. But we can impose this burden only temporarily. We would soon begin paying for it. Some of the payment would be in partially obscured but quite tangible costs—training, for instance. The most serious costs would be in the effectiveness of the Armed Forces, and here the cost could be disastrous.

The pay scale we are here considering provides an average increase of 12.5 percent. This average is significant only as an index of cost in relation to the cost of the current pay scale. Within this overall amount the scale purposefully allocates bigger increases in the most critical segments of the career population, goes down to as little as 5 percent in other areas, and in the case of beginners provides no increase.

Immediate needs have been the principal concern of the Committee on Armed Services in making the recommendations contained in H.R. 5555. Considered solely as a pay matter the proposed scale is probably less than is justified and desirable.

Its limitations obviously are dictated in some measure by the budgetary situation in which we find ourselves, and I wish it were possible to meet this problem more adequately.

But it should be understood clearly that the proposed bill will not be permanently valid. We should be aware that under present trends military pay needs to be adjusted more frequently than at 5-year intervals. Unintentionally, but actually, the Federal Government in its lag in adjusting military pay much of the time has effectively loaded a disproportionate share of the defense costs on the people who man the establishment. This is neither a fair nor a sound policy.

The details on other aspects of the bill will be covered by several of my colleagues. I would like to conclude my statement with a few words about the overall cost and the effective date.

Enactment of this proposed legislation will require additional annual appropriations to the Department of Defense in the approximate amount of \$1.2 billion. For fiscal year 1964 the increase would be slightly less than \$900 million since the proposed legislation submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense contained an effective date of October 1, 1963.

The President, in his budget submission to the Congress for fiscal year 1964, included only \$900 million to cover the cost of the proposed legislation on the basis of an October 1, 1963, effective date.

The committee recognizes that in the Military Pay Acts of 1949, 1952, 1955, and 1958, the Congress established a pattern of providing that pay increases for members of the Armed Forces would become effective on the first day of the first month after enactment. In addition, testimony before the committee during the course of the hearings on the proposed legislation established beyond question that the proposed pay increase for members of the uniformed services is long overdue.

Nonetheless, in view of the practical limitations imposed by the President's budget for fiscal year 1964, the committee has reluctantly acceded to the recommendations of the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the proposed legislation provides for an effective date of October 1, 1963, or the first day of the first month after enactment, whichever is later. The fiscal cost for 1964, assuming an October 1, 1963, effective date, is \$891,521,000, or \$8,479,000 less than the President's budget proposal.

We believe that H.R. 5555, as it stands, is an urgent need—no less urgent than the dollars we shall appropriate for the most critical of our weapons programs. The Committee on Armed Services strongly endorses enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I concur in a great deal of the remarks of my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. As a member of the committee I think we all feel that we would like very much, because of the dedication of our military personnel, to double the amount of this bill and give all we believe they need and deserve. I think we are restricted in our thinking a great deal in trying to justify what we are doing because of the vast billions of dollars that are voted by the Congress for every type of boondoggling project you can imagine, except for those dedicated people who preserve the security of this Nation and the free world.

I have said on the floor of the House before and I have been challenged for this, perhaps facetiously or cynically, but I have said time and again that our military leaders of this Nation have won every war in our history. Every war in our history has been won because of our military leaders and our fighting youth of this Nation, but it has been our civilian leaders that have lost every peace and put the world in the mess it is in today.

I only wish we could do more than we are doing now. But what I have in mind distinctly is what I would call the dedication of the men in our military service. Yet I read yesterday of the disgraceful action taken by the Secretary of Defense against one of the greatest naval officers, one of the greatest military officers we have ever had, one of the finest men it has ever been my privilege to know, Admiral George Anderson, being retired as Chief of Naval Operations. There were some very flowery statements about his fine service, and intimations that he might be kicked upstairs to an ambassadorship. This is a disgraceful action.

We passed in 1958, a pay bill so that we might retain military personnel and not spend billions of dollars for retraining new men all the time. This did not have its desired effect, nor will this bill have its desired effect. What will have the desired effect is the recognition of the motivation and dedication of those men who give their lives for the security of this Nation. We are not going to do this with pay bills alone. We are not going to do it on this floor today. We can only hope we will alleviate their

financial condition and the housing and other conditions under which they have to live in many trying situations over the world.

I would like to quote for a moment an editorial, and I am not addicted to editorial writers because there is one editorial on the same page of today's Evening Star criticizing me. In the bottom editorial they have, "Mr. Becker's Blackout." Above, they say in this editorial in the Evening Star:

We think that Admiral Anderson was denied another term as Chief of Naval Operations, or at least a 1-year extension, for two principal reasons. One was his plain-spoken opposition, when called to testify by the McClellan committee, to Mr. McNamara's TFX project. The other, and perhaps lesser reason, was his criticism of the military pay bill. But the two statements, read together, do not make sense. They are an affront to the intelligence of a child.

Then they go on further to say:

If, as we believe, TFX was an important if not a dominant factor in what has happened to Admiral Anderson, doubts are raised in our mind as to whether Mr. McNamara is a "big" man as well as a competent man.

Further:

Mr. McNamara should be the boss, but it does not follow that he should be a czar and absolute master in his own domain.

Mr. Chairman, the editorial in full is as follows:

#### THE FIRING OF ADMIRAL ANDERSON

Adm. George W. Anderson's distinguished career in the Navy has been torpedoed by Defense Secretary McNamara. Those who are willing to buy one or both of the official explanations which have been offered are welcome to do so. We do not buy either.

We think that Admiral Anderson was denied another term as Chief of Naval Operations, or at least a 1-year extension, for two principal reasons. One was his plain-spoken opposition, when called to testify by the McClellan committee, to Mr. McNamara's TFX project. The other, and perhaps lesser reason, was his criticism of the military pay bill.

In this connection we make one point. The official spokesman at the Pentagon says Mr. McNamara and the President believe that 2 years should be a normal tour as service chief except in extraordinary circumstances. Well and good. But the President, in announcing that Admiral Anderson was being dumped overboard, also said that "he has served with great distinction during a critical period in this Nation's history." We realize that praise of this sort has become more or less the conventional thing when the executioner is getting set for his task. But the two statements, read together, do not make sense. They are an affront to the intelligence of a child.

Our concern, however, runs to more than the injustice which, as we see it, has been done to Admiral Anderson. He had reached the top in the Navy, and this denial of a second term as Chief of Naval Operations does not necessarily mean a blighted career for the future. But what about the Secretary of Defense? And what about those other service people who, one day, will find themselves in Admiral Anderson's position?

As for the Secretary, we have already made plain our belief that his decision on the TFX was the right one. We have expressed our respect for his competence and stated in addition that the Pentagon should and must be run by a strong civilian. The Secretary of Defense ought to be just that—the Secretary of Defense. He should not al-

low himself to be pushed around by generals or admirals. But this affair shakes us up a bit. If, as we believe, TFX was an important if not a dominant factor in what has happened to Admiral Anderson, doubts are raised in our mind as to whether Mr. McNamara is a "big" man as well as a competent man.

Of possibly greater importance is the effect that the timing of the Anderson ouster can be expected to have on other service officers when called in the future to testify before congressional committees.

Mr. McNamara, or so we are told, doesn't care much what people say or think about him. He is too busy running the Defense Department. But he ought to care—especially when he is trying both to install new management techniques in the Pentagon and to shake up the services a bit. Mr. McNamara should be the boss. But it doesn't follow that he should be a czar—an absolute master in his own domain.

For, whether he realizes it or not, he has a partner in this defense enterprise—and it will never be a silent partner. This partner is the Congress, representing the people of the United States. We do not think that Congress should conduct nit-picking harrassments of the Secretary of Defense. But we do believe, and very strongly, that the appropriate committees of Congress are entitled to know what is going on in the Pentagon and that they should be able to call the service chiefs, or other officers, before them and have the benefit of their uninhibited, un intimidated, and completely honest opinions on matters affecting the security of the United States.

It is not our intention to say that Mr. McNamara is deliberately trying to gag the service people. But we think that is the effect of what he has done in the case of Admiral Anderson and, to a lesser extent, in the case of General Lemay. Unless the atmosphere in this respect is cleared, and convincingly cleared, we fear that many officers in the future will hesitate to give testimony to any congressional committee which brings them into conflict with a strong-willed Secretary of Defense. Surely it is not necessary to argue the point that this is potentially dangerous for the people of the United States—dangerous both to their security and, someday perhaps, to their freedom.

Mr. Chairman, let me remind you of this. We appoint young men, the finest young men, the cream of the crop from our district to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the Air Force Academy at Denver, and to the Military Academy at West Point. Why do we appoint them? What do we do in our investigation and in our efforts? We try to get the best men we can get because we want motivated, dedicated young men who will be the military leaders of this Nation and who will continue, God willing, when we are in trouble, so that we will be able to win not only the battle but the war.

I say what has happened to George Anderson is a disgrace to this Nation. It is not the first time it has happened. But as one American, and as one Member of this House, I say to you, while we are discussing a pay bill, providing for pay increase and other emoluments, let us not forget that this is not going to pay for the dedication of these men, but we do want to show respect for their service and their intelligence and their ability and an appreciation of their willingness to serve and to give advice to our civilian leaders. They must also be heard and recognized because of their experience and ability.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had the time to say more not only about George Anderson, but I would mention Gen. Curtis LeMay, Adm. Arleigh Burke, General MacArthur and many others. There was Billy Mitchell in the First World War. The way we have treated some of these men by our civilian leaders is a disgrace to this Nation, and God knows we need these men.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 27 minutes.

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the subcommittee, has indicated, this is not a dramatic bill, it is not a glamorous presentation that we are making before you today, and we purposely approach it in that way. There is no need for us to talk about the *Thresher* or the men who gave their lives on that ship; or the accounts in the newspapers about the widows of those men and the talk about the small pitance that they received after their husbands had lost their lives. We are not talking about those who only last week in California went down on the *Andrew Jackson* on its first trial run—another *Polaris* submarine. We are all old enough to understand the facts without having recourse to that emotional kind of discussion.

Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of H.R. 5555, the proposed Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963 is threefold:

First. It would provide selective increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances.

Second. It would establish a new method for adjusting retirement or retainer pay in the future based on increases in the cost of living.

Third. It would correct certain inequities in the present compensation system for service members.

Mr. Chairman, the overall increase which would be made by this bill in the present level of expenditures for basic pay and allowances for military personnel of our Active Forces is approximately 10 percent.

A comparison between increases in the pay of military personnel and increases in the pay of civilian employees of the Government for the past 10 years shows that the pending bill gives only a very modest increase in the compensation of military personnel.

For example, in 1955, classified civil service employees received a 7.5-percent increase in compensation; in 1958 they received a 10-percent increase; in 1960 they received a 7.7-percent increase; in 1962 they received a 5.5-percent increase, and will receive a further increase of 4.1 percent on January 1, 1964.

In contrast, the basic pay scales for members of the uniformed services have been increased only twice in the past 10 years.

In the case of military personnel, Congress in 1955 provided an average increase in basic compensation of 6.7 percent. In 1958 military personnel received an average increase in basic compensation of 6.2 percent. Thus, the last time that the rates of basic pay for members

of the uniformed services were increased was some 5 years ago.

In 1962 Congress, for the first time in 10 years, authorized a sorely needed increase in the basic allowance for quarters for members of the uniformed services. The effective date of the increase, however, was delayed until January 1, 1963.

For military personnel this increase in the quarters allowance represented an average increase of 2.5 percent in basic compensation. All the percentages I have stated represent percentage increases in the budget estimates for basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances for personnel on active duty.

Expressed another way, the cumulative percentage of pay increases provided by Congress since 1952 for classified civil service employees is 39.8 percent. For military personnel over the same period, Congress has provided a cumulative increase of 16.2 percent including the recent increase in the basic allowance for quarters.

It has been said before and it is just as true today, that pay alone is not, and never has been, the primary motivation for a career in the armed services.

We could never compensate in dollars for the hazards and privations that members of the armed services must be prepared to accept, and do accept, in wearing the uniform of their country. But, what Congress can do, and in simple justice ought to do, is to extend to our service men and women the same consideration that we have consistently demonstrated in providing pay increases for civilian employees of the Government.

I believe, particularly in the case of members of the uniformed services who have no unions to bargain for them, that the Congress has a duty to see to it that the rates of pay for service members are regularly adjusted to conform to the pattern of steadily increasing earnings in the United States.

Such a policy is in the national interest and is the only sound one in the long run. It is the only policy which can make it possible for the armed services to attract and retain their fair share of our best young men for career service.

#### THE PROBLEM—INADEQUATE RETENTION

Mr. Chairman, our national commitments require military personnel to serve in many locations where their dependents cannot accompany them. Our troops, ships, and aircraft squadrons are deployed in instant readiness for combat, and personnel so deployed must undergo considerable hardship, including long separations from their homes and families. The combination of inadequate pay and personal hardship is effectively preventing the Armed Forces from attracting sufficient young candidates for career military service, while at the same time, personnel with substantial investments of service are quitting the Armed Forces.

The loss of highly trained personnel, particularly in the enlisted technician category, and the loss of young officers, especially flying and submarine officers, is very expensive in terms of the money required for their training. More im-

portant, it is damaging to the combat efficiency of the Armed Forces.

In order to maintain the required force structure, the military services must recruit or draft annually about 450,000 men to replace an equivalent number leaving the service. Thus, the total administrative load, or the in-and-out problem generated by such turnover, is more than 900,000 men a year. Training costs of the military services total about \$2,500 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, increased retention of skilled manpower not only means increased operational efficiency, but also that a substantial investment in technical training costs would be preserved. For example, it costs \$8,530 to train an Army electronic guidance systems repairman; \$12,550 to train an Air Force nuclear weapons specialist.

All of the services are short of the desired number of careerists in the electronics and other technical career fields. The Army is short 19,100 careerists in electronics, and another 10,200 in other technical specialties. The Navy is short 34,000 careerists in electronics, and 18,600 career mechanics and repairmen.

The services are procuring and training sufficient numbers to have the desired 60 to 65 percent career force in electronics, but too few are reenlisting for the career force. In 1962, out of 39,000 fully trained electronics specialists who were eligible to reenlist, only 9,936 reenlisted. The 29,000 who did not reenlist represented a training loss of \$135 million, and an experience loss that is impossible to estimate.

I could cite many other examples but I will mention only a few more for illustration of the problem.

To train an aviation fire control technician for the Navy costs \$7,580. The desired career ratio for this skill is over 50 percent; the actual career ratio is 34 percent. Similarly, it costs \$6,660 to train a Navy aviation electronics technician but only one out of three men in this skill is a career man.

The Army spends \$8,530 to train an electronics guidance repairman for surface-to-surface missiles. Only 15 percent trained in this field are reenlisted for a second term; 85 percent leave the service.

Not all the problems are in the electronics field. It costs \$8,000 to train a teletypewriter maintenance man, and the Army needs 60 percent of these men to be careerists. It has only 40 percent who are careerists.

It costs \$5,300 to train a specialist in the communications security field and it takes a full enlistment to reach acceptable proficiency. Yet, the Army has only 18 percent careerists in this field.

The problems of inadequate retention and associated high replacement training costs are not limited to enlisted personnel.

When officers leave after serving a minimum tour of duty—and approximately two out of three do leave—the cost of procuring and training replacements must also be repeated.

In particular, pilots leaving the service represent a large investment. It costs

a minimum of \$75,000 to put an Air Force pilot through pilot training; and an additional \$200,000 to qualify him in a fighter aircraft such as the F-102, for a total cost of \$275,000.

During the next fiscal year, it is estimated that some 525 Air Force pilots alone will voluntarily leave the service, representing an investment cost of \$130 million.

Retention rates of officers in other fields are equally disturbing. The Air Force, with a critical need for officers in the scientific and engineering skills is retaining only about 15 percent of such officers upon completion of their obligated service. In some research and development specialties, the retention rate is as low as 7 percent. The Army is retaining only 16 percent of its Judge Advocate General officers, and 19 percent of its engineers. The Navy experience is equally poor.

These are the facts, among others, which principally determined the pattern of the proposed basic pay increases which I will now discuss.

#### BASIC PAY INCREASE

Mr. Chairman, no Member of the House should let the cost of the bill mislead him into thinking that the selective increases in basic pay which the bill would provide are generous in any respect.

The plain and simple fact is that the sheer size of the Armed Forces which our national security requires makes even a modest pay increase for service members bulk large in terms of total cost.

For example, to increase the pay of all members of the Armed Forces by even \$10 a month would mean a total annual increased cost of \$382 million. The fact of force size alone, and the fact that some 5 years have elapsed since the last increase in basic pay for service members, make self-evident the reasons for the cost of the bill.

Let me tell you, generally, what we have done with reference to the increase in basic pay.

With one major exception the rates of basic pay in this bill correspond to rates originally recommended by the Department of Defense. The major exception is that the Department of Defense had proposed increases in basic pay for all members irrespective of length of service. The committee rejected this proposal. Under this bill before you, no increase is provided for members with less than 2 years of service for pay purposes. For members with more than 2 years of service for pay purposes, the average increase is 14.7 percent.

The pattern of selective pay increases which would be provided by this bill has been expressly designed to alleviate the enlisted and junior officer retention problems I have described.

For officers, the highest percentage increase, about 18 percent, is provided at the critical retention points in the grades of first lieutenant and captain. The amount of the increase is progressively less for each higher grade. The average increase for majors is 15.1 percent; for lieutenant colonels, 12.1 percent; for

colonels, 10 percent; and for flag and general officers, 5 percent.

For enlisted members the largest percentage increases, in general, go to members in pay grade E-3, 18 percent; and in pay grade E-4, 16 percent. The smallest increase, 4.8 percent, would be provided for members in pay grade E-1 with more than 2 years of service.

The critical point in the career decision for most enlisted members is at the 3- to 4-year service point. By that time the average enlisted man has advanced to the grade of E-4 and is seriously eyeing the pay rates for the E-5. Accordingly, this bill provides a basic pay increase of \$30 a month to the E-4 with over 4 years of service, and a \$30 increase to the E-5 with over 6 years of service. This amounts to a 17.6-percent increase in basic pay for the E-4, and a 14.3-percent increase for the E-5. We hope that these increases will prove sufficient to encourage a significant number of enlisted men to seek career status at this critical decision point.

The largest increases, dollarwise, would go to enlisted members in the three highest enlisted pay grade, E-7, E-8, and E-9.

Under the present pay scale, enlisted members in pay grades E-8 and E-9 receive only one longevity increase of \$10 a month between 20 and 30 years of service, and the E-7 receives no longevity increases. As a result, most of these highly skilled noncommissioned officers leave the service at the 20- or 22-year point.

The bill would correct this deficiency in the present pay scale by providing significant incentive increases for all three senior enlisted grades at the 22- and 26-year service points. At the 22-year point, the increase for the E-7 will be \$50 a month; for the E-8 and E-9, \$70. At the 26-year point, the E-7 will receive a \$100 a month increase, and the E-8 and E-9 will each receive a \$120 a month more.

At present, the maximum basic pay an E-7, master sergeant, can receive is \$350, after 20 years' service. This bill will increase that to \$450. For an E-9, the present maximum is \$440 after 22 years of service. Under this bill he would receive \$560 a month in basic pay after 26 years' service.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED PAY RATES

Mr. Chairman, the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services were last increased in 1958. Since that time, increases in earnings of workers in private industry, and of civilian employees of the Federal Government have created a substantial disparity between service pay and the compensation available elsewhere for comparable skills and responsibilities.

For example, the indexes of earnings in private industry show that the average pay of officers has lagged substantially behind increases in earnings elsewhere in the economy. Since 1958, the median earnings of full-time employed, professional, scientific and technical workers, a group generally comparable to officer personnel, has been increasing about 3 percent a year.

For classified civil service employees in grades GS-8 through GS-12, which in general are related, paywise, to the com-

missioned officer grades of first lieutenant through major, Congress, since 1958, has provided cumulative pay increases—including phase 2 of the 1962 increase—ranging from 19 to 23 percent.

It can be seen, therefore, that even the maximum increase of 18 percent in basic pay which this bill would provide for first lieutenants and captains is not excessive when compared to the pay increases achieved by the other groups I have mentioned.

The 5-percent increase which this bill would provide for flag and general officers is based on the increase in the cost of living since 1958 as reflected in the Consumer Price Index. In other words, for the most senior officers, this bill does no more than maintain the purchasing power of their basic pay at the 1958 level.

With respect to enlisted members, the bill now before the House would provide an average increase of 14.5 percent in basic pay. Since 1958 the average hourly earnings, excluding overtime, of production workers in manufacturing has increased 15.1 percent. The average earnings of Army-Air Force wage board blue collar workers, a group generally comparable to enlisted personnel, has increased by 20 percent since 1958.

The proposed average increase in basic pay for enlisted members is therefore fairly close to the average increase in hourly earnings of production workers in industry, but less than the average increase in earnings since 1958 for blue collar workers of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is clear from the facts I have cited that the proposed average increase in basic pay for both officers and enlisted members is in no way excessive and will do no more than narrow the gap which has developed between service pay and the earnings of workers elsewhere in the economy.

#### INCENTIVE HAZARDOUS-DUTY PAY

The bill now before the House would also amend existing law governing entitlement to incentive hazardous-duty pay. Although these changes are minimal from a cost standpoint, they would correct certain deficiencies and inequities in existing law. The amendments that would be made pertain to submarine pay, incentive pay for high-pressure chamber duty, and multiple payments of incentive pay.

#### SUBMARINE PAY

We all know and realize the importance of our submarine fleet. This essential element of our defense posture is being expanded, and conventional submarines are giving way to vastly more complicated, nuclear-powered, missile-firing submarines. The conversion and strengthening of our submarine fleet requires extensive retraining of individuals now qualified in and assigned to conventional submarines, as well as thousands of new volunteers. However, existing law does not authorize submarine pay during time spent in training as a prospective member of a submarine being constructed, or during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design. Yet, when these multi-million-dollar subma-

rines slide into the water, their crews are expected to be fully qualified to operate them as fighting units of the fleet.

The limitations of existing law have seriously hampered the Navy in obtaining sufficient volunteers from personnel qualified in submarines. The reason is one of pure economics. Officers and men already qualified in submarines and receiving submarine pay, cannot afford to voluntarily give up their submarine pay while undergoing training for assignment to submarines of advanced design.

The bill now before the House will correct this inequity by authorizing, in the case of personnel already qualified in submarines, the payment of submarine pay during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design, or a position of increased responsibility on a submarine. The annual cost of this provision would be \$2,065,000.

#### HIGH-PRESSURE-CHAMBER DUTY

The second change in incentive pay for hazardous duty concerns those officers and enlisted members performing duty as an observer or in any other capacity "inside a high- or low-pressure chamber." The present law authorizes monthly hazardous-duty payments of \$110 for officers and \$55 for enlisted members on duty as a "low-pressure chamber inside observer" only. The present bill would merely extend the special pay to include duty in a high-pressure chamber as well as a low-pressure chamber, regardless of whether or not the individual is an observer.

The risks taken and the training required to work in a high-pressure environment are similar to those in a low-pressure environment and should be equally compensated. The annual cost of this provision would be \$145,000.

#### MULTIPLE HAZARDS

In the Military Establishment today the mission of certain units requires members to expose themselves concurrently to two or more hazards, any one of which would qualify them to receive incentive-hazardous duty pay. For example, certain demolition experts are required to train as parachutists and to jump into areas to neutralize explosives. This bill would duly recognize the multiple hazard involved in such duties by providing that members required to regularly perform two or more hazardous duties be authorized to receive not more than two incentive pays a month. The annual cost of this provision would be \$1,941,000.

#### INCREASE IN SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

Mr. Chairman, this bill would also increase, for the first time in 11 years, the basic allowances for subsistence for officers and enlisted members. It is an adjustment that is obviously long overdue if this element of basic compensation for service members is to continue to fulfill its intended function.

#### OFFICERS

For officers, the present rate of \$47.88 a month would be increased to \$51 a month or, in other words, an increase of \$3.12 a month. This is a 6.6-percent in-

crease over the present rate and is based on the increase in the cost of food since 1952 as reflected in the Consumer Price Index.

I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Defense recommended that the subsistence allowance for officers be increased from \$47.88 a month to \$77 a month. Under the Department of Defense proposal, the increased cost in subsistence allowance for officers would have been \$122 million annually. The Department of Defense, however, did not recommend any increase in the subsistence allowances for enlisted members.

The Committee on Armed Services did not accept the recommendation of the Department of Defense. Under the lesser amount recommended by the committee, the increased annual cost for subsistence for officers would be \$13 million, or \$109 million less than the cost that would have resulted from the Defense proposal. This means that under the bill now before the House, each officer would receive \$26 a month less in basic compensation than was recommended by the Department of Defense. At the same time, however, the increase in subsistence allowances which this bill would provide for enlisted members will increase the take-home pay of enlisted members by \$77,549,000 a year.

#### ENLISTED MEMBERS

You will recall that under existing law three different subsistence allowances are prescribed for enlisted members depending upon the conditions applicable. Two of the rates are prescribed by statute. The third rate is established administratively by the Secretary of Defense and is applicable to enlisted members authorized to ration separately.

The number of enlisted men presently authorized to ration separately is about 800,000. Generally, these are career enlisted men who are married and subsist with their families. Under existing law these enlisted members are entitled to an amount equivalent to the actual cost of the ration as determined by the Secretary of Defense. At present this amount is \$1.03 a day, or about \$31 a month. It reflects only the cost of the food to the Government to feed the member if he were subsisting in the mess hall.

Under this bill, for the first time in the history of the military pay system, enlisted members authorized to ration separately will be entitled to a statutory monthly amount. The amount prescribed in the bill is \$37.50 a month, or the equivalent of \$1.25 a day on a 30-day month.

The Committee on Armed Services believes that the proposed amount of \$37.50 a month for an enlisted member to subsist separately is an eminently reasonable and modest one in light of its intended function. Certainly, it more nearly approximates the cost of meals served in the mess hall since the present amount of \$1.03 a day does not recognize the added cost to the Government of procuring, shipping, storing, and issuing

the raw food to the mess halls, nor the cost of preparing and serving it.

At the same time, by placing the subsistence allowance for enlisted members on a monthly basis, the bill would effect a highly desirable simplification and modernization of the present system.

The increased annual cost resulting from this proposed increase in the amount of the subsistence allowance for enlisted members who ration separately would be \$54 million.

The other changes in rates for subsistence allowance which would be made by the bill would affect relatively few members.

The first of these changes would increase from \$2.57 a day to \$97.50 a month—equivalent to \$3.25 a day—the subsistence allowance for enlisted members who do not have a field ration mess available, and whose duty assignment requires them to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of those incurred by other members authorized to ration separately.

At present, there are approximately 63,000 enlisted members who receive the \$2.57-a-day subsistence allowance. However, from testimony developed during the course of hearings on this provision, it was ascertained that some of these men are assigned to areas where messing facilities or commissaries are available, although not at the installation to which they actually report. Obviously, for these men the cost of subsisting is not substantially greater than for the enlisted man assigned to a base where messing facilities or a commissary are available, but who is authorized to mess separately. Therefore, under the language of this bill, some enlisted members now receiving the \$2.57 daily subsistence allowance would only be entitled to receive the lower \$1.25-a-day rate. Others now receiving \$2.57 a day and performing duties which actually require them to incur substantially increased subsistence would receive \$97.50 a month—\$3.25 a day equivalent.

The change represents an increase of 26 percent and is based on the increase in the cost of meals served in restaurants since 1952 when the last previous adjustment to this rate was made. The annual increased cost of this provision in the bill would be \$15 million.

The third rate which would be changed by the bill is the rate presently authorized for enlisted personnel assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no messing facilities of the United States are available. Under existing law this rate is \$3.42 a day. The number of enlisted men—about 800 a year—who receive this amount is extremely small and such assignments invariably are of short duration. Under the bill the new rate would be \$129.30 a month. This is equivalent to \$4.31 a day on a 30-day month, or a 26-percent increase. It, too, is based on the increased cost since 1952 of eating in restaurants, as reflected in the Consumer Price Index. The annual increased cost of this provision in the bill would be \$274,000.

#### NEW FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

Mr. Chairman, one of the most acute problems confronting service members is the lack of any reimbursement to them for the additional expenses caused by lengthy, enforced separation of service families.

To correct this inequity and to alleviate the financial hardships caused by the added expenses which result from such enforced separations, the bill now before the House would establish a new allowance to be known as a family separation allowance.

Briefly, this provision of the bill will do two things:

First, it provides an additional quarter allowance to members with dependents who are assigned to an oversea station without their dependents and where bachelor quarters are not available for the service members.

Under such circumstances, the effect of existing law is that the service member is required to find quarters on the local economy and pay for such quarters out of his own pocket. This inequity would be corrected by the bill in that it would authorize, in effect, reimbursement to the member for this additional, necessary expense.

Second, it provides to all eligible members—pay grade E-4 with 4 years of service and all pay grades above—when separated from their families for a period of 30 consecutive days or longer, an allowance of \$30 a month or one-third the amount of the basic allowance for quarters of a member of the same grade without dependents, whichever is greater. This means that the range of this allowance would be a minimum of \$30 to a maximum of \$53 a month. To qualify for this allowance, the family separation must be involuntary; that is, due to exigencies of the service, and the dependents of the service member must not be occupying Government quarters during the absence of the service member.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the need and justification for the proposed family separation allowance are all too evident to require extended discussion.

It must be recognized that as a result of the continuing tensions of cold war, more and more members of the uniformed services are being separated from their families for longer periods of time, and on a recurring basis.

For example, in the Tactical Air Command, 49 percent of all personnel assigned to that command were away from their home bases without their families for more than 6 months out of each of the last two preceding fiscal years.

During calendar year 1962, the 14 carriers of the U.S. fleet were absent from home ports for an average of 329 days out of the 366 of the year.

Many of our service personnel are assigned to isolated points where their families cannot join them, such as radar sites and duty in the Antarctic. It is obvious that when the breadwinner of a family is away from home for extended periods of time, the cost of maintaining the household increases. This includes

the expense of hiring help to do the various handyman jobs that are normally taken care of by the husband when the family is together, such as home and automobile maintenance and repair, yard maintenance, and increased child care expenses.

Mr. Chairman, it is too much to ask of our service members that they not only undergo enforced separations from their families for extended periods, but also pay out of their pockets all the extra expenses to their families which result from these separations. The assistance which this proposed allowance would provide will do a great deal to ease the present burden on our servicemen and their families.

The estimated annual cost of this section of the bill for the Department of Defense is approximately \$42 million.

#### EXCLUDING HAWAII AS FOREIGN-DUTY STATION

Among the proposals made by the Department of Defense to the Committee on Armed Services was the elimination of sea- and foreign-duty pay for enlisted personnel. The committee rejected this proposal.

Under existing law only enlisted members receive sea- and foreign-duty pay. Such pay was eliminated for officers in 1949. The amounts of sea- and foreign-duty pay today for enlisted members range from \$8 a month to \$22.50 a month, depending on the grade of the enlisted member concerned.

We believe that the present system of sea- and foreign-duty pay is essential for morale purposes and in recognition of the many unpleasant aspects of such duty. Enlisted members at sea for long periods of time most often live under crowded, cramped conditions. Enlisted members on foreign duty and in Alaska must often serve in undesirable areas for extended periods of time.

The committee does believe, however, that existing law should be amended so that entitlement to foreign duty pay shall not include duty in the State of Hawaii, and the bill would so provide.

#### PROPOSED CHANGES AFFECTING RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. Chairman, this bill also contains three major provisions affecting retirement pay for members of the uniformed services. In effect, these provisions would accomplish the following:

#### NEW METHOD FOR FUTURE ADJUSTMENTS OF RETIRED PAY

To replace the former system of recomputation of retired pay based on changes in active duty pay rates and which was in effect prior to June 1, 1958, a new statutory method is provided for adjustment of retirement or retainer pay in the future.

The proposed new system is essentially the same as the system prescribed by the Congress in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 for adjustment of annuities of civil service retirees. Future adjustments of retired pay for members of the uniformed services would be based on increases in the cost of living as reflected in the Consumer Price Index. Whenever the increase is equal to or greater than 3 percent since the last adjustment of

retirement pay or retainer pay, then all retired pay rates would be increased by the same percentage.

#### APPLICATION OF PROPOSED PAY SCALES TO PERSONNEL WHO RETIRE IN 1963

The proposed legislation provides that personnel who became entitled to retired or retainer pay during calendar year 1963 will be paid retired or retainer pay on the new rates contained in the bill. The committee considers this provision to be fully justified in fairness to the many retirees who have no control over their separation date during this calendar year. This situation has become accentuated by the fact that the proposed effective date for the proposed legislation is October 1, 1963 or the first day of the first month after enactment, whichever is later.

The services all have programs to reduce the World War II hump in certain grades and to revitalize the force. Many members also face mandatory retirement due to physical disability, age, and completion of certain mandatory years of service.

Recommendations of the Department of Defense for increases in the basic pay scales were submitted to the Congress on the 25th day of January 1963. Almost without exception, therefore, the service members who retired, or will be retired, during this calendar year were still on active duty when the proposed new rates of basic pay were submitted to the Congress. The Committee on Armed Services believes that these service members have rightfully earned the extension to them of the proposed new rates of basic pay.

Accordingly, the bill would authorize the retired pay of members retired at any time during 1963, and before the effective date of the bill, to be computed on the proposed new rates of basic pay.

#### FIVE-PERCENT INCREASE IN RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. Chairman, the third important provision affecting retired personnel would provide a 5-percent increase in present rates of retirement pay or retainer pay for all other retired personnel.

The proposed increase of 5 percent is based on the increase in the cost of living between 1958 and 1962 as reflected in the Consumer Price Index.

None of the provisions that I have mentioned affecting the rates of retired pay are retroactive. The new rates would be payable only from and after the effective date of this bill.

#### ANNUAL COST—SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, in view of the various provisions contained in the bill now under consideration, and the importance of this bill to all members of the uniformed services, I believe it would be helpful to the Members of the House for me to summarize at this point the cost aspects of the bill as a whole.

Under this bill, the total annual cost of the proposed increases in pay and allowance for military personnel will be \$1,191,694,000. Of this total, \$1,052,630,000 is for active personnel, \$68,845,000 for Reserves in a drill pay status, and \$70,219,000 for retired personnel—\$383,-

005,000 will go to officers, \$808,633,000 to enlisted personnel, and \$56,000 to officer candidates and cadets.

The proposed increase in basic pay for active and reserve personnel accounts for \$915,156,000 and the increase in subsistence, \$90,560,000. These will have the further effect of increasing other items linked to either or both of these, such as reenlistment bonus, terminal leave pay, severance pay, reserve readjustment, social security, and death gratuity, by \$75,114,000. Nearly all of the remainder for active and reserve personnel results from the proposed family separation allowance when exigencies of the service prevent families from living at or near the duty station. The annual cost of the family separation allowance will be \$41,979,000.

The annual cost of H.R. 5555 is \$46,832,000 below the cost of the Defense Department proposal. This reduction was accomplished even though the committee refused the Department's proposals, to abolish sea and foreign duty pay—which is only paid to enlisted personnel—and to deny any increase in basic pay for drills attended by Reserve members in an obligatory status. Also, the committee added \$77,549,000 for an increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel, who had received no increase in this item since 1952. The reduction in the total cost was accomplished by eliminating any increases in basic pay for members with less than 2 years of service and by reducing the proposed increase in the subsistence allowance for officers.

The total cost includes the extension of the scope of submarine pay to include time devoted to certain types of training, at a cost of \$2,065,000. Also, it is proposed to allow the concurrent payment of two types of hazardous duty incentive pay in appropriate circumstances, at a cost of \$1,979,000.

All of the costs I have stated are on an annual basis. However, it is proposed to have the increases become effective on October 1, 1963, or on the first day of the month following enactment, whichever is later. If the effective date is October 1, 1963, the increase in cost for fiscal year 1964 will be \$891,521,000.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I have covered the major provisions of the bill. I believe the bill provides, at minimum cost, a sorely needed and long overdue pay increase for members of the uniformed services. I believe the selective pay increases which are provided by the bill have been placed where they are most needed and will be the most effective in attracting and retaining trained personnel for career service.

I cannot overemphasize the fact that without trained and experienced personnel, the effort and billions of dollars we spend on weapons, ships, planes and submarines could be wasted.

The Armed Forces are responsible for the security of the United States. They must be ready and effective. To be ready and effective they must be able to attract and retain adequate numbers of our best people.

I have high hopes for the results which may be achieved by the enactment of this bill. I believe that the reduced training costs made possible by improved retention of highly trained officers and enlisted members will offset in substantial part the cost of the bill.

I know that increased retention of our skilled officers and enlisted members will be reflected in increased combat capability, making this bill an essential and worthwhile investment in our national security.

I sincerely trust the bill will be favorably received by the House and that it will be adopted.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, last week end when I was home a number of servicemen engaged in recruiting duty and who, therefore, live off the post where no rations are available, called on me and expressed concern that their allowance of \$2.57 a day would be cut to \$1.25 by the passage of this bill. On page 23 of the committee report the language regarding subsistence allowances indicates to me that their fears were unfounded. In fact, their \$2.57 will be increased to \$3.25 a day. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts or the chairman of the subcommittee whether I am correct in that?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We have gotten out a letter on this subject. This idea that the ration allowance for enlisted personnel will be reduced is entirely in error.

There is no intention on the part of the committee to reduce the present allowance now paid to personnel on civilian component duty, such as ROTC, Reserve, and National Guard duty, recruiting duty, or other similar duty, where the enlisted personnel involved are not assigned to a military installation or a Government mess is not available.

All allowances for enlisted personnel will be increased under the pay increase now under consideration.

The subsistence allowances, when rations in kind are not available—and this is the case the gentleman refers to—are to be increased from \$2.57 to \$3.25 per day. The \$3.25 a day will be payable when the member's duty assignment requires him to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of members permitted to mess separately. He gets the \$3.25 and the \$1.25 figure does not apply to him. Many of them have told me of their worry about this, but their concern is not well founded. We would not do this under any circumstances.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman. I think these recruiters are doing an excellent job. I think they ought to be encouraged to continue their efforts. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman

from Massachusetts on the fine way he has presented the facts on this difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 5555. Between 1952 and 1962, the average earnings of professional, scientific, technical workers, and others in categories generally similar to military officer personnel have increased by 49 percent. At the same time the average earnings of manufacturing-production workers, a group which might be considered analogous to enlisted personnel, has gone up 44.8 percent over the 10 years in question. The civil service employees, as the result of numerous pay raises over the past 10 years have gone up a total of 39.8 percent. The uniformed personnel of the Armed Forces have received pay raises over the 10-year time period totaling but 16.2 percent.

The pending bill will raise pay for uniformed personnel of the Department of Defense by about 12.6 percent. The bill substantially follows the recommendations of the administration. It will cost slightly less in fiscal 1964 than budgetary provisions suggested for this purpose by the President.

Classified employees of the Federal Government have received raises in 1958, 1960, 1962, and will receive another in 1964. It has been 5 years since there has been a pay raise for the members of the uniformed services. It is time Congress began the task of equalizing the existing disparity in compensation.

(Mr. STAFFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. May I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who was an outstanding officer of the Navy. I think the gentleman knows as much about this subject, if not more, than any other Member. He is a tower of strength on our subcommittee. Without his fine contribution I doubt if we would have gotten this bill out at all. His knowledge on this subject is extraordinary.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I, too, want to join our colleagues in complimenting the gentleman from Massachusetts for the admirable manner in which he has explained a complicated bill.

I want to say this. It has been my privilege over the years to participate in a great many pay bills. There can be no doubt that this pay bill is the most equitable and fairest pay bill that has been submitted to the Congress during the time I have had the honor to serve here. I certainly trust that this bill will receive the overwhelming support of every Member of this House. It is fair and equitable to the Active Forces and it is fair and equitable to those in the Reserves. I hope this committee bill will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment

the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] for his excellent and clear statement concerning the proposed legislation.

I also want to compliment all members of the subcommittee of which he is chairman for the fine work they did in the recommendations submitted to the full committee.

I think most of us will agree that because of rising costs, and the substantial increases that have been enacted for civil service employees, as well as the fact that wages and salaries have been increased in all segments of American industry, that a pay increase for members of the uniformed services is not only fully justified, but absolutely necessary if we are to retain the trained personnel we need so badly.

It is also essential if we are to obtain, on a career basis, the type of men we must have in our Armed Forces in order to maintain our combat efficiency, and to utilize the highly complicated weapons systems that we are now producing.

Now the Department of Defense submitted a pay proposal to the Congress which recommended an annual increase of \$1,238,526,000, for 2,710,000 members of the armed services on a full fiscal year basis.

But the President only requested \$900 million for 9 months of fiscal year 1964 to pay for the proposed pay increase for members of the armed services.

After carefully analyzing the Department proposal, we have reported a bill to the House involving a full fiscal year cost of \$1,191,694,000, or \$46,832,000 under the President's proposal.

And with an effective date of October 1, 1963, the committee proposal involves a cost of \$896,521,000, or \$8,479,000 less than the amount requested by the President for the remainder of fiscal 1964.

Now I would like to tell you briefly where this \$1,191,694,000 will go if we enact the proposed legislation.

On a full fiscal year basis, the proposed legislation increases the basic pay scales for 1,890,000 members of the armed services by \$847,498,000.

The increase in subsistence allowances for officers accounts for approximately \$13 million.

The increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel is approximately \$77 million.

Retaining sea and foreign duty pay, which the Department of Defense wanted to eliminate, accounts for \$127,675,000.

We have also recommended a new benefit to be known as a family separation allowance, at an annual cost of \$41 million.

Now I think the first thing the House would like to know is how we were able to bring the cost of this bill under the amount suggested by the President.

First of all, we reduced the cost by \$135 million by eliminating any increase in basic pay for those with under 2 years of service.

Our major problem is in retaining enlisted personnel and officers after they have been trained.

So long as we have a Selective Service System, we will not have any difficulty

in obtaining the numbers of men that are needed.

The problem comes up when we try to encourage these men to reenlist or to continue on as officers after they have been trained.

We spend more than \$2½ billion a year training our military personnel. Over \$1 billion a year goes into technical training alone. And yet our first-term reenlistment rates in some of the critical skills is as low as 15 percent.

The overall reenlistment rate for those who complete their obligated service or their first enlistment is only 24 percent.

After the first reenlistment, the retention rates increase since these people then have an investment in retirement.

But we still lose far too many men at the end of their obligated service, and even after their first reenlistment, and this is reflected in high training costs and reduced combat efficiency.

If we can increase our reenlistment rates substantially we can reduce our training costs, because we can assign fewer people as trainers, and at the same time we can assign those trainers to our combat units.

And if we can increase our retention rate for officers, we will not only reduce training costs, which in some areas are fantastically high, but at the same time we will provide the services with a higher number of applicants from which to choose those who express a desire to make a career of the services and eventually become our military leaders.

Today we have to accept 98 percent of those officers who apply for extended tours of duty; as a result, there is no degree of selectivity.

Since the basic problem is the retention of persons who have completed their obligated service, we decided to eliminate any pay increase for those with under 2 years of service. This resulted in our first substantial savings of \$135 million.

I might say that this is the same policy we adopted in the 1955 and 1958 military pay increases.

Now the Department of Defense wanted to repeal sea and foreign duty pay. As you know, this money is paid in amounts ranging from \$8 a month for a private, up to \$22.50 a month for master sergeants. It is paid only to enlisted personnel. Officers do not get this pay.

The Department of Defense wanted to substitute a remote and isolated duty allowance to be paid to officers and enlisted personnel at a cost of \$30 million and repeal sea and foreign duty pay at a savings of \$134 million.

Obviously, many of our enlisted personnel would suffer a substantial loss of pay if we repealed sea and foreign duty pay.

Thus we refused to repeal this present benefit, although we did eliminate the State of Hawaii as an area in which an individual can qualify for foreign duty pay.

Because we did not repeal sea and foreign duty pay, we added \$127,675,000 to the cost of the bill.

The next item of consequence involved subsistence allowances for officers.

The Department of Defense wanted to increase the subsistence allowance for all officers by \$29 a month, at a cost of \$120 million a year. At the same time, the Department recommended no increase in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel.

We did not believe this was a proper approach.

As a result, we increased the subsistence allowance for officers by only \$3 a month, at a cost of \$13 million. We also increased subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel by \$77 million a year.

We did this by increasing the average enlisted man's commuted ration allowance by about \$7 a month.

As a result, we took \$77 million from the officers and gave that money to enlisted personnel. This still gave us a savings of \$30 million.

As I have already indicated, the Department of Defense recommended a remote and isolated duty station allowance which would have been applicable to officers and enlisted personnel in amounts equal to 15 or 25 percent of basic pay. They had allocated \$30 million for this proposal.

We rejected this proposal not only because we retained sea and foreign duty pay, but also because we adopted a family separation allowance to compensate those enlisted personnel and officers who are entitled to transport their dependents and household effects to their duty stations at Government expense but who are denied the right to have their dependents with them, for various reasons.

We also found that many of our service personnel are ordered to temporary duty assignments for long periods of time. These individuals likewise cannot transport their dependents at Government expense because they are on temporary duty.

Whenever the head of a household is away from his family for long periods of time the cost of maintaining the household is increased since there is no man to do the many chores that have to be done around the house.

This added \$40 million to the cost of the proposal, which was \$10 million more than the Department recommended for remote and isolated duty.

We also provide in the proposed legislation that anyone who retires during calendar year 1963 may compute his retirement pay under the proposed pay scales.

We did this because the effective date has been put off until October 1, 1963.

This has brought about many efforts on the part of officers and enlisted personnel to postpone their retirement and as a result it has practically eliminated many deserving promotions that would otherwise take place.

In many cases, Reserve officers in the Army and Air Force who must go off active duty as officers will seek to enlist and wait until the effective date of the act before applying for retirement as an officer in their Reserve grades.

All this can be obviated by adopting the provision to which I have referred, namely that anyone who retires during

this calendar year can compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales. This will do a great deal for morale and, in my opinion, it is fully justified. This action adds \$9 million to the cost of the bill.

The next proposal that faced the Committee was the question of retirement pay.

In 1958, the Congress decided not to apply the new pay scales to those already retired. The Department of Defense recommended that those retired prior to June 1, 1958, who are paid under the Career Compensation Act, be allowed to recompute their retirement pay under the 1958 pay scales, and, in addition, receive a 5-percent cost of living increase.

The committee rejected this proposal, and instead approved a straight 5-percent increase in all retired pay.

As a result of the committee's action in adhering to the decision we made in 1958 not to permit recomputation, we reduced the cost of the proposal by an additional \$30 million.

Another large cost involved our reservists.

The Department of Defense recommended that all reservists who are required to participate in inactive duty training with pay be entitled to draw their pay under existing pay scales, and not qualify for the proposed new increases.

We did not believe it was right to discriminate between obligated and unobligated reservists.

By refusing to accept this recommendation of the Department of Defense we added \$19 million to the cost of the proposal.

Now the major costs in the proposed legislation, therefore, are in these areas: \$847,500,000 in basic pay for all officers and enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service; \$13 million in subsistence allowances for officers; \$77 million in subsistence allowances for enlisted personnel; \$41,979,000 for separation allowances; \$68 million for increases in basic pay for reserve personnel; \$52 million for the 5-percent cost of living increase for retired personnel; and \$9 million for those who retire during calendar year 1963.

The remaining \$74 million will be found in such items as reenlistment bonuses, terminal leave payments, and social security, all of which are tied in with basic pay scales, and in submarine pay for training duty, high and low pressure chamber incentive pay, and multiple hazard duty payments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me give you a few examples of the pay increases provided in the proposed legislation:

The maximum increase for members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is \$95 a month, which amounts to a 5-percent increase, or a straight cost of living increase.

Four-star generals and admirals will receive a \$85 a month increase, which is a 5-percent cost of living increase.

A lieutenant general or vice admiral will receive an increase of \$75 a month, which is a straight 5 percent cost of living increase.



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7591

Major generals and rear admirals will receive an increase of \$70 a month, which is a straight 5 percent cost of living increase.

Brigadier generals and rear admirals will receive \$60 a month, which is a straight cost of living increase.

The average colonel or Navy captain will receive about a \$90 a month increase, which is 10 percent above their present pay.

The average lieutenant colonel and commander will receive a \$91 a month increase, which is 12 percent above their present pay.

The average major or lieutenant commander will receive a \$93 a month increase, which is 15 percent over their present basic pay.

The average captain or Navy lieutenant will receive an \$85 a month increase which is 17.8 percent above their present basic pay.

A first lieutenant or Navy lieutenant, junior grade, will receive a \$56 a month increase, which is 16.4 percent above their present pay.

You will note, therefore, that among the officers, the largest percentage increase is in the grades of lieutenants, captains, and majors, right at the critical retention points.

Among enlisted personnel, we give chief master sergeants as much as \$120 a month increase, but the average E-9 will receive an increase of \$63 a month, or 14.7 percent above his present basic pay.

The average E-7 will receive a 10-percent increase, or \$33 a month.

The average E-6 will receive a 13.7-percent increase, or \$37 a month.

The average E-5 will receive a 13.7-percent increase, or \$31 a month.

The average E-4 will receive a 15.2-percent increase, or \$25 a month.

An E-3 will receive a 10.7-percent increase, or \$12 a month.

You will note that we provide substantial percentage increases in practically all of the enlisted grades, and particularly at the reenlistment points.

Now let me summarize by telling you where the money goes as between officers and enlisted personnel.

You will recall that the Department of Defense wanted to take away \$134 million from the enlisted personnel by eliminating sea and foreign duty pay. We refused to do this.

You will recall that the Department of Defense wanted to increase subsistence allowances for officers by \$120 million, and we refused to do this.

Instead, we took \$26 away from each officer and gave \$77 million of that money to enlisted personnel.

So of the \$1,191,600,000 contained in this bill, \$383 million is for officers, and \$808 million is for enlisted personnel.

Stated another way, we have reduced all officers by \$26 a month under the amounts recommended by the Department of Defense for subsistence allowances; we have given enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service the basic pay scales recommended by the Department of Defense, and in addition, have given enlisted personnel \$77 million more

in subsistence allowances than the Department recommended.

In addition, we saved \$127 million in sea and foreign duty pay which the Department of Defense wanted to take away from enlisted personnel.

We are presenting to you a bill within the dollar framework prepared by the Department, but \$46 million under the total amount recommended by the Department.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have presented a fair and equitable pay bill.

The Department recommended an annual expenditure of \$1,238 million. Our proposal involves \$1,191,694,000.

We have reduced the overall fiscal cost of the bill by \$46 million, and we have reduced the cost for the remainder of fiscal year 1964 by \$8 million.

I hope that the House will overwhelmingly support the bill recommended by the Armed Services Committee.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON].

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I opposed this bill in the Armed Services Committee because it had one glaring weakness, the failure to include recomputation for those officers and enlisted personnel who retired prior to 1958.

I am hopeful the committee will restore the recomputation provision. When Congress passed the 1958 Pay Act, we gingerly put one foot into the cold water of retired pay reform. The water at that time was obviously too cold for comfort, so rather than taking the plunge, Congress proceeded to let one foot freeze while we debated the merits of diving in. It is obvious that we were not ready at that time to go all the way, and it is equally obvious that with this pay bill Congress will finally take the plunge that has concerned us for so long.

Before we do that, let us correct the situation that created a glaring inequity, not only in law but in moral obligation.

By not taking the complete plunge in 1958, we created an impression that we were merely experimenting with the idea that retired pay should not be tied to active duty pay.

For example, when the act of May 20, 1958, was enacted, there were several provisions of law relating to a substantial number of members and former members of the uniformed services that provided, in effect, that their retired pay would be recomputed to reflect increases in the basic pay of members on active duty. These provisions of law were not repealed by the act of May 20, 1958, and are still "on the books" although section 3(a) of that act prevented their application in the case of the increases provided by that act.

We have given aid and comfort to those who were unfairly treated. And now we change the sequels and say our past sympathies were synthetic. The House in passing the 1960 amendment, and also failing to remove the provisions of law allowing recomputation, indicated

that it was sympathetic to those who had been unfairly treated in 1958.

The original pay proposal submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense in January of this year provided for recomputation on the 1958 pay rates. In making this recommendation, the Department of Defense stressed the need for correcting the inequities that now exist among retired members. This is necessary also to provide a more equitable basis for transition to the proposed new system for adjusting retired pay in the future, based on increases in the cost of living. The bill reported out by the subcommittee which I supported likewise provided for recomputation; but the bill now before us makes no provision for such adjustment.

Mr. Chairman, the gross inequity that has resulted from the denial of recomputation in 1958 has been the subject of numerous resolutions from State legislatures urging the Congress to pass legislation to end the inferior status of service members retired prior to June 1, 1958. Editorial comment from many newspapers all over the country has been to the same effect.

Mr. Chairman, there was only one reason for the denial of recomputation in 1958. The action had nothing to do with the merits of recomputation on the 1958 pay scales. It saved money primarily at the expense of the dedicated officers and men who struggled through the lean years of the twenties and thirties and then emerged in the forties to assume the brunt of responsibility for fashioning together and leading the world's greatest military machine.

The Department of Defense, in 1958, ignored the recommendations of the Cordiner committee with respect to recomputation of retirement pay and recommended no increase to members on the retired rolls. Congress, primarily under the leadership of the House, insisted on a 6-percent increase for retirees and wrote that into the bill.

In 1960 the Department of Defense acknowledged its mistake and proposed the Retired Pay Recomputation Act of 1960, which this House passed by an overwhelming vote.

Defense Secretary Gates, in his testimony at that time before the House Committee on Armed Services, said:

We urge Congress to pass this bill which is now before this committee for consideration. In doing so, we will be keeping faith with those who kept faith with their country, particularly during the dark and dangerous days of World War II, and to all who have given the best years of their life in loyal, honorable service in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, it was not just generals and admirals who were harmed by the 1958 action. The records of the Department of Defense indicate that approximately 112,000 members have been made to suffer a loss in retired pay by the radical departure in 1958 from the historical method of recomputation for retired personnel. True, officers in the grades of lieutenant colonel and higher and the sergeants and warrant officers would receive more than the lower ranks from recomputation on the 1958 rates but this is largely because they are the ones who

had suffered the greatest erosion in income during their active duty days. They are the ones who had been the most underpaid in relation to their responsibilities while they were on active duty. The correction of this serious deficiency was the principal objective of the 1958 Military Pay Act. That act was expressly designed to relieve some of the compression in service pay that had developed over a period of many years. The pay compression developed not as a result of increasing the lower rates too much; it developed because the rates of pay for the higher grades were too long held down.

Therefore, in 1958 we approved a military pay bill which gave the upper ranks a long overdue, proportionately larger increase. But when, at the same time, we denied retired members the time-honored right of recomputing retired pay at the current rate, we said, in effect, to the pre-1958 retirees, "We recognize that you were underpaid while serving on active duty and now we are changing the rules so that this underpayment will continue throughout your retirement years." Of course, no one told them that, but by our action in 1958 that is exactly what we did.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is generally not known, or has been forgotten, that between 1908 and 1946, a period of 38 years, no pay increases whatsoever were given to flag and general officers on active duty and therefore no increase in retired pay. During this same period the cost of living more than doubled.

Every Member of this House should also be aware of the fact that if retired pay for members on the retired rolls had been adjusted during the period 1943 to 1961 to keep pace with the increases in the cost-of-living, the cost to the Government would have been \$130 million more than the cost of recomputation over the same period, including recomputation on the 1958 pay scales.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, when it was cheaper to use recomputation rather than cost-of-living increases to adjust retired pay, we did so. Now that it appears that it will be cheaper to give cost-of-living increases in the future rather than recomputation, it is proposed to change the rules at the expense of some of our retired service members.

Mr. Chairman, let there be no mistake about this fact: there is more than 100 years of tradition involved here. Existing law specifically provides for recomputation. Our action in 1958 denying recomputation did not change the law, but only prevented its application. For example, section 6149, title 10, United States Code, reads as follows:

The retired pay of each retired officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps shall be computed on the basis of rates of pay provided by law, at the time of his retirement, for officers on the active list. If after the retirement of any such officer, the rates of pay for officers on the active list are changed, the retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates.

Other provisions of law provide the same right to enlisted members and to members of the other uniformed services.

The question has been asked: "What other retirement system allows its retired people to recompute retired pay on rates revised after retirement?" I answer: "Federal judges—because judges, like military personnel, are also subject to recall to duty." But the real question should be this: What other retirement system has promised its members that their retired pay will be adjusted in accordance with current rates?

Mr. Chairman, I urge the inclusion of the Rivers-Gubser amendment to restore recomputation.

(Mr. BOB WILSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

(Mr. GUBSER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that time is so limited that a thorough discussion of this most important bill is impossible. Because of this limitation I must confine my remarks to the recomputation amendment which I had originally planned to introduce but which I am most pleased to say will now be introduced by the distinguished and knowledgeable chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

There are many points of confusion about the recomputation amendment that perhaps I might be able to clear up.

First of all, the distinguished chairman of the full committee indicated that fair warning was given to retirees because of the action of the House in 1958 in allowing only a cost-of-living increase. If I quote him correctly, he said "it has been on the books since 1958."

I must point out to the House that the basic law which states that recomputation shall be allowed on the basis of pay increases subsequent to retirement is still on the books as of this day. It was not repealed in 1958, and the Comptroller General has repeatedly ruled that unless there is legislative intent to the contrary recomputation shall be allowed. All we did in 1958 was express legislative intent to the contrary and say that the benefits of the law shall be denied those who retired prior to June 1, 1958. The Congress itself held out hope to these retirees when, in this very chamber in 1960, after a unanimous recommendation of the House Armed Services Committee, the House unanimously said to the retirees of this Nation: "We did wrong, we will correct that wrong and allow you your right to recompute."

Now, some will say that even if the recomputation amendment carries in this bill, that a built-in future injustice will still remain. They will say that in the future there will be a disparity between retirees. But let me point out that there is a difference between the 1958 law and the bill which is before you. The 1958 law said not one single word about future treatment of retirees. This bill does. It says that in the future they will be allowed increases in increments of 3 percent as the cost of living increases.

So the cost of living formula for the future is in this bill, and in that respect it differs from the 1958 law.

The chairman made some statement about being fish and fowl, that there is a difference between those who would retire in 1959 and those who would retire after the passage of this bill. If we want to make all fish or all fowl, then why does someone not suggest that we go back and say to those who retired after 1958, "you can only get what those who retired prior to 1958 are getting." Obviously there will be no takers for this offer.

The first meaningful pay increase occurred in 1958. For 38 years there was not a single pay increase for flag officers or general officers. The raises for 50 years were less 10 percent of the national wage index.

In 1958 the Congress corrected its neglect of 50 years. So the 1958 pay raise was the first meaningful increase for those who recompute. Future raises will not be picking up the lost ground of 50 years and will be less dramatic. Therefore not much of a question will be raised about a cost of living increase versus traditional recomputation.

Make no mistake about it. The real injustice, the real mistake was made in 1958 when we created a situation where a colonel with 30 years of service could retire on May 31, 1958, and would receive \$93.75 per month less than his West Point classmate who retired on June 1, 1958, with the same length of service, with equal distinction and equal rank. The future is provided for in this bill. The amendment will correct the mistakes of the past.

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

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 5555 is to provide a long delayed and much deserved pay increase for members of our Armed Forces. A detailed study made by the subcommittee found the morale and effectiveness of our servicemen to be closely identified with this move. Fortunately we do have in uniform those who are dedicated to their tasks and are bound to the service by other than monetary considerations. They represent a standard of courage and competency that throughout our history has kept this Nation secure. I do not believe this standard is in danger but I do wish to point out that the military strength of this Nation depends today upon not only the valor of our forces but their individual capacity to employ intricate and rapidly changing weapon systems.

In passing upon this legislation, we should be mindful of the changed conditions now surrounding our Armed Forces. Modern warfare employs techniques and weapons which require skills never before contemplated. Months and more often years are necessary to train for these skills, many of which have applications in civilian life. Therefore, if we lose these trained personnel to more attractive jobs in industry we are robbed,

not only of their skills but we also have to expend excessive time and money to obtain replacements. Accordingly, a proper pay bill is more than fair treatment to the serviceman, it is also a real bargain for us all, economically and securitywise.

While we can rely upon many to be career motivated, we should not penalize such spirit by being unappreciative and unfair with respect to compensation. It is significant to point out that military pay has risen only 16.2 percent since 1952, in comparison to increases of 49 percent for professional workers, 44.8 percent for production workers, and 34.3 for civil service employees in the same period. Nevertheless, the proposed increase in this bill will still leave military compensation substantially below other pay levels.

The details of the bill have been carefully outlined. I am confident it has been demonstrated that the adjustments have been carefully selected and will correct a substantial number of admitted deficiencies.

Disappointment has been expressed in many circles that the bill does not permit personnel retired prior to June 1, 1958, to recompute their pay on 1958 pay scales as had previously been voted by this House. Having indicated our belief that this recomputation was necessary and proper, our present proposal seems inconsistent. Although it can be argued with much validity that most retirement plans carry no such recomputation possibilities, we have recognized this procedure in the past and the personnel affected may well feel singled out for what seems to them unfair treatment. I, therefore, feel that the purposes of this bill and the best interests of the Nation will be better served if the recomputation provision is restored.

In conclusion, let me point out that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and the entire committee did a magnificent job in formulating proposals for committee action. Our full committee responded to the forceful and objective leadership of our able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in reporting a bill which provides relief in many sensitive areas.

However, in bringing this bill to the floor, our committee does not claim that it is a complete answer to a critical need. We do, however, view it as a constructive step forward which is urgently required. The proposed effective date is a concession to the President's budget but delay beyond that date is unthinkable. Favorable action on this bill to meet the objectives I have mentioned is clearly in the interest of our defense program.

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

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman for his very fine statement and for his support of this bill.

I would also like to join with the gentleman in the position which he has

taken to permit recomputation of retired pay of those who retired prior to June 1, 1958. Likewise I join with the other Members of this House, particularly the gentlemen from California [Mr. BOB WILSON and Mr. GUSSE], in their position favoring this recomputation provision for retired members of the Armed Forces. I certainly subscribe to the same position as they do and want to take this opportunity to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] and align myself with the position which he has taken. It is important these inequities be corrected.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

(Mr. ROBISON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all sure that the provisions of H.R. 5555—the military pay bill—are adequate and fair to those who have accepted, normally out of patriotic reasons, the economic disadvantages as well as the hazards of peacetime military service.

My adherence to the principle of economy in Government has, I hope, been well demonstrated. I suppose the customary thing to say, here, would be that: "I yield to no man in my support of the concept of 'fiscal responsibility.'" However, neither do I think that this concept should be applied with such broad strokes, or in such a shortsighted fashion that the equally important principle of equity is violated.

There is a temptation, always present, to do this when Congress is relatively free—as it is, here, in view of the almost total absence of any organized voice in behalf of the armed services—from political pressures.

It also seems to me—and I say this in all kindness—that the Committee on Armed Services has swung from one extreme of generosity, with the authorization bill for military hardware, to an extreme of fiscal caution, with this, the pay bill. This has left those of us who do not serve on this committee, but who must to a great degree rely on the judgment and advice of those who do, facing a considerable dilemma. And, in view of the way the committee system works during floor debate, there is not a great deal that the rest of us can do about resolving our individual doubts.

I have been substantially impressed by the morale problem we face, first in interesting and then in retaining competent personnel in military-career status. I have been equally impressed by the ever-growing technical competence demanded of our Armed Forces, and by the great disparity in pay for comparable civilian work. I am also aware of the lack of comparability between the pay of those who serve our Government in uniform, and those who serve it in corresponding capacities, insofar as training, experience, and responsibility are concerned, but as civilians, and it seems to me that we are guilty of discrimination here.

I intend, therefore, to support H.R. 5555—as being worthy of my support insofar as it goes toward improving the present situation, and I also intend to support the amendments to be offered by Representative WILSON, of California, or by others, to correct the patent inequity worked on our military retirees by the abandonment, in H.R. 5555, of the principle of recomputation of retired pay.

At this time, I do not know what other amendments may be offered but I assure you I shall give them my serious consideration, and I wish to close by expressing the hope that further improvements in this measure may be given serious consideration in the other body.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the quality of the country's defense is the quality of its armed services and the men and women in uniform.

Every year we spend billions of dollars to purchase or develop the most modern and technically perfect military equipment known to science. However, it is equally important that we have in service people with the skills to handle this complex equipment.

The defense of our Nation demands that those who are in the armed services be the very best. Yet, if we are unwilling to pay them adequately, to pay them in accordance with what their abilities would command in civilian life, then we jeopardize our security.

I believe the United States has the moral obligation to adequately compensate its service men and women and to adopt a sufficiently realistic military pay scale that will attract others into service.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLAUSEN].

(Mr. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my comments to what has already been said here on the floor of the House with reference to the military pay bill H.R. 5555 and the so-called theory of recomputation of pensions.

National defense is big business and should be recognized and treated as such. It is the primary responsibility of this Federal level of Government. It is quite evident to me that we will have a continuing responsibility for sometime to come—at least until a positive program of winning the cold war is advocated and adopted. Meanwhile many individuals and families are effected by the action of this body. Where I was formerly a member of the Naval Air Arm during World War II, I severed my association with the naval military organization after my terminal leave expired in 1945 and up until now have not participated in any of their activities.

I feel that salaries of members of our armed services should be adequate to attract desirable personnel and keep them, thereby minimizing the turnover

and the mandatory draft calls. This, in my judgment, will reflect in economy over a long period of time and minimize the inconveniences to personnel and families affected.

This position, of course, applies to the military pay bill, H.R. 5555. I also plan to support the "theory of recomputation" of pensions for those military men who retired before 1958 so that such pensions will be based on current salary levels as they were for more than 100 years before the law was changed in 1959. Recognition of this inequity will rectify an existing problem in keeping with every rule of fairness and satisfy my conscience for having met a responsibility that is truly ours.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the military pay raise bill which I believe will be passed by the House by a sizable margin. I support the measure because it is necessary if we are to do justice to our servicemen. However, we should not overlook the fact that by passing this bill, we are adding approximately a billion and one-half dollars to the national budget.

I predict that tomorrow or later in the week when we take up the debt increase bill, many of my colleagues who supported this military pay raise legislation will engage in a clamorous chorus against the debt increase. I am simply intrigued by the fact that although two-thirds of our budget comprising the defense, space, and veterans appropriations are supported by almost every Member of the House, many of the biggest spenders bewail our high national debt the loudest.

Maybe due to the springtime season, I am moved to offer a rhyme from a not-so-bashful poet. I have titled this epic "Paradox," and it reads as follows:

One day we favor spending,  
The next—of debt we prate.  
Although it's irresponsible,  
Politically it's great.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on our side to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I likewise yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, some 35 or more Members of Congress have indicated that they would like to join with me as coauthors on the amendment on combat pay.

They are as follows: Representatives JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, OLIVER P. BOLTON, FRANK T. BOW, W. E. (BILL) BROCK, JOEL T. BROYHILL, JAMES C. CLEVELAND, JEFFREY COHELAN, JAMES C.

CORMAN, EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, THADDEUS J. DULSKI, CARL ELLIOTT, DANTE B. FASCELL, SAM GIBBONS, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, GEORGE A. GOODLING, CHARLES S. GUBSER, SEYMOUR HALPERN, CHET HOLIFIELD, CHARLES S. JOELSON, EDNA F. KELLY, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., ROBERT H. MICHEL, ARNOLD OLSEN, CLAUDE PEPPER, OTIS G. PIKE, RALPH J. RIVERS, RALPH J. SCOTT, DON L. SHORT, OLIN E. TEAGUE, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, and BOB WILSON.

This is a measure which is approved by the Department of Defense, is requested by the Army, and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, the exact provisions of the measure which I hope to introduce as an amendment to this bill are to be found at page A2749 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6. This is a modest proposal, Mr. Chairman. It provides that the men who are serving in Laos, Vietnam, and places where we are actually engaged in combat duty receive a maximum of \$55 a month when they are under actual hostile firing.

This pay is sometimes called hostile fire pay, sometimes called combat pay. This amount of \$55 was arrived at by simply taking the lowest amount of special pay or extra pay under other legislation for people serving on active duty.

You may not realize just how much we pay for other types of pay. We pay \$632,486,960 a year for various types of special pay. And if you will look at the tables which I have set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A2837 and A2833 of today you will see that many people who serve and obtain special kinds of pay are not doing anything that is very difficult.

Paratroopers receive their special pay for making one jump in every 3 months. They obtain parachute pay for the entire period. And people with flight pay are required to fly only 1 day out of every 3 months to obtain flight pay. In Congress we have actually encouraged, and at times even prohibited some men drawing flight pay from flying because we know that they are too old to fly and we do not wish to bear the cost of the airplane and the gasoline, and so forth. And we pay them these very substantial amounts of pay far in excess of the \$55 a month which I am proposing for this. I am not asking that any of that be stricken, but I am asking that this Congress consider what I would call the tragic and inconsiderate approach which is about to be made on this bill unless we amend it.

There is no administrative problem involved in combat pay. We had combat pay in World War II; we had combat pay in the Korean war. There were not any administrative difficulties raised with respect to combat pay.

Certainly there are administrative difficulties about these other types of pay. Some of these other types of pay are fantastic. We pay many millions of dollars per year to people who we know will never serve again in the particular

field in which they are being paid these large sums. There are many administrative responsibilities and difficulties with respect to some of these other types of pay, but we do not blink an eye about that, not a bit. We say we will go ahead and pay it. But here we are only talking about something that involves perhaps only \$1 million or \$2 million a year.

If you will look at page A2837 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will see set out the costs. The Army, which is the chief service involved, would have about \$1 million a year. In the next column you will see the total of such pay for all services, which is estimated at from \$1,400,000 to \$1,800,000. That is for all types that might be involved in this particular kind of pay. Compare that, if you will, with the \$632 million that we spend for these other types of pay. Look and see what we are paying this money for and contrast it with what is involved here. Then note the regulations which are set out. These are very simple regulations. This man must serve 6 days a month as compared with parachute pay, where the regulation is one jump in 3 months. This man, as I said, has to serve 6 days a month in that sort of situation before he is allowed to have this type of pay.

So I would like to stress that there is no administrative difficulty about this at all. I would like to stress that the cost here is very slight indeed. I would like to stress finally that it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, this is a small matter in dollars.

It is a small thing in the number of people involved. It is a big thing in the moral responsibility of our country. I do not think anybody could better say it than the Department of Defense did when it asked for this amendment to be approved. At page A2834 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find they said:

While combat is, of course, the basic purpose of a military establishment, the fact remains that the actual hazards and hardships of combat are currently experienced by a small percentage of the Armed Forces.

In approving \$55 per month to be paid, under strict regulations, the Department said:

It is, of course, impossible for the Government to compensate adequately for this kind of sacrifice or potential sacrifice, but it would give a token recognition of the special role being played by such personnel.

Casualty data indicate that at the end of the first 100 days in combat—not necessarily consecutive—one-half of his friends with whom he entered combat will be missing in action, in a hospital, or dead. At the end of 200 days in combat, 93 percent of his buddies will be gone. For all practical purposes, 200 days in frontline combat as an infantryman amounts to either a death sentence or a future as a mentally or physically handicapped man.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7595

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida on a very splendid presentation and statesmanlike approach to this subject and will support the amendment. I congratulate him also on being the proud father today of a new baby girl, and wish the best to the new daughter and her lovely mother.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I, too, should like to congratulate the gentleman on the very excellent statement he has made and his very excellent work on our Committee on Armed Services. It was my privilege to support him in committee, and I only hope that when he presents his amendment at the appropriate time it will receive overwhelming support.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. In conclusion, I should like to say that of course you can draft men. Of course you can tell men on the frontlines in combat that if they do not fulfill their purpose they can be lined up against the barracks or the bunkers or whatever you may have, and shot. That is the law, that is true. You can compel these men to go into this kind of combat. You can compel them without paying any money. So there is no incentive required as far as that is concerned to have anybody up in the frontlines.

You cannot pay a man to be a front-line soldier. We compel them to do that. There are many benefits paid and people serving in the Armed Forces, many veterans' benefits to former servicemen. There is the 20-year retirement privilege. Some of the other benefits are quite generous. But every one of these benefits, everybody knows, is based upon the man who is out there compelled to take the life of another man, perhaps against his ethics, against his morals, against his emotions, against his basic feelings. He takes the lives of other people for the protection, for the security, and for the continuation of his beloved land. He does this endangering his own life. There is nobody else in the world that does the sort of thing he does. Are we so niggardly as to deny \$2 million annually for that kind of service?

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Are there any retroactive provisions in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. There are no retroactive provisions in the amendment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. There are several people that have already been killed in this combat the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If the gentleman would like to add the retroactive amendment, I would be glad to support it.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and certainly, as a very strong believer in, and supporter of our Armed Forces, and our dedicated and patriotic military personnel, I am proud, indeed, to support, and to urge the Members of this body to support this bill for the military pay increase (H.R. 5555). Although this bill does not perfectly suit all the demands or meet all the needs of our military personnel, it does encompass a good many long-needed changes and improvements in our military compensation program. I have endeavored, along with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today, to attempt to rectify some of the inequities existing in the bill. Some have been improved, some have not, but I stand in support of the bill as is reported and urge its approval and passage.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in deciding whether the Government of the United States should or should not provide for the recomputation of military retired pay in accordance with the fluctuations of active duty pay, the decision should be based on the answers to three basic questions. These are:

First. Is the procedure morally right?

Second. Is it legally permissible or required?

Third. Is it financially feasible?

To every question, the answer is "Yes."

The procedure is unquestionably morally right. Since the inception of the military pay and retirement system, it has been practically the undeviating policy of our Government that the pay of a retired officer is to be geared directly to the active duty pay of an officer of the same rank and length of service. When this policy was deviated from in 1922, the next Congress acted swiftly to correct the error.

On April 12, 1926, House Report No. 857 of the 69th Congress pointed out that, and I quote:

The pay of retired officers is not a fixed sum nor is it a specified sum, but it is 75 percent of the pay of the rank upon which they are retired; that is, three-fourths of the pay of officers of similar rank still on the active list, and not three-fourths of the pay at the time of retirement.

This indicates that the policy is legally permissible. That the policy may not only be legally permissible but legally required is indicated by section 6149, United States Code, title 10. This section reads as follows:

The retired pay of each retired officer of the Navy or Marine Corps should be computed on the basis of rates of pay provided by law, at the time of retirement, for officers on the active list. If after the retirement of any such officer the rates of pay for officers on the active list are changed the retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates.

Clearly, then, the policy of recomputation is so hallowed by tradition as to be morally right, and so outlined by United States Codes as to be not only legally permissible but perhaps required.

It remains then to consider the third question, Is it financially feasible? I say to you that this question must be answered with an unqualified "Yes." For if the Government of this Nation is faced with a course of action that is both morally and legally right, then that course must be followed. If, in the following, financial adjustments are necessary, then those adjustments must be made, whatever the cost. Fortunately, in following this path of moral and legal obligation, the cost is not such as to destroy our economy. I am informed that the beginning cost, under the proposed pay scales, would be \$33 million annually, and that this amount would decrease each year as recipients passed to a greater reward.

I am aware that the ranks of the retired will be swelled enormously in years to come and that if the principle of recomputation is followed in the case of future pay raises, that the cost will rise.

The question before us now, however, should not be answered on a basis of what might or might not happen in the future, but what is happening in this, the present. Stated bluntly, it is that this Congress is faced with a choice of keeping faith with the men and women who gave the best portion of their lives to the service of their country in the Armed Forces, or of repudiating its moral and legal obligation to these men and women.

In honor there can be but one answer—we must keep faith by providing for recomputation of retired pay.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the military pay bill, H.R. 5555, not because I am under any illusion about our Nation's ability to adequately remunerate our military servants, commensurate with the value of their service, but because I feel we have an obligation to recognize their contribution to the stature and strength of our Nation.

These dedicated men and women who serve in uniform will not be less vigilant or alert, nor will they be less willing to give their last full measure of devotion if we do not provide them with a pay increase. I do feel, however, that we who are recipients of the sacrifices they make in peace, as well as war, could not in conscience look a new day squarely in the face if we did not make this small measure of effort to indicate our appreciation of their talents and selfless devotion.

The bare, bold fact of life is this: When diplomacy breaks down we must depend upon our career military men, who are trained in their respective specialties, for life itself. I, for one, want to be assured that my life, the lives of the members of my family, the future of freedom itself are indeed in the hands and care of America's best. We cannot hope to keep this assurance unless we are realistic and fair in our responsibilities to give adequate material support to those upon whom our own future and the future of freedom is so dependent.

I share with all peace-loving people the hope that some day, somehow, we

can "beat our swords into plowshares"—use our nuclear abilities for constructive purposes instead of potentially destructive purposes. But wishing does not make it so. We must face the facts as they are. We are compelled by circumstance to be adequately armed. It is of little avail to be adequately armed with expensive and complicated equipment if we do not have the trained personnel to use it. It is poor economy to spend literally billions to buy this equipment and to train men to use it if because of an unrealistic pay scale they are not encouraged to make the maximum use of their training in continued service. While the bill calls for an increase in spending, this is one situation in which we find an increase in spending responsible for the saving of the taxpayer's dollar.

In most of the bills before the House dealing with the military we are concerned with things. In this bill we are concerned with persons.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we have deprived our military personnel of the right to strike, bargain, picket, arbitrate, or even mediate for better hours, wages, and working conditions. There is no such thing as an 8-hour-a-day soldier or sailor and, therefore, hours are no subject for consideration. Our Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine personnel are working or available for work on an around the clock basis. These men are given consideration for job assignment and duty location, but any Congressman can testify from his mailbag that this is not an entirely enjoyable and voluntary proposition.

We are living in a land with more freedom than any other people on the face of the globe at any time in history, but we must remember that there is a group which has no right to speak publicly at all unless censored prior to speaking, a group which has no degree of freedom of press, a group which only recently was given the right to write their Congressmen on compensation matters, a group which is constantly mobile, therefore ineffective in utilizing the elective franchise, a group which is constantly under totalitarian control due to its very nature and which group has the power through simple order in battle or through the process of court-martial, to effectively take the lives of its members.

This is our military. This is not a time of war and it is amazing to me that there are patriotic Americans who are constantly coming forward and voluntarily exposing themselves to the semi-irrevocable membership in this system.

In short, when it comes to civil rights, which the American people have come to enjoy, our soldiers and sailors just do not have any. No rights to even determine what they will eat, where they will sleep, or what they will wear.

At one time a swabie would earn his military keep by learning the manual of arms with an M-1 rifle. Today it is interesting to note that first-class seaman sailors attending the nuclear power schools at Mare Island, Calif., and throughout the country, must know chemistry, physics, analytics, and cal-

culus before they get into the school, only to graduate as an enlisted third-class petty officer.

Yes, today we demand a lot of our people as we are engaged in an effort to cut military expenditures such that fewer people more ably prepared can do a better job of defense with fewer bombs, missiles, and armaments.

We question intraspectively among the Congress the necessity of the American people to have forced conscription for an uncertain 10-year period of jeopardy at a time when we have not declared a war in 22 years.

Surely if the future of the American defense is going to rest on the shoulders of a relatively few highly trained professional defenders who are in a sense rightless, certainly they should be compensated.

The problem presented to this Congress therefore is an adequate wage scale. We are bargaining with ourselves with some of us representing the public purse and some of us the silenced defenders.

Are new concepts involved in this bargaining? I do not think so. Nobody asks to pay us what we are worth or pay us on the basis of our relative technical know-how, or pay us on the basis of our ability to produce fire power or defensive power.

The only thing asked is to place us in the same parity position we maintained 10 years ago.

In 1952, officers between the rank of second lieutenant to colonel earned on the average each of \$300 per year more than their corresponding GS-7 to GS-14 civil servant counterparts. Today those same civil servants earn from \$2,100 to \$3,300 per year more than each of their military counterparts. Enlisted rates are similarly comparable. Is it no wonder that 20 years after the last war we must continue forced conscription?

Every Member of Congress has correspondence from service people claiming that they have been kicked in the teeth by Uncle Sam. I think they have—I think we can forsake the pocket book for today and stand up to our responsibility to a voiceless people who form the back bone of our protectorate of democracy.

With respect to a second matter it is my feeling that a retired second lieutenant is the same whether he has retired this year or 10 years ago. They both are entitled to parity irrespective of the hand fate deals in the date service is terminated.

Likewise this is a multimillion dollar decision to make, but decisions somehow are easy when right is evident.

It is the feeling of the members of our great Armies and Navy and special corps that there is something sacred in the idea of consistency and fairness. They are disciplined, of course, to accept dogmatic instruction and not too severely complain but occasionally every 5 years or so when the merits of their service is drawn in question, there is a way in which the Congress can say "job well done." I think there is a way we can say this without our voices but from the heart of the Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in the complexities of modern-day military

armament, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force must carry out widely diversified research and development responsibilities. In order to continue research on and the development of the Nike-X, the Minuteman and Titan missiles, and the nuclear-powered submarine, the military services must have personnel of the highest competence.

On examining H.R. 5555 and comparing it to the upper level pay increases authorized under the Federal Salary Reform Act, I find that similar pay increases have not been provided for the upper grades of the uniformed services. It is my firm conviction that some attempt must be made to establish a pay relationship between the various pay systems of the Government. If this is not done, the pay system of the uniformed services will continue to deteriorate in relation to other Federal pay systems. When this happens, the services will be unable to retain the qualified and experienced personnel, so vitally needed to carry out their programs.

Further, the health of the Nation stands to suffer if the work of the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service and its National Institutes of Health continues to be limited in scope and quality because of the inability of that Service to attract and retain needed personnel. The Secretary of HEW referring to NIH personnel recently stated he has never before found so many people willing to devote so much time for so little money. He said "It is because they are dedicated." But how long can this dedication last. Secretary Celebrezze admitted he is losing scientists because of the pay scale and stated that "NIH is not matching private industry in salaries and is hardly matching the universities." There has been a steady erosion of the scientific staff at NIH in recent years. Many of its key staff members have left for higher paying positions in universities, other centers for biomedical research, and in private industry. Unless salaries for leading scientists are improved to a marked degree, medical and scientific research programs will be seriously impaired.

The Congress has placed increasing emphasis on public health programs such as water pollution control, air pollution control, and radiological health. There is a serious shortage of the experienced public health leaders such programs demand and the Public Health Service must be able to compete for these people. Again, a marked improvement in salary and incentive pay is necessary.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that a pay boost is needed for the members of our Armed Forces. We need to attract and keep the best possible manpower in our military forces. Normally I oppose Federal spending bills when the Federal Government is deficit financing. That is, borrowing to spend, instead of making both ends meet.

My approval of the military pay boost is a worthy exception to the rule, as I see it.

I assume, of course, that the very military officers and men who will benefit from the pay increase are aware of the

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7597

dangers of deficit financing and the threat to the value of our currency by such action. It is incumbent on them, Members of Congress, and all responsible citizens to so revise Federal expenditures as to return to a balanced budget.

It is far more costly to our taxpayers to pay for turnover of military personnel than to pay this pay increase. However, the President, Secretary McNamara, and Members of Congress owe a responsibility to taxpayers today, and those of the future to whom we shift the debt, to curtail nonessential expenditures to balance the budget.

For my part, I shall oppose spending in public works, welfare and social measures, foreign aid, and other nondefense expenditures. Further, I believe we should demand of the military that wasteful procurement practices and other unnecessary expenditures be eliminated so that this pay bill can be absorbed.

A \$52 billion defense budget has enough waste, duplication, and uneconomic practices in it, such as occur in sole-source procurement and surplus disposal, that more than enough can be saved to pay for the pay boost.

I have no patience nor defense for those who vote for all appropriations, all tax cuts, and no balancing of the budget.

While I vote for economy and the balanced budget at every opportunity, I am happy in the knowledge that I can indicate my approval of increased pay for our military personnel.

However, pay boosts do not go to the heart of the matter of retention of men in the Armed Forces. The President, our military leaders, the Members of Congress, have a responsibility to improve the career aspects of military service. The draft should not be used as a crutch by the military, so that men serve because they have to do so. We should seek to improve the quality of our military personnel, on a career basis, so that the rapid turnover will be reduced. I believe this pay bill is part of that effort, but only a part.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5555, the military pay increase bill, a measure which has been long overdue.

As stated in the committee report, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide increases in basic pay and subsistence allowances; to establish a new method of adjusting retirement pay; and to provide other benefits for members of our uniformed services.

There appears to be a general agreement here that our military personnel on active duty are grossly underpaid as compared to employees in our civil service. For example, a colonel is paid about \$200 a month less than his civil service counterpart. Such a differential certainly is not conducive to enlistment in our armed services. Yet I note with deep concern that the full Committee on Armed Services has deleted two provisions from the bill as originally introduced which would have provided some incentive fringe benefits. These are: first, the recomputation provision; and second, the combat pay provision.

I am firmly of the position that these two provisions should be restored. As stated in the additional views of the report, the bill as reported by the full committee contains a major inconsistency. While purporting to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to such service.

It has been traditional for more than 100 years that retired military pay be computed on active duty pay. Secretary McNamara has submitted a memorandum to the Senate Armed Services Committee expressing beyond doubt that the authority for recomputation of pay is based on clear provisions of the law rather than on mere practice. He disclosed that the Controller General has consistently held that section 6149, United States Code, title 10, and other laws established this right. This section reads in part:

The retired pay to which the officer is entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates.

The traditional principle of recomputation prevailed until 1958 when in a drastic and sudden action with no warning to retired personnel, Congress provided that all officers who retired prior to June 1, 1958 would receive instead only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase.

It is a well-known fact that fringe benefits including retired pay have always been offered as an inducement for servicemen to accept less money in the military than they would receive in comparable civilian positions. At the hearings on this measure an experienced recruiting officer now retired testified at page 1577 as follows:

Every man on the retired rolls and on active duty has been told by the recruiting officers that his retired pay would be based upon the active duty pay scales.

The opposition to the restoration of the two deleted provisions is based upon budgetary considerations. I believe that as Members of Congress representing the greatest democratic government in mankind's history, we ought to keep a promise in line with our world image. We ought not to replace morality with budgetary considerations.

Restoration of the recomputation provisions would mean that we shall keep faith with those citizens of ours who, by the nature of their work must sacrifice their lives, if need be, upon call.

The deletion of the combat pay benefits as contained in the original bill as introduced must have come to many of us as a great surprise. The bill as amended provides for hazardous pay for parachute duty, demolition duty, flight duty, thermal stress duty, high and low pressure duty, and submarine duty, yet fails to provide for combat duty pay. What could be more hazardous than combat with an enemy determined to kill you? Certainly, in the name of equity, we ought to restore and provide for additional compensation for those who place their lives in jeopardy in our Nation's behalf. Seventy-three Americans have

already given up their lives in Vietnam in our present struggle against communism. Four of these brave men were citizens of my great State of Hawaii. There will not doubt be others who must make the supreme sacrifice before freedom prevails. While the additional compensation proposed in the original bill and deleted by the committee is certainly only a token of our concern and wholly insufficient by way of compensation, I am sure that the practicalities of life will bring forth an appreciation from its recipients and members of their families.

Both of these deleted provisions were approved by the subcommittee which studied this legislation for weeks. They were requested by the Army and by the Department of Defense and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the President. Certainly, there can be no real reason why these two provisions cannot be restored. I urge the restoration of these two provisions and passage of the bill with such amendments as will do the job as we ought to do it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. I agree, there is a moral obligation on the part of this Congress to continue combat pay for those gentlemen who have volunteered to advise, on a military level, the actions in Vietnam.

I visited Vietnam in December of last year and witnessed the extreme difficulties that our advisory group endure in the defense of South Vietnam's democracy. Although these special forces volunteer for these assignments, there is not reason why we should not compensate them for the extreme dangers that they face, day in and day out. Jungle warfare, as many of my colleagues know, is most difficult as you are fighting the hazards of nature as well as the enemy.

I believe that these volunteer forces, who are willing to endanger their lives, and sacrifice them if need be, are entitled to the same extra compensation that is presently being awarded to our Air Force personnel as well as the airborne infantry. In my opinion, those that are actually facing the danger of a hidden enemy 24 hours a day, are more deserving of extra compensation for their dedication to the cause of freedom.

Let us acknowledge their courageous stand in the face of tyranny by giving full support to the amendment before us.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5555, a bill to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

President Kennedy pointed out in his message to the Congress:

In this era of increasingly complex weapons and military systems, a large part of the effectiveness of our Defense Establishment depends on the retention of well-trained and devoted personnel in the Armed Forces. General military pay was last increased 4½ years ago. Since then, higher wages and salaries in private industry have provided strong inducement for highly trained military personnel to leave the service for better paying jobs in civilian life.

I have known many members of the military service who could be making much more in civilian life in the way of salaries and wages; however, they are devoted to the concept of maintaining the freedom of our great Nation. I am convinced that it is in the national interest for us to pass H.R. 5555 with the amendments that have been adopted here today to partially relieve the financial sacrifices that our servicemen must make. I believe that it is incumbent upon the Congress to do everything possible to make the military an attractive career for the young men who have chosen to defend our way of life.

The salary increases in this bill are at a minimum and in many instances they should be even higher. I receive many letters from career servicemen who are having a difficult time making ends meet financially. Several of them have applied for hardship discharges rather than continue to face financial difficulties caused in part by inadequate military pay.

When we consider the great cost of training our servicemen and getting them to the state of combat readiness in this day of nuclear and technological warfare, I am sure that it would be cheaper for the Government to pay these men on a basis equivalent with the pay scales of private industry rather than have them leave the service and be faced with the cost of retraining replacements.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I was proud to support the amendments offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. I believe that these two amendments have strengthened the bill in that they are correcting inequalities that existed prior to their adoption. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of honor and justice, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5555 that we may not only show our appreciation to the members of the military service who are contributing so much to our national defense but also

that we may pay them wages and salaries that are more nearly equal with those being paid for comparable work outside the military service.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963".*

**BASIC PAY**

SEC. 2. Section 203 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

**"§203. Rates**

"The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

**"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS**

| "Pay grade        | Years of service computed under sec. 205 |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|-------------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                   | 2 or less                                | Over 2  | Over 3  | Over 4  | Over 6  | Over 8  | Over 10 | Over 12 | Over 14 | Over 16 | Over 18 | Over 20 | Over 22 | Over 26 | Over 30 |
| O-10 <sup>1</sup> | \$1,200.00                               | \$1,315 | \$1,315 | \$1,315 | \$1,315 | \$1,365 | \$1,365 | \$1,470 | \$1,470 | \$1,575 | \$1,575 | \$1,680 | \$1,680 | \$1,785 | \$1,785 |
| O-9               | 1,063.30                                 | 1,155   | 1,180   | 1,180   | 1,180   | 1,210   | 1,210   | 1,260   | 1,260   | 1,365   | 1,365   | 1,470   | 1,470   | 1,575   | 1,575   |
| O-8               | 963.30                                   | 1,050   | 1,075   | 1,075   | 1,075   | 1,155   | 1,155   | 1,210   | 1,210   | 1,260   | 1,315   | 1,365   | 1,420   | 1,420   | 1,420   |
| O-7               | 800.28                                   | 905     | 905     | 905     | 945     | 945     | 1,000   | 1,000   | 1,050   | 1,155   | 1,235   | 1,235   | 1,235   | 1,235   | 1,235   |
| O-6               | 592.80                                   | 690     | 735     | 735     | 735     | 735     | 735     | 760     | 760     | 880     | 925     | 925     | 1,000   | 1,085   | 1,085   |
| O-5               | 474.24                                   | 565     | 605     | 605     | 605     | 605     | 625     | 660     | 705     | 760     | 805     | 835     | 870     | 870     | 870     |
| O-4               | 400.14                                   | 490     | 525     | 525     | 525     | 560     | 600     | 635     | 665     | 695     | 725     | 725     | 725     | 725     | 725     |
| O-3               | 326.04                                   | 410     | 440     | 490     | 535     | 540     | 570     | 600     | 630     | 630     | 630     | 630     | 630     | 630     | 630     |
| O-2               | 259.36                                   | 345     | 420     | 435     | 450     | 465     | 490     | 510     | 530     | 530     | 530     | 530     | 530     | 530     | 530     |
| O-1               | 222.30                                   | 280     | 355     | 365     | 380     | 395     | 410     | 430     | 450     | 450     | 450     | 450     | 450     | 450     | 450     |

**"WARRANT OFFICERS**

| "Pay grade | Years of service computed under sec. 205 |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|            | 2 or less                                | Over 2 | Over 3 | Over 4 | Over 6 | Over 8 | Over 10 | Over 12 | Over 14 | Over 16 | Over 18 | Over 20 | Over 22 | Over 26 | Over 30 |
| W-4        | \$332.90                                 | \$430  | \$430  | \$440  | \$460  | \$480  | \$500   | \$535   | \$560   | \$580   | \$595   | \$615   | \$635   | \$685   | \$685   |
| W-3        | 302.64                                   | 395    | 395    | 400    | 405    | 435    | 460     | 475     | 490     | 505     | 520     | 540     | 560     | 580     | 580     |
| W-2        | 264.82                                   | 345    | 345    | 355    | 375    | 395    | 410     | 425     | 440     | 455     | 470     | 485     | 505     | 505     | 505     |
| W-1        | 219.42                                   | 305    | 305    | 330    | 345    | 360    | 375     | 390     | 405     | 420     | 435     | 450     | 450     | 450     | 450     |

**"ENLISTED MEMBERS**

| "Pay grade           | Years of service computed under sec. 205 |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|----------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                      | 2 or less                                | Over 2 | Over 3 | Over 4 | Over 6 | Over 8 | Over 10 | Over 12 | Over 14 | Over 16 | Over 18 | Over 20 | Over 22 | Over 26 | Over 30 |
| E-9                  |  |        |        |        |        |        | \$435   | \$445   | \$455   | \$465   | \$475   | \$485   | \$510   | \$560   | \$560   |
| E-8                  |  |        |        |        |        |        | \$365   | 375     | 385     | 395     | 405     | 415     | 425     | 450     | 500     |
| E-7                  | \$206.39                                 | \$275  | \$285  | \$295  | \$305  | 315    | 325     | 335     | 345     | 355     | 365     | 375     | 400     | 450     | 450     |
| E-6                  | 175.81                                   | 240    | 250    | 260    | 270    | 280    | 290     | 300     | 310     | 320     | 330     | 330     | 330     | 330     | 330     |
| E-5                  | 145.24                                   | 210    | 220    | 230    | 240    | 250    | 260     | 270     | 280     | 280     | 280     | 280     | 280     | 280     | 280     |
| E-4                  | 122.30                                   | 180    | 190    | 200    | 210    | 210    | 210     | 210     | 210     | 210     | 210     | 210     | 210     | 210     | 210     |
| E-3                  | 99.37                                    | 145    | 155    | 165    | 165    | 165    | 165     | 165     | 165     | 165     | 165     | 165     | 165     | 165     | 165     |
| E-2                  | 85.80                                    | 120    | 120    | 120    | 120    | 120    | 120     | 120     | 120     | 120     | 120     | 120     | 120     | 120     | 120     |
| E-1                  | 83.20                                    | 110    | 110    | 110    | 110    | 110    | 110     | 110     | 110     | 110     | 110     | 110     | 110     | 110     | 110     |
| E-1 (under 4 months) | 78.00                                    |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |

<sup>1</sup> While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, basic pay for this grade is \$1,970 regardless of years of service computed under sec. 205 of this title.

<sup>1</sup> While serving as a permanent professor at the U.S. Military Academy or the U.S. Air Force Academy, basic pay for this grade is \$1,165, if the officer has over 31 years of service computed under sec. 205 of this title, and \$1,235, if the officer has over 36 years of that service.

**BASIC PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CONTRACT SURGEONS**

SEC. 3. (a) Section 201(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "O-2 with two or less" and inserting in place thereof the words "O-3 with over four, but not more than six."

(b) Section 421(a) of title 37, United

States Code, is amended by striking out the words "O-2 with less than two" and inserting in place thereof the words "O-3 with over four, but not more than six."

**RETIRED PAY AND RETAINER PAY**

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, the changes made by this Act in the rates of basic

pay of members of the uniformed services do not increase the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of the uniformed services was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

(b) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the day before the



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7599

effective date of this Act is entitled to an increase of 5 percent in that retired pay or retainer pay.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of an armed force who was entitled to pay and allowances under any of the following provisions of law on the day before the effective date of this Act shall continue to receive the pay and allowances to which he was entitled on that day:

(1) The Act of March 23, 1946, chapter 112 (60 Stat. 59).

(2) The Act of June 26, 1948, chapter 677 (62 Stat. 1052).

(3) The Act of September 18, 1950, chapter 952 (64 Stat. A224).

(d) Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section after section 1401:

"§ 1401a. Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index

"(a) Unless otherwise specifically provided by law, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force shall be computed at the rate of basic pay applicable to him when he was retired, was granted retired pay, or became entitled to retainer pay, as the case may be.

"(b) In January of each calendar year after 1963, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the percent that the annual average of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the preceding calendar year has increased over that for 1962 or, if later, for the calendar year preceding that in which the most recent adjustment in retired pay and retainer pay has been made under this subsection. If the Secretary determines the percent of that increase to be 3 or more, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force who became entitled to that pay before January 2 of the year in which the Secretary makes that determination shall, as of April 1 of that year, be increased by that percent, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.";

(2) by inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"1401a. Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index."

(e) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1401 is amended by striking out the words ", and adjust to reflect later changes in applicable permanent rates" in footnote 1 to the table;

(2) Sections 3991 and 8991 are each amended—

(A) by amending column 1 of formula A in the table to read as follows:

"Monthly basic pay<sup>2</sup> of member's retired grade.";

(B) by amending footnote 2 to the table to read as follows:

"Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement."

(3) Chapter 561 is amended by repealing section 6149 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"6149. Retired pay: computed on basis of rates of pay for officers on the active list."

(4) Sections 6151(b), 6323(e), 6325 (a) (2) and (b) (2), 6326(c) (2), 6381(a) (2), 6389(c) (2), 6390(b) (2), and 6394(h) are each

amended by striking out the words "to which he would be entitled if serving on active duty in" and inserting in place thereof the word "of".

(5) Section 6327(b) is amended by striking out the words "to which he would be entitled if on active duty" and inserting in place thereof the words "of the grade in which retired".

(6) Section 6396(c) (2), 6398(b) (2), 6399 (c) (2), and 6400(b) (2) are each amended by striking out the words "to which she would be entitled if serving on active duty in" and inserting in place thereof the word "of".

(f) A member or former member of a uniformed service is not entitled to an increase in his retired pay or retainer pay because of the enactment of this Act for any period before the effective date of this Act.

(g) Section 3(b) of the Act of August 10, 1956, ch. 1041 (33 U.S.C. 857a(b)), and section 221(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 213a(b)) are each amended by striking out the words "or 'the Secretary concerned'" and inserting in place thereof the words ", 'the Secretary concerned', or 'the Secretary of Defense'".

(h) Section 1402(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting the words, "at any time for a continuous period of at least one year" immediately after the words "serves on active duty" in the first sentence and by striking out the words "on the basis of any period of active duty that was of less than six consecutive months' duration or" in the second sentence.

#### SUBMARINE PAY FOR MEMBERS TRAINING FOR DUTY ON NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINES

Sec. 5. Section 301(a) (2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) as determined by the Secretary concerned, on a submarine (including, in the case of nuclear-powered submarines, periods of training and rehabilitation after assignment thereto), or, in the case of personnel qualified in submarines, as a prospective crewmember of a submarine being constructed, and during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design or a position of increased responsibility on a submarine;"

#### INCENTIVE PAY FOR DUTY INSIDE A HIGH- OR LOW-PRESSURE CHAMBER

Sec. 6. Section 301(a) (9) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(9) inside a high- or low-pressure chamber;"

#### MULTIPLE PAYMENTS OF INCENTIVE PAY

Sec. 7. Section 301(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "only one payment" and inserting in place thereof the words "not more than two payments".

#### REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR RESPONSIBILITY PAY

Sec. 8. Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by repealing section 306 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"306. Special pay: officers holding positions of unusual responsibility and of critical nature."

#### INCREASE IN BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE

Sec. 9. Section 402 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out the words ", on a daily basis," and the fourth sentence.

(2) Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The basic allowance for subsistence for members of the uniformed services is as follows:

(1) Officers----- \$51.00 a month

(2) Enlisted members when rations in kind are not available and their duty assignment requires them to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of those incurred by members covered by clause (3).

(3) Enlisted members on leave, when permission to mess separately is granted, or when rations in kind are not available and the members are not otherwise qualified under clause (2).

(4) Enlisted members when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no messing facilities of the United States are available and they are required to incur subsistence expenses substantially in excess of those incurred by members covered by clause (2).

\$37.50 a month.  
\$37.50 a month.  
Not more than \$129.30 a month."

#### FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

Sec. 10. Chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The following new section is inserted after section 426:

"§ 427. Family separation allowance

"(a) In addition to any allowance or per diem to which he otherwise may be entitled under this title, a member of a uniformed service with dependents who is on permanent duty outside of the United States, or in Alaska, is entitled to a monthly allowance equal to the basic allowance for quarters payable to a member without dependents in the same pay grade if—

"(1) the movement of his dependents to his permanent station or a place near that station is not authorized at the expense of the United States under section 406 of this title and his dependents do not reside at or near that station; and

"(2) quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service are not available for assignment to him.

"(b) Except in time of war or of national emergency hereafter declared by Congress, and in addition to any allowance or per diem to which he otherwise may be entitled under this title, including subsection (a) of this section, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to a basic allowance for quarters as a member with dependents under section 403 of this title is entitled to a monthly allowance equal to \$30 or one-third of the basic allowance for quarters payable to a member without dependents in the same pay grade, whichever amount is the greater, if—

"(1) the movement of his dependents to his permanent station or a place near that station is not authorized at the expense of the United States under section 406 of this title and his dependents do not reside at or near the station;

"(2) he is on duty on board a ship away from the home port of the ship for a continuous period of more than 30 days; or

"(3) he is on temporary duty away from his permanent station for a continuous period of more than 30 days and his dependents do not reside at or near his temporary duty station."

(2) The analysis is amended by inserting the following item:

"427. Family separation allowance."

#### FOREIGN DUTY PAY

Sec. 11. (a) Section 305 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "or Hawaii" in subsection (a) and the word "Hawaii," wherever it appears in subsection (b).

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) an enlisted member who, on the day before the effective date of this Act, is permanently assigned to duty in Hawaii, shall, during the remaining period of that assignment, be paid the basic pay to which he was entitled on that date plus special pay under section 305 of title 37, United States Code, whenever qualified thereunder, if the total of that basic pay and that special pay is more than the basic pay to which he would otherwise be entitled during that period under section 2 of this Act.

#### SAVINGS PROVISIONS

Sec. 12. (a) Any member of the uniformed services who becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay during calendar year 1963 but prior to the effective date of this Act, may compute his retirement or retainer pay on or after the effective date of this Act under the rates established by section 2 of this Act unless entitled to a higher rate under some other provision of law.

(b) The enactment of this Act does not reduce the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation under section 411 of title 38, United States Code, that any person was receiving on the day before the effective date of this Act or which thereafter becomes payable for that day by reason of a subsequent determination.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 13. This Act becomes effective on October 1, 1963 or on the first day of the first month after enactment, whichever is later.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: On page 4, strike out lines 8 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) A member or former member of a uniformed service who, in accordance with section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 829), is entitled to retired pay or retainer pay computed by 'method' (a) of that section using rates of basic pay that were in effect before October 1, 1949, is entitled—

"(1) to have that pay recomputed by 'method' (b) of that section using the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act on the day before the effective date of this Act; or

"(2) to continue to have that pay computed by 'method' (a) using rates of basic pay that were in effect before October 1, 1949, plus any applicable percentage increases;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(c) A member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired pay or retainer pay computed under the

rates of basic pay that were in effect under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 before June 1, 1958, is entitled—

"(1) to have that pay recomputed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act on the day before the effective date of this Act; or

"(2) to continue to have that pay computed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act before June 1, 1958, plus any applicable percentage increases; whichever pay is the greater.

"(d) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay on the day before the effective date of this Act and who served as Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps is entitled—

"(1) to have his retired pay recomputed under the formula for computing retired pay applicable to him—

"(A) when he retired; or

"(B) if he served on active duty after he retired and his retired pay was recomputed by reason of that service, when his retired pay was so recomputed;

using as his rate of basic pay the rate of basic pay prescribed for officers serving on active duty in those positions on June 1, 1958, by footnote 1 to the table for commissioned officers in section 201(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 122); or

"(2) to continue to receive the retired pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(e) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the day before the effective date of this Act is entitled to an increase of 5 per centum in—

"(1) the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on that day; or

"(2) the pay to which he is entitled under subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section, in the case of a member or former member who is entitled to have the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on that day recomputed under that subsection."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, this is the recomputation amendment, and I think everybody understands it. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have already discussed the provisions and the intent of this amendment. It is to right a wrong that was committed in 1958 when we denied those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, the right to compute. They had had this right by law with the exception of a brief period in the 1920's purely for economic reasons, and they were denied this right. This applies to enlisted as well as officer personnel and anybody who retired prior to 1958. We have agreed that this is the last time this sort of situation will arise. When this amendment is disposed of, in the future there will be an escalation clause and we are giving notice. In 1958 we did not do that. We have the most distinguished heroes of World War II in the history of America out of the 11 mil-

lion or 12 million, or 14 million service men and women who served their country, the greatest array of heroes since the founding of this Republic—one retired one day and one retired the next day. One was denied and one was given the right. This is not right. It is to right this wrong that I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I know it is right. If we can afford a hundred billion dollars in foreign aid, military assistance, and Alliance for Progress, we can afford this measly \$30 million for the greatest array there is since you were born.

As one poet said:

I have never had the privilege of tasting the ardor of conflict, I have never been on a battlefield.

Some of you may have. I do not know what it is like, but I know this is my day, this is my time to do something, and I am trying, because in my heart I know it is right.

Once a lineal descendant, a person from whom Winston Churchill came, said:

God and the soldier we adore  
In time of danger—not before—  
Danger passed and all things righted,  
God forgotten and the soldier slighted.

I recall when we passed a bill to give special consideration to five-star men. I recall when MacArthur, Nimitz, and all of these great heroes appeared, how high the enthusiasm was to give them something for what they had done.

How many do you think ought to have the Legion of Merit or the Distinguished Service Cross? How many do you know of your acquaintances who never got the decoration? This is your time to reward these men and women who have given so generously to their country.

I recognize, as you do, this retirement problem. I recognize, as you do, that in the future we may have to give consideration to it. But I want to remind you that this is your time to right a wrong, and I will leave it there.

I thank you very much.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, on April 9, the Committee on Armed Services voted on two motions which dealt directly with the question of recomputation. The first motion was to grant recomputation, plus a 5 percent cost of living increase. That motion was defeated by a vote of 19 to 13. The second motion was to permit those retired prior to June 1, 1958, to be given a choice of recomputation or a 5 percent of cost of living increase. That motion was defeated by a vote of 18 to 23.

Therefore, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, speaking for a majority of the members of that committee, is asking the House to support the committee's position. I think I can

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7601

demonstrate to you by facts and figures the soundness of the position of the majority of the Committee on Armed Services.

Here is what the issue boils down to.

The Pay Act of May 20, 1958, which went into effect on June 1, 1958, provided that no one retired prior to June 1, 1958, could compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales contained in the 1958 Pay Act. However, these people did receive a 6-percent cost-of-living increase.

The issue before the House today is whether we will permit all persons who are paid under the Career Compensation Act, and who retired prior to June 1, 1958, to recompute their retirement pay under the existing 1958 pay scales, plus a 5-percent cost-of-living increase, or whether we will adhere to the decision we made in 1958 not to permit recomputation.

If recomputation is authorized by this proposed law, then any person who retired prior to June 1, 1958, who draws his retirement pay under the Career Compensation Act will be able to recompute his retirement pay under the 1958 pay scales and this could include persons who served in the Spanish American War, if they are still alive.

Bear in mind now, in 1948, when the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Kilday, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, presented that bill after a long hearing, we wrote in that all those distinguished officers who retired prior to that date, June 1, 1958, were not permitted to recompute their retirement upon the scale of pay given in the 1958 act. Now, that is the whole issue.

One step further. Recomputation is authorized by the proposed law, and any person who retired prior to June 1, 1958, and draws his retirement under the Career Compensation Act will be able to recompute his retirement pay under the 1958 pay scale, and this will include persons who even served in the Spanish-American War, if they are living.

We tried to bring about a cutoff period. The Congress cut it off in 1958. From 1958 down to this very hour an effort has been made to set aside that cutoff date. The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina in his amendment says that it only applies to those who retired before June 1, 1958. Now, I say to you if it is fair to that group, why is it not equally fair to the man who retired in 1959, 1960, 1961, or 1962 down to this present time? Are you going to make fish of one and fowl of another? As I pointed out when he was speaking, the logical conclusion is if you are going to give it to him, do not stop it. That is the logical thing to do. If those who retired before 1958 are entitled to recompute, why is not the man who retires

after 1958 entitled to the same thing? Yet this amendment does not do it.

Now, we tried to stop it, and the reason we had to stop it was because of the enormous cost. And no man fought more vigorously on the floor of this House for the retired officers and the other officers of the armed services than I have. For 48 years I have been fighting their fights here. But I see the danger of what will happen.

Now, here is what is going to happen. Just listen to this: You are sowing the seed that is going to destroy the retirement system. You cannot continue to have this retirement cost going up billions of dollars year after year.

Mr. Chairman, in the next 10 years, without any recomputation, it will be in the neighborhood of \$3 billion annually. Here is what is going to happen: If we continue this then we have got to change the retirement system. When you change your retirement system then you are forcing people to stay in the service longer than their military physical qualifications would warrant them to stay there. Then, what happens? Then you slow down promotions. Then a man says "Why should I stay in the service? I have no opportunity to go forward."

If you adopt this amendment, I venture the prediction here today that in less than 5 years an effort will be made on the floor of this House to completely change the retirement system, because this country cannot stand this retirement pay as it is going along now. That is the reason why in 1958 we had to do it. Today what does the appropriation bill carry for this purpose? \$1,029 million for retired pay. It will be \$3 billion in 1980.

Without any retired pay increases our annual retirement costs will exceed \$3 billion in 1980.

If we assume a 6-percent cost of living increase every 4 years, those retirement costs will go to \$4,135 million by 1980.

And if we take the average increases in military pay since the end of World War II, which approximates an 11-percent increase every 3 years, and project that in the future on the basis of recomputation, then retirement costs for military personnel in 1980 would exceed \$6,415 million annually, and by 1983 would exceed \$7,800 million a year.

I might add that a study prepared by the University of Michigan for the Senate Armed Services Committee came up with this conclusion:

The cost of living method of increasing retired pay is not only the most equitable, but more closely will achieve the objectives of the retirement system. \* \* \* The committee concludes after a thorough study of all the evidence that the cost of living method of increasing retired pay should be retained and that this policy should be continued in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to preserve the retirement system. These distinguished men who have defended the country and have given their lives are entitled to a fair and an equitable bill. We have given it to them. We have given them a 6-percent, cost-of-living increase. Let me show you this. Do you know what? I ask my learned friend here, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], does he know what is involved in this? They talk about \$32 million. That is the first payment. If you adopt this amendment, for the life of this amendment you will put a cost of \$600 million on the American taxpayer. That is exactly it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, of course my life has been enriched by my association for all these years with these admirals and these generals, great men. I regret that my conscience will not permit me to go along with them. But I cannot do it under these facts and figures.

Mr. Chairman, what does the law give them today? The former Chief of Staff under the law receives retirement at the rate of \$12,180 a year. If you vote for the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] you will give him \$17,712. Generals and admirals get \$12,180, in addition to the privileges, and they are entitled to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to complain about the fringe benefits which these people receive. They are entitled to them. However, generals and admirals get \$12,180 today. Under this amendment they would get \$16,068. Lieutenant generals and vice admirals get when they retire \$11,220. Under this amendment they would get \$14,172.

Now, he had to retire before June 1. It is proposed that we vote these increases merely because of the fact that he had been in the service and was retired. It is wrong in principle to say that because an officer on active duty gets a certain amount then a retired officer is entitled to base his retirement pay upon the pay of the officer on active duty.

Let me continue to show what some of these increases are. Major generals and rear admirals of the upper half get today \$10,272. Under this amendment they would receive \$12,768.

Brigadier generals and rear admirals who today get \$9,228, under this amendment would get \$11,100.

Here is the list; I am going to put it in the RECORD:

## Annual retirement pay

| Grade  | Present pay | Recomputation and 5 percent | 5-percent increase only |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Former Chiefs of Staff.....                            | \$12,180    | \$17,712                    | \$12,792                |
| Generals and admirals.....                             | 12,180      | 16,068                      | 12,792                  |
| Lieutenant generals and vice admirals.....             | 11,220      | 14,172                      | 11,784                  |
| Major generals and rear admirals (upper half).....     | 10,272      | 12,768                      | 10,788                  |
| Brigadier generals and rear admirals (lower half)..... | 9,228       | 11,100                      | 9,684                   |
| Colonels and captains (30).....                        | 7,740       | 9,312                       | 8,124                   |
| Lieutenants colonels and commanders (27).....          | 5,760       | 6,588                       | 6,048                   |
| Majors and lieutenant commanders (26).....             | 4,896       | 5,172                       | 5,136                   |
| Captains and lieutenants (25).....                     | 4,092       | 4,296                       | 4,296                   |
| 1st lieutenants and lieutenants (25).....              | 3,288       | 3,456                       | 3,456                   |
| 2d lieutenants and ensigns (27).....                   | 3,216       | 3,372                       | 3,372                   |
| E-7's (23 years).....                                  | 2,340       | 2,532                       | 2,460                   |
| E-6's (23 years).....                                  | 2,112       | 2,220                       | 2,220                   |
| E-5's (24 years).....                                  | 1,968       | 2,064                       | 2,064                   |
| E-4's (25 years).....                                  | 1,740       | 1,824                       | 1,824                   |

I made this statement before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Armed Services concluded that the facts did not warrant this increase.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened? You saw here this morning by a roll-call vote a bill from the Committee on Appropriations recommitted because of an item of \$65,000. And yet on the next matter before the House, they are asking us to saddle upon the American taxpayer at least \$600 million.

Mr. Chairman, I want to raise this question. I am disturbed about it and I think you had better be disturbed about it. In my opinion if the amendment is adopted, section 4(a) of this bill would be completely ineffective in preventing a demand for increased retirement pay for the entire period 1958 to 1963. I take the position that under the language of this amendment there are 5 years when he has not received this money, and in my opinion he would have the opportunity to file a claim in the Court of Claims for every one of those years, that he would be entitled to recompute for those years. He would be entitled under this amendment to start in 1958 and recompute down to October 1963. He has not received that pay, and therefore he would be entitled to recompute for each of those years.

Who knows what that will cost? Mr. Chairman, we have a good bill here. We have given them 6 percent. If you want to give these distinguished gentlemen these enormous increases—\$4,000, \$2,000, \$1,000, whatever the amount is—that is your privilege. I have done my duty because I am afraid, I see the danger—mark my word, and I repeat it here—the day will come in this House, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB] will be here probably, but I will not because I am an old man—but he will be here and will see an effort made to change the entire retirement system if you continue to permit these things to happen.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to save the retirement system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia be permitted to continue an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, but I have concluded my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia says that he has finished his statement.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would be less than frank and candid if I did not say to you that I do not quite relish being in this particular position at this time. You have just heard the man who has done more for the armed services of the United States than any other man who lives or ever will live. But I should like to point out that deep convictions can be held by younger men as well as those who are more experienced. I rise here, not in disrespect of my chairman, who is one of the greatest men I will ever know, but out of a deep sense of conviction that a wrong has been done and that this Congress must correct it.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that by a vote of 19 to 13 the Rivers amendment which is before you was rejected in the House Committee on Armed Services. But since that time, I may say, there have been a great many second thoughts, much additional thinking, and soul searching, and the unofficial count today is that somewhere between 22 and 25 of that 37-man committee are going to support this amendment.

The distinguished chairman has said that this recomputation amendment is "sowing the seeds that will destroy the retirement system." I respectfully disagree. I cannot say that correcting a wrong, an injustice, at a cost of \$30 million a year, and that is all that is at stake here, is going to bankrupt the retirement system. Thirty million dollars a year is the most this amendment could cost, and as each year goes by it will cost less.

I do not believe we are ready to say that the U.S. Government is going bankrupt because from time to time we improve the Civil Service Retirement System. Yet the deficit in this system increased from June 30, 1960, to June 30, 1961, by \$1,117 million, despite a Federal contribution of \$896 million. My mathematics indicates that in the fiscal year 1961 the cost of the Federal share of the Civil Service Retirement System was therefore \$2,013 million. We know it will

increase in the future. None of us will say that this is going to bankrupt the country. Why is it that \$30 million a year spent in the interests of right and fairness will bankrupt the country?

To say that the total cost of the amendment is \$600 million is to use the technique of shock. The amendment will cost that much over more than 20 years. Had this fact been stated the amount would not have been shocking. I should like to point out that at the rate of \$2,013 million annual Federal cost for Civil Service Retirement over the same period of time would amount to more than \$50 billion.

Our respected chairman has said that if we permit recomputation for those who retired prior to 1958, why not do the same for those who retired after 1958? The thing the chairman did not tell you is that those who have been retired since the 1st of June 1958 do get to compute their pay on the basis of the 1958 pay scale, and they are getting the increased payment today. You do not have to allow it. They are getting it now.

This amendment is a pure and simple bit of fairness. We did not provide in 1958 for the future as we are doing in this bill. This amendment is only correcting the wrong of 1958. We are wiping the slate clean and starting a new system. Let me make this perfectly clear. This is the end of recomputation for the future.

This amendment is not retroactive in the sense that there will be retroactive payments.

Let me make it clear that this amendment will still keep the cost of the bill under the President's budget for fiscal year 1964.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Will not the gentleman agree with me on the very point that he is developing, the very thing we are suggesting today is merely what the Secretary of Defense has recognized as a gross inequity and, therefore, in his report on the pay bill that came up from the Department of Defense this was provided for; is this not correct?

Mr. GUBSER. That is correct. The gentleman raises a very significant point. This was proposed by former President Eisenhower. He is in favor of it today, I understand. This was proposed by President Kennedy in his successful campaign. This is the position of the Department of Defense because this was in the bill that they sent to us. This is the unanimous position of the Rivers subcommittee which worked 2 weeks on pay legislation. Everybody is in favor of this.

I do not see why we do not get it over with and do what is basically fair.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like to say this. I do not think it is a crime to be an admiral or a general. For 40 years we did not give

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7603

them anything. In every statute, and I have them listed here, they refer since 1920 only to officers below brigadier general. In 1922 or 1942 it refers only to the lowest commissioned grade. For over 40 years, from 1908 to 1946, which is roughly 40 years, they got nothing. Now what is wrong with correcting that inequity? My distinguished chairman said, in his opinion, they could go to the court of claims and sue for this. I happen to be a member of the bar just as a lot of you—not very distinguished but where I come from, I do not do so bad. We put this in the bill. It is the bill. There is no fanciful thinking here. It says:

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, the changes made by this Act in the rates of basic pay of members of the uniformed services do not increase the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of the uniformed services was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

Now I respectfully reserve the right to disagree with my chairman. I do not think it can happen. This, of course, is my opinion. I think I have a lot of people who know something about the law on my side. So this is not a one-way decision. I do not think many of them would go into the court of claims because this act speaks pretty plainly. We have a chance to do the right thing and we have a distinguished array of people who feel the same way about it.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand that this will bring all of the officers up to date on a recomputed basis or give them the right to recompute but stops it for the future?

Mr. GUBSER. That is exactly right.

Mr. ALGER. In other words, this is a provision that makes the law consistent and puts all retired officers on the same basis. We assume that there will be no further recomputation in the future.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I have one more point I would like to make and since I have yielded so much time, may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I have several examples of the four star generals who would benefit from this amendment. These examples expose the specious argument which implies that this amendment would favor only the high-ranking officers. Unfortunately time does not permit me to relate all of them.

Let us consider a distinguished officer like Admiral Kinkaid, with 45 years in the military service. Many of the officers who were junior to him are today retired on the \$16,000 a year that this bill would give to Admiral Kinkaid. If it is right for his junior officers to have

it, what is wrong with giving it to him? The same is true of General Clark.

Some of his junior officers were made generals and because they retired after 1958 are getting \$16,000 a year. But their commanding officer who directed them in World War II is getting \$4,000 less. Is this right? Is this proper?

Don't make the mistake of concluding that this amendment benefits only high-ranking officers. The truth of the matter is there are only 50 four-star generals and chiefs of staff involved.

There are only 1,852 general officers. There are 33,000 majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels, and 5,000 company grade officers.

There are 45,000 chief petty officers and sergeants who would benefit from this amendment. They get an increase of only \$130 a year, but that \$130 to the sergeant and chief means more than the \$4,000 increase to the retired member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There are four or five thousand other noncommissioned officers, or a total of 50,000 noncommissioned officers, who would benefit from this amendment.

The Fleet Reserve Association, composed entirely of enlisted men, is wholeheartedly on record in favor of this re-computation amendment. So are the Army Sergeants Association and the Naval Enlisted Reserve Association.

The American Legion, AMVETS, DAV, Jewish War Veterans, Catholic War Veterans, Military Order of Purple Heart, VFW, and Veterans of World War I have also gone on record as favoring the principle of this amendment.

I conclude by saying this amendment officially ends re-computation for the future. We correct the injustice of 1958 and the situation where one man retires and gets more than another man of equal rank and equal service of equal distinction.

This amendment will not bankrupt the country. It was in the President's budget for 1964; it is in the Department of Defense recommendation; it was a basic part of President Kennedy's campaign speeches. It is the subcommittee's position. We should respect this great weight of authority and accept the Rivers amendment.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because it recognizes that the insidious ills of inflation fastened upon our Nation of which the retired and pensioned are the firstline victims cannot be placed at the feet of those who questioned not the cost to person when the time of crisis bid them rise to the occasion.

At \$30 million a year it would take 15 years to spend the same amount this House voted a few days ago for the politically inspired \$450 million so-called emergency public works bill—a total authorized expenditure approaching \$1 billion.

I voted against the emergency public works bill because it deals with politics. I vote for this amendment because it deals with the welfare of persons who deserve our gratitude. I trust that those why cry crocodile tears over our national

spending will remember those tears when they are faced with the necessity of voting on the multiplicity of fantastic programs to add agencies and bureaus to an already towering bureaucracy to say nothing of the aid to foreign governments to keep their leaders on an economic level to which kings are accustomed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult issue, as are many of the issues that are before the committees and before the House.

A few weeks ago, some of us in the Armed Services Committee came before the House and appealed for some recognition of the problem of financing and costs with regard to our defense program. We did not win that fight on the B-70, but although we lost the battle we may have won the war, because since that time there has been a great deal more recognition of the fact that even in our defense expenditures there must be some recognition of the ultimate cost, and that maximum effort must be made to hold the line.

That is the spirit in which this bill has come from the committee. That is the issue under which this Rivers amendment must be argued.

It is true that the recommendation offered by the gentleman from South Carolina was in the original submission from the Defense Department, but let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that the committee in its wisdom added some costs to the bill.

We retained sea pay and overseas pay, which the Department sought to strike out. We added a family separation allowance, and to balance off these increases we have made some reductions.

There has been a certain amount of confusion about this matter of re-computation. This is a somewhat complicated issue and sometimes even some of us on the committee are perplexed over some of the details.

I would like to try, if possible, to throw a little light on some of the points on this particular legislation and this particular amendment. In the first place, the purpose of this bill, the central purpose, is to bring the pay of active duty personnel somewhat more into line with that of those in private industry, and to retain active duty personnel in the service, to make a career out of the service. We are concerned about retired personnel too, of course. We certainly have to be fair to them, but I think we have also got to recognize that when a pay bill comes along, the central and important question is the pay given to those on active duty who are immedi-

ately charged with the defense of our country.

Now, two points have been involved in this particular issue, and both of those points were made eloquently to the committee by the Department of Defense. The first point is that we simply cannot provide the increases in active duty pay that have got to be made if we are going to have a highly trained professional armed force, if at the same time all of these changes in active duty pay must also be translated into the vastly growing amount of money that is paid out to our retired personnel. If we are going to be restricted in the improvements that we can give to our active duty personnel because all such increases must also be passed along to our growing body of retired personnel, then the result may likely be that we will have to skimp on what we do for our active duty people.

The second point was made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, namely, the vast increase in retirement pay that we are running into. By 1980, without any recomputation, retired pay will cost \$4.1 billion a year. If recomputation goes through today and if it were to continue in the future—and I do not see how in view of the eloquent argument given by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], that we will ever be able to cut off recomputation for good—if we have recomputation all the way through, then the entire cost of retired pay will rise in 1980 to \$6.4 billion or, in other words, almost 6 percent of the budget, assuming that the 1980 budget is of the same size as the present one.

Now the issue has been raised, Mr. Chairman, that we are breaking faith with our retired service personnel.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the decision on that matter was made back in 1958. I did not happen to be a Member of the Congress at that time, but what is being proposed now in the Rivers amendment is that we revoke that decision back in 1958, which has now been recognized and has become accepted, and provide a recomputation for people in that particular period but then cut it off for all time in the future, and for all personnel retired after 1958.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Did the gentleman vote for the recomputation bill which was unanimously passed by this House in 1960?

Mr. STRATTON. I believe I did, but it is possible for a Member to change his mind. And, I have been impressed, as the gentleman knows, by the tremendous fiscal and economic problem facing this country. I voted for the B-70 a year ago too, but I opposed it, as the gentleman knows, the other day, because of the seriousness of our fiscal situation. Yes, we are told that we are breaking

faith with these people, but we did that, if we did it, back in 1958. And if we adopt the Rivers amendment we will still be breaking faith, but only with a 5-year gap.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we are being fair to our retired personnel. In the first place, many of them are able to get jobs in private industry after they retire. In the second place we are giving them a 5 percent increase in this bill. I may say that this 5 percent in many cases is larger than what they would get if they had recomputed their pay on 1958 pay scales. In addition to that, we are guaranteeing them now in this bill for all time to come an automatic cost of living increase of 3 percent every time the cost of living goes up by 3 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is not a single other private retirement system that does the same thing. This is an eminently fair arrangement. We are guaranteeing that these honored people who have served our Nation can, when they retire, continue to live on the same standard of living that prevailed when they retired.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think in fairness to the needs of our active services and in recognition of our budget limitations that we can be expected to do any more.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to re-incorporate into the military pay bill—H.R. 5555—the provision which would permit Armed Forces personnel retired before July 1958 to recompute their retirement pay on the basis of current pay rates.

In this connection I wish to associate myself with the views of those members of the Armed Services Committee who filed additional views on H.R. 5555 when it was approved by our committee. I believe the first sentence of the additional views is particularly pertinent:

This bill contains a major inconsistency.

It does indeed, Mr. Chairman. It not only contains a major inconsistency, it contains a major breach of trust with a group of the most devoted and patriotic citizens of this great country of ours—that group made up of individuals who have dedicated their lives to defending and preserving the security of our Nation.

I am privileged to have in my congressional district the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., and from my former membership on the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, I am acutely aware of the need for continuing to make service careers as attractive as possible in order to retain the Academy's highly trained graduates as career officers. In addition, many retired officers of all services have chosen to make Annapolis their home. Among them are some of our finest combat leaders of two World Wars and the Korean conflict. I appreciate intimately their concern over

the arbitrary system of two classes of retirees which the violation of the recomputation tradition has created.

The inequity, if not corrected, will continue to be very upsetting to morale among those on active duty today. The active duty personnel believe they have lost a most valuable and traditional right—real security for the future—in that heretofore they had a retirement system which was geared to the existing pay scales.

We all know the history of the recomputation provision so there is no need to repeat it here. There are, however, a few points—major points—which I would like to emphasize at this time for fear that they might be lost in the clouds created by irrelevant debate.

The first is that when Congress in 1958 violated the longstanding tradition of recomputation for retired pay, the injustice and error of the decision was soon recognized and attempts were started to rectify the situation. The House in 1960 passed a bill to reinstitute recomputation, but the measure died with adjournment before final action could be completed.

The Kennedy administration, like its predecessor, has supported recomputation not only because of the tradition but because it is provided for in existing law. Secretary McNamara last year submitted a memorandum to the Senate Armed Services Committee which showed that the Comptroller General has consistently held that section 6149 of title 10 of the United States Code and other laws establish this right.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote an excerpt from the remarks Mr. McNamara recently presented to the House Armed Services Subcommittee which originally considered the pay proposals. This part of the statement clearly indicates the administration's support for recomputation:

Apart from the historical precedent, recomputation has certain advantages. Since retirement pay is based on active duty, disparities in rates of retirement pay between members of the same grade and length of service were avoided. Moreover, a member retired either involuntarily or voluntarily, whether for age, physical disability or length of service had no reason to seek a delay in his retirement. He knew that his retirement or his retainer pay would be the same whether he retired before or after a pending pay increase. Under recomputation the retirement date as such was not crucial since the level of retirement pay always bore the same relationship to active duty basic pay.

Another point which I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is that recomputation is a two-way street. Under this tradition, retired military personnel get their share of the harvest in bad years as well as good. In four separate instances retired personnel have taken a cut in their annuities when the active duty pay has been reduced.

Furthermore, Congress, when setting active duty pay rates, traditionally has taken into consideration the retirement equity officers are accruing—that retired pay for military personnel is not completely gratuity but earned through contributions by each individual in uniform. In other retirement systems the

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7605

annuity is based on the total salary of the individual while in the military it is based only on the person's basic salary without taking into account his allowance for quarters and subsistence.

It is important to note in this connection that over the past 10 years the median earnings have gone up 49 percent for groups comparable to military officers and 44.8 percent for groups comparable to enlisted personnel, while during the same period military compensation rose by only 16.2 percent.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is one point on which this whole argument, I believe, hinges, and that is that when we talk about retirement pay for military personnel we are not describing the problem properly. This in reality is not retirement pay at all. It is, in fact, retainer pay.

The military servant, in comparison to most of us, spends a relatively short portion of his working life in his chosen career. More often than not he retires after 20 years, but his association with the military does not stop there. In addition to being eligible to receive an annuity, he assumes certain obligations. For instance, he must keep his service chief informed of his whereabouts and get permission to travel outside the country. He carries these burdens because he is on call by his former boss—he can be recalled to active duty when his services are needed. In this sense, then, his so-called retirement is a retainer. It is to keep him ready and available so that he can again serve his country if needed.

In closing let me quote a very pertinent section of the 1957 report of the Cordiner Committee, that group established to study all aspects of the military pay problem. The report said:

The inclusion of retired personnel within the new compensation system is considered by the Committee to be a mandatory and essential feature fully in consonance with the long-established principle that retired compensation must always remain closely related to current active duty pay. To depart from this principle would not only break faith with the individual currently retired, but would have a most serious adverse effect upon the retention rates of personnel currently on active duty.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and thus for recomputation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And the Committee on Armed Services then reported this thing out unanimously and the House passed it unanimously. On the subcommittee of which I have the distinct honor to be chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] was a member of that subcommittee, and I do not recall his raising a point of order to this provision when we reported it out. The point at which the gentleman got religion I am not certain. But I am sorry to see such a great concern for the budget now and his colleagues in arms. We want to

take care of them. This disturbs me, this disturbs me.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. VINSON. So the committee can clearly understand, in 1960, by direction of the Armed Services Committee, I presented to the House a bill permitting recomputation or computation. It passed unanimously. It went to the other body. It was referred to a subcommittee. It stayed in the subcommittee. After awhile a decision was made to have a staff study by the great University of Michigan. That university held that they were not entitled to recomputation but they were entitled to cost-of-living increases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] has expired.

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my respected chairman that I am speaking of the actions of the House of Representatives, not of the other body.

Mr. VINSON. I was just telling the complete story.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANKFORD. Briefly.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman permit me to point out that this proposal which the gentleman from South Carolina is now advocating so strongly is a proposal which, when it was first presented to the subcommittee, by the Department of Defense, was bitterly opposed by all of the representatives of the retired associations as itself constituting a breach of faith. Now we have the gentleman and these representatives coming in and telling us that this proposal they opposed so strongly before our subcommittee was just what the doctor ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. In my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many others, it is a breach of faith.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The reason they opposed it is it did not go far enough. Mention was made of the University of Michigan, that great university. Their decision was based on compression. Their report to the chairman was compressed from the top. Remember that high-ranking officer never even got a pay increase for 40 years.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I realize, as pointed out by the gentleman from California, that since the action of the full committee there has been a lot of reflection, a lot of thought and much soul searching,

and I might also add there has been a lot of letter writing.

For that reason, I am reluctant to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, but I do not feel that I can responsibly pursue any other course.

This bill, may I point out to the Members of the House, carries a cost tag of \$12 billion a year. The committee has acted with some responsibility. We have brought this bill into the House better than \$46 million under the recommendations of the Department of Defense. Here in one fast move of noneconomy you are going to remove better than two-thirds of those reductions which we brought to the House.

The most discussed action of the committee has been the rejection of this amendment, the recommendation to permit military personnel who retired prior to 1958 to recompute their retired pay by using the 1958 pay scale. Recomputation will cost us an additional \$31 million a year. I voted for the elimination of recomputation in the committee. I shall of course, adhere to that position in the House, even though I have been swamped by requests, as have all of the Members, to change my position.

I have the greatest appreciation for the service which our retired personnel have rendered to this country, but I cannot in good conscience, in the light of our national debt of \$306 billion and our perennial deficits, vote for the right to recompute, which is a feature not contained in any other retirement plan.

I think it should be emphasized to all the Members of the House that all retired personnel are receiving under the bill a 5-percent cost-of-living increase, which seems to have been forgotten during the discussion on this amendment. I did not feel that we could afford, in view of our budgetary problem, to grant both a cost-of-living increase and recomputation.

Let me point out to the Members of the House again the words of the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, when he pointed out that without any increase in retirement pay whatsoever the cost to the American taxpayer in 1980 for military retirement pay is going to be \$3 billion a year, and if you project the cost of military retirement in the future and have these same increases as we have had in the past, by 1983 military retirement pay is going to cost this Nation \$7,800 million.

I further point out to the House the words of the chairman when he stated to the House that 11 generals and admirals are going to get an annual increase of \$4,586 a year under this recomputation amendment which they ask you to adopt. I do not think that you can justify an increase of \$4,586. For that reason I side with the chairman and believe that the action asked by the gentleman from South Carolina will jeopardize the entire military retirement system.

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

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this legislation, but I also intend to support the chairman of the committee, the

distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], in reference to this particular amendment.

I suspect the same question could be asked me: How did I vote in 1960 on similar legislation that included a re-computation feature? My answer to that question, if it were asked me, would be that I have seen some financial figures that have given me a little religion about this serious problem.

Let me quote some of those startling figures. As has been indicated here several times this afternoon, in 1971 the cost of military retirement will be over \$2 billion a year.

In 1980 it will be over \$3 billion a year. But let us go back and take a look at history to give us a better perspective for the future.

In 1954, the first year that I went on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, the military retirement expenditure was \$386 million a year. The military budget for fiscal 1964, the budget we have before us—this year the cost will be \$1,163 million. In other words, going up from almost \$400 million to over \$1 billion in 11 appropriation bills.

There is one other factor that I have not heard mentioned here.

In 1954 the total military expenditures were \$40,386 million and the retirement cost or expenditure in that year was \$386 million. In other words, the percentage of retirement cost to total military expenditure was 0.96 percent or slightly less than 1 percent of the total military expenditure.

Now we turn to fiscal year 1964. We have before us in the committee, and you will shortly in the Congress, a military expenditure figure of \$51 billion. The retirement cost is \$1,163 million. But the percentage of retirement to the total expenditure will go up to 2.28 percent. In other words, in 11 appropriation bills your overall military expenditures will have gone up 25 percent, but your retirement costs will have gone up 130 percent.

This is only with reference to the past. Now let us look at the future. Mr. McNamara tells us that he hopes in the future, by good management and by being very selective on weapons systems, he can more or less hold the line on military expenditures. I hope he can without any degradation of our military capabilities. But nobody here this afternoon can say our retirement costs will not go up and will not skyrocket. As they go up, and if you hold the line on military spending, the percentage of retirement costs annually to the total cost of the military program will likewise skyrocket. So in 10 years instead of being 2.28 percent of your military cost as it will be in fiscal year 1964, it will be 3 percent or 4 percent or 5 percent of every dollar that is spent annually in the future for military protection.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not think we can maintain a military system in the future for the protection and the security of the United States paying 5 percent, or 6 percent, or 7 percent of the cost on an annual basis for retirements of the past.

Let me add this point. Many people have said that if we do not recompute, it will be a breach of faith.

I think there might be an argument on either side of that question. But let me assume for a moment it would be a violation of a previous contract. I will assume that for argument.

Every lawyer in this Chamber has from time to time represented clients who had a contract with another party but the other party was in some fiscal or financial jeopardy. So the two lawyers and the two parties involved sit down to try to work out a new contract so that the man who has a claim against the other party will get paid something so that his whole contract claim will not be destroyed or wiped out.

I want to say to my friends in the military, and I cherish and relish that relationship, I hope and trust that their attitude on this item on this program will not cast in serious jeopardy a whole retirement system for some 400,000 retired military today who are getting benefits, and a very substantial number who will retire in the future. If they are not sensible today about this whole matter, I predict they will place the entire system in serious jeopardy, and I do not want that to happen. I urge you to support the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Vinson] on this amendment.

May I add one footnote to my remarks. If the Rivers amendment is approved it is still my intention to support the bill on final passage.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to note that our good genial chairman, with whom we have had occasion to disagree recently, has managed to divide us. You have seen how the "fearless five" are pretty well split. However, as a divided young Turk I rise in support of the amendment.

I would first like to comment on some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and also one of the points made by our distinguished chairman, Mr. Vinson.

I do not think there is any doubt but what any retirement system we develop is going to cost lots of money. What we must do is begin to take a look at what we are comparing these cost figures with. I can think of some programs around here I would like to talk about that will cost and do cost more. If you are talking about \$3 or \$4 billion in terms of possible projected requirements, that we are committed to, I could compare this with some other items we are voting on around here where we have obligated ourselves in excess of this amount.

What are we talking about? The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, who is very knowledgeable in this area, neglected to point out as he was giving us the cost progression certain things that I hope he gets into the Record.

These are the realities. What we are talking today about is a Military Establishment, the like of which this country

has never known before in peacetime. We have gone from a "Here to Eternity" establishment prior to World War II of some 200,000 to an establishment composed of Army, Navy, and Air Force, the best in the world, with a manpower requirement of 2.7 million. If you are going to maintain the quality of this force structure, you are going to have to take a look at what we call the labor supply price curve. You have to tell the House what we require quantitatively in order to maintain the kind of establishment we presently have. The cold war does not come cheap, but it is far less expensive than at hot one. We cannot have it both ways.

I am on a research and development subcommittee. I have been in the field investigating activities in this field. We are looking at scientists, engineers, and other professionals who are working alongside of every grade of military men and officers. There is a tremendous gap in their incomes.

At the present time, for example, I am interested in attrition rates of the graduates of our Military Academies. It is too high, in my opinion. We are not considering just the men we are producing at the Military Academy. But, clearly, we are not holding enough of our highly trained men, and it is not hard to understand why.

What does this have to do with the re-computation bill? Let me tell you something. A good society is a society that takes care of its retired people. It is reflected in all its institutions, military included. If you want the young career men in the service to feel that we will keep faith, I urge you to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BOB WILSON. I think the gentleman is making a very significant statement. We have heard a great deal about the total cost of retirement, but that is not the point at issue in connection with this particular Rivers amendment. We are talking about a total cost of \$30 million a year which over the years will decrease each year. It is not a continuing cost, it is not a cost that increases. It is a decreased cost, and we should not get confused with the total retirement situation.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is correct. This is a declining amount every day, but since the general problem of retirement has been raised, I want us to bear the total problem in mind. It does not make any difference whether this amendment passes at all, if the truth were known. The problems that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and the rest of you are talking about are going to be with us. What are you going to do? Are you going to pay these people? Are you going to rescind retirements? You know that you are going to do just like you did when you voted for domestic and foreign aid and other programs. You are going to pay the necessary costs of the cold war.

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



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7607

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the answer and the question by the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] was trying to demonstrate that all the cost is only \$32 million a year and each year will go down. Now, it has been figured mathematically by the people involved that the ultimate cost to administer this program is \$600 million.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, on any question of fact you know I will not quarrel with you. However, you also know my great admiration for Secretary McNamara, and my position on this question is equivalent to his.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to allow those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, to recompute their retired pay on the basis of the 1958 act.

I would like to make it clear initially that I do not believe this bill accomplishes all it should or could. Recognizing the very serious problems we face in attracting and retaining qualified personnel, though, I believe it should be supported and approved.

I am deeply disturbed, however, by the glaring inequity in this bill which allows retirees with equal rank and equal length of service to receive unequal pay—an inequity initially brought about by the abandonment, without warning, of recomputation in 1958.

Prior to this date, recomputation, or the adjustment of retirement pay in accordance with changes in active duty pay, had been followed for more than 100 years, both as a matter of practice and legal right. The Comptroller General, as a matter of fact, has consistently held that section 6149, United States Code, title 10, establishes this right beyond doubt.

As Secretary of Defense McNamara made clear in his statement to the Committee on Armed Services, inequities are entailed in the recomputation system. Primarily, with selected pay increases to meet specific active duty force needs, it is inevitable that some groups on the retired list would suffer real income erosion if strict adherence to recomputation were practiced.

The Defense Department proposed substituting for recomputation an adjustment of retirement pay on the basis of increases in the Consumer Price Index.

But as Secretary McNamara's statement emphasizes:

Acceptance of this principle, however, does not reconcile the Government's obligation with respect to those members now on the retired lists who were denied recomputation in 1958. The question is whether they should be allowed to recompute on the 1958 pay rates with the explicit understanding that henceforth, all personnel retired, or to be retired, will have periodic adjustments to retired pay made on recognized changes in the cost of living. The alternative would be to apply the straight cost of living adjustment to all persons now retired, irrespective of the base upon which their present retirement pay was computed.

For two reasons the Department of Defense has concluded that the first course of action should be taken and we recommend it to this committee: First, those who were in the active duty force prior to 1958 and were retired prior to June 1, 1958, had every reason to expect that their retirement pay would be based on active duty pay scales at the time of retirement and thereafter \* \* \* ; second, the objective of the 1958 pay adjustments was to correct "compression" which had occurred since 1942.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to make clear that this amendment does not ask for a permanent continuation of recomputation. Rather it makes the modest request that before a retirement pay system based on the cost of living index is adopted, that the inconsistencies resulting from the 1958 act be corrected; that equity in basic pay scales be established with fair warning.

This, I believe, is a reasonable amendment which would enable us to keep faith with those who have served in our country's defense, and I urge that it be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending recomputation amendment which would correct a major inconsistency contained in this bill. As set forth in the additional views included in the report, beginning on page 69, while purporting to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, this bill breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service.

Mr. Chairman, there is a good and simple reason for the military retirement system to be different from other retirement systems. It is because the status of the military retired member is unique. Even with a full career of 30 years, the great majority of military men are likely to be between 52 and 55 years of age when they are mandatorily retired. In almost any other occupation, an individual at that age could look forward to additional years of full or even increased earnings instead of the sharply reduced income of retirement.

It is apparent to anyone who will take the time to check that the total career earnings, including their retirement pay, of military men who are forced into retirement after 30 years of service, is substantially less than their counterparts in other occupations who are permitted to work until age 60 or 65.

Mr. Chairman, we must never forget that the Government demands the best years of life from a military member, but reserves the right to dismiss the individual when his most useful years are past. This is imperative since, if a military force is to be maintained at a high

standard of efficiency, its personnel must be composed of men in the prime of life.

While in the service, the individual, theoretically at least, is under orders constantly, not 8 hours a day, but 24, except when granted definite leave of absence from duty. His personal liberty is constantly curtailed, even his apparel, speech, and manners are subject to scrutiny and criticism such as would not be endured by civilian employees. His pay is supposed to be sufficient for his needs, but in the case of neither officer nor private is it sufficient in itself to be an inducement to enter the military service. The attraction is supposed to be the honor and dignity attached to the service, and the opportunity for distinction in service to our country. In peacetime, as well as war, he must go wherever and whenever he is ordered, whether it is with or without his family. The civilian employee, on the other hand, makes no agreement when accepting employment to be subject to military discipline or to risk his life if necessary in carrying out his duties. The duties of the civilian employee are seldom of a hazardous nature. The regulations to which he is obliged to conform are usually what would be customary in an ordinary business office and no more.

In addition, even after retirement the military officer continues to hold a Government office within the meaning of the law and because of existing dual office and dual compensation laws cannot avail himself of certain types of employment for which he is often suited.

And finally, he remains subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and to recall to active duty. As such the retired member continues to be an important part of our national defense team. This vast reservoir of experience and mature judgment of our retired military people is relied upon heavily in times of emergency.

For these and other reasons we must never regard military retirement pay merely as a pension for long and honorable service. It is partly for that; partly as a retainer pay; and partly reduced pay for the completion of a career, the active part of which had to be terminated at a relatively early age cause of the character of the service.

Mr. Chairman, it is not worthy of the dignity of the Congress of the United States to allow the inequities which now exist among our retired members to continue. Nothing that we could say here today can justify the sharp disparity that now exists in rates of retired pay for service members retired under the same laws, with the same rank, and the same period of service. Today, for example, a colonel who retired on May 1, 1958, receives approximately \$1,000 a year less in retired pay than a colonel who retired on June 1, 1958.

Mr. Chairman, let us act now as we did in 1960 when we voted overwhelmingly to end the injustice which now exists and thus make it possible to effect an equitable, orderly transition to the proposed new system of adjusting retired pay in the future, as provided in this bill.

7608

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 8

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I think all the figures that have been quoted here this afternoon have been correct, but they have been mishandled in such a way that I think by this time the House is completely confused.

I would like to point out that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] said that by 1980 the possible cost of military retirement will be around \$3 billion. I would also like to point out that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] was entirely correct in pointing out that the total cost of this amendment, which in my opinion does not in any way jeopardize the retirement system, will amount to a maximum of about \$32 million a year and will be going down each year so that by the time you hit 1980 it will contribute less than one percent to this total of \$3 billion cost of military retirement. The chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], was entirely correct when he used the figure of \$600 million, but that is the total figure for all the years that this amendment will have effect on retirement pay.

This amendment has but one purpose, not to jeopardize the retirement system but to correct an injustice to retired personnel who retired before June 1, 1958.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take a great deal of time of the House today on this particular bill. I am certainly in support of any assistance we can render to our military who are the defenders of this great country of ours and who, throughout the years, have shown their devotion to our Nation, not by words but by action.

Mr. Chairman, I know that every Member of this House is aware of the wonderful job that the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service has been performing over the years. As chairman of the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee of the parent Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have personally had the opportunity to see the results of this distinguished group of dedicated people. As a matter of fact, in the 86th Congress, the subcommittee of which I was chairman reported the legislation known as the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps Personnel Act of 1960 without a dissenting vote and without having anyone appear before the subcommittee in opposition to the legislation. Later, after this legislation passed the House, I had the privilege of serving on the conference committee with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable Oren Harris.

I realize full well, Mr. Chairman, that the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service is being considered in this legislation we have before us today as its members hold the rank of their counterparts in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, on February 22, 1962, President Kennedy called for a new study of military pay. He stated that one of the important objectives would be to achieve comparability of service pay with that of industry and civilian Federal employment.

While I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Armed Services Committee, under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, has done a very good job in reporting this bill out of committee, I do feel that the present pay bill for the uniformed services falls far short in achieving the comparability the President called for last year. As a result of the last of three civil service pay raises since 1958, the final step which goes into effect in 1964, previous levels of comparability between the two systems have substantially deteriorated. This lack of comparability jeopardizes the essential career system of the uniformed services and presents a serious recruitment and retention problem.

There has been a uniform lack of success in retraining engineers, scientists, physicians, and research and development specialists. The Public Health Service has reported a very serious problem in the recruitment and retention in its Commissioned Corps of experienced scientific and professional personnel to provide leadership for major research and national health programs. It serves no useful purpose to place increasing emphasis on important public health programs, such as water pollution control, air pollution control, and radiological health, if adequate compensation is not provided to attract and retain the type of professional and technical personnel needed for these programs.

Comparability studies show that in 1958 the maximum statutory pay of a colonel, navy captain, or director in the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service was only \$654 less than a GS-15. In 1964, it will be \$3,285 less and comparable to the pay of a GS-14. This steady deterioration in the comparability concept creates a serious effect on the morale of our uniformed services personnel and on the quality of our research and development and public health programs.

Mr. Chairman, the report itself which accompanied H.R. 5555 clearly supports my point. I quote:

Since 1952 there has been a steady deterioration of the compensation provided members of the uniformed services compared to the compensation payments in private industry and to civilian employees of the Federal Government. Between 1952 and 1962, the median earnings of professional, scientific, technical, and kindred workers, a group generally comparable to officer personnel, has increased by 49 percent. The average earnings of manufacturing—production workers, a group usually associated with enlisted personnel, has increased by 44.8 percent since 1952. The cumulative average increase for classified civil service employees in the past 10 years totals 39.8 percent. For members of the uniformed services, the overall average increase in compensation since 1952, including the recent increase in basic allowance for quarters which became effective January 1, 1963, is 16.2 percent. This is slightly more than the increase in the

cost of living since 1952, 13.9 percent. Even with the increases recommended in the proposed legislation, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will still be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in the private economy and civil service employees.

As I stated in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabor the point at this time but I would like very much to express our appreciation for the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service as I believe they, in their field, are just as devoted and serve in the protection of our Nation as those of the military be they Army, Navy, or Air Force officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

(Mr. KEITH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to ask a question of the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN]. In simple justice, if the Congress should approve this kind of increase for presently retired armed services personnel, must we not also approve similar increases for the civil service, for the Foreign Service, the social security recipients, and railroad retirement beneficiaries?

Mr. COHELAN. Well, the gentleman is asking me my opinion, and in my opinion I believe the military pay structures historically in this country have been on an entirely different basis.

Mr. KEITH. I would ask the gentleman the further question, if he knows the cost of, for example, a pension of \$100 per month at age 50?

Mr. COHELAN. You are asking me? I did not get the question.

Mr. KEITH. The cost of a pension of \$100 per month for a person at age 50 would be about \$20,000. That is the single premium required at age 50 for \$100 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Massachusetts who just preceded me, I am greatly disturbed about what will happen one of these days when the retired civilian civil service employees come in and ask for a recomputation of their retirement pay based upon one of the numerous pay increases, such as, perhaps, the one which has been proposed for this year.

Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], I am going to walk with him through his rose garden this afternoon in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Thank you.

Mr. GROSS. But let me say this to the gentleman that when the multi-billion-dollar annual foreign giveaway bill comes up I hope that he will walk down the sawdust trail with me to chop off enough money from that program to take care of all the spending measures he has been supporting.

Can I depend upon the gentleman to walk the sawdust trail with me, come that day when the foreign giveaway program comes up?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that as long as the light burns the vilest sinner may return.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. I believe that we must approve this amendment as a matter of elementary justice. The money proposed to be saved by not approving this amendment seems of little consolation if at the same time and by the same action we fail to honor our commitments to the courageous men who have constituted our Armed Forces in times of crisis in this century.

There is no reason why our retired military personnel should be considered pensioners for they are still part of our national defense structure, subject to recall to active duty in time of need. This being so, their payments should be computed on the same scale as that used for those on active duty.

The departure from the traditional policy of one pay scale was first made in 1958, on the same grounds used for justification today—it would cost too much. If we accept this argument, we will deprive those already retired—those who fought so valiantly in the three wars of this century—of the compensation which, under the old policy, they had every right to expect. We must remedy the defect in the 1958 legislation and in the bill before us today by voting favorably for the recomputation amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely seek to ask the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Georgia, whether he would explain how he arrived at the figure of \$600 million as the cost of administering this particular program?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that those figures are from the computers down in the Department. They advised, based upon the likelihood of the number and the longevity and all of that, that this amendment will cost the American taxpayers for all the benefits paid out, \$600 million.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. That is an unfair figure to use in the argument. One could say that this bill is going to cost the American taxpayer \$35 billion or \$40 billion. If we want to calculate it that way, let us do it that way.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield further, this is going to cost that. I am not trying to deceive anyone. I am telling the truth. This amendment will ultimately cost \$600 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, in response to an inquiry from a constituent, I have written him as follows:

I don't know of a more complex problem that has ever been presented to our subcommittee than this question of retired pay. I concur in your observation that if we are not careful we could kill this entire bill if we persisted in attempting to put retirement pay back on the traditional basis. It would not only add \$87 million to the fiscal 1964 costs and jeopardize the retirement system, if enacted, but might kill the bill now under consideration. I far prefer to pass a bill that has a chance of becoming law, rather than pass a bill that could die in the Senate. In a previous Congress we passed a recomputation bill which the Senate would not consider. Now, if the Senate wouldn't even consider the recomputation bill we passed in the 86th Congress, I wonder what chance we would have if we attempted to pass a recomputation bill for the proposed new pay scales?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

(Mr. BALDWIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, every person in this House who has been here for more than the current term was a Member of the House in 1960 when a similar bill to this amendment passed the House without a single person raising a dissenting voice. This record started in the Armed Services Committee where there was a unanimous vote and on the House floor—I remember it clearly—there was not a single voice raised in opposition to the bill. So if you have constituents who are interested in this bill, your constituents certainly were led to believe in 1960 that you were in favor of the bill on recomputation. The only way, therefore, for this House to be consistent with its position, upon which it went on record in 1960, is to pass this amendment today to do the thing we attempted to do in 1960 but were blocked from doing by failure of action of the other body.

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It corrects a grave injustice and inconsistency in this legislation. The law as it now stands purports to encourage competent members of our armed services to make lifetime careers of the military service, but it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service.

For over a century it has been traditional that retired military pay be based on active duty pay. This right to recompute retired pay on the basis of active duty pay is not only a moral obligation but has a firm basis in law.

In 1958, in a drastic and rather unprecedented move and without adequate warning to retired personnel, Congress created this situation with which we are now faced. It is up to Congress to correct it. We all know that every man on the retired rolls and on active duty has been told by recruiting officials that his

retired pay would be based on active duty. We know that fringe benefits, including retired pay, have always been offered as inducements for servicemen to accept less money in the military than in civilian life. I believe it is out of character for the U.S. Government to make a promise and then refuse to keep it. Mr. Chairman, this country gives billions away in foreign aid, presumably to halt communism and raise the standard of living of other nations. But when it comes time to grant a few dollars to our own military who have done more to halt the flow of communism than any other group, and when an effort is made to raise their standard of living, a great furor is heard. I cannot follow the thinking of those who vote for foreign aid on one hand, yet oppose this effort at fair play to our own veterans on the other.

Mr. Chairman, I could continue on this debate, but I think the issue is clear. I urge my colleagues to keep faith with our military and support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I am about to make as well as the remarks I made earlier.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time merely to get over what I failed to get over the last time; and that is in connection with the statement made by Secretary of Defense McNamara. The Secretary made it clear in his statement to the Committee on Armed Services that inequities are entailed in the recomputation system primarily with selected pay increases to meet specific active-duty-force needs. It is inevitable that some groups on the retired list would suffer real income erosion if strict adherence to recomputation were practiced.

And he goes on: The Defense Department proposed a substitute for recomputation and adjustment of retirement pay on the basis of increases in the Consumer Price Index. But as the Secretary emphasized, acceptance of this principle does not reconcile the Government's obligation with respect to members now on the retired list who were denied recomputation in 1958.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to put myself firmly on the side of equity and justice by advocating the military pay bill be amended to rectify a longstanding breach of faith and reestablish the confidence of our military men and women in the word of the U.S. Government, a confidence that has been shaken by the failure to fulfill an obligation.

There are today 108,412 veterans who retired prior to June 1, 1958, who will receive no increase of pension from the pay bill reported out—H.R. 5555. Throughout their service and subsequent retirement they were given to believe that they would receive increases in their pensions proportionate to increases in active duty pay for the rank in which they retired. They had entered the service with this understanding. But the pay bill that was passed in 1958 ended this practice, which had been followed since 1861. Instead, those who had retired prior to 1958 got a flat 6-percent increase. Those who happened to be lucky enough to retire after June 1, 1958, had their pensions based on the new 1958 rates which were increased anywhere from 6 to 25 percent.

When this happened it met immediate opposition from the services, the retired people, and from Congress. In the 86th Congress alone a total of 45 House bills and 2 Senate bills were introduced to let those who retired before 1958 recompute their pay on the new rates. Seeing the mistake that had been made, the administration, including the President, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget favored a bill to allow recomputation.

This bill—H.R. 11318—was passed unanimously by the House in May 1960. But the Senate never acted on it.

The new pay legislation requested by the Department of Defense and worked out by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and his subcommittee would allow these 108,412 retired people to receive an increase in their pensions—not based on the new 1963 rates, but merely on the present 1958 scale. It would accomplish what was unanimously desired by the House in 1960.

Whereas this subcommittee bill falls short, in my opinion, of what I would consider a truly satisfactory pay bill for the active and retired members of the uniformed services, it is a vastly superior measure to H.R. 5555. In all areas concerned the bill reported by Congressman RIVERS' subcommittee is a better approach to this matter and I would hope the House of Representatives will accept the provisions of H.R. 4696 in preference to the provisions of the bill we now have before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

(Mr. MATHIAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Enactment of this recomputation provision would rectify a past wrong, would eliminate an inconsistency in our military pay scales, and would erase a glaring inequity in retirement computations now applicable to former members of our armed services.

In 1958 the Congress passed a military pay bill which provided for only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase for all officers who retired before June 1, 1958, but retained the traditional and higher active duty rate of compensation for all officers retiring after that date. Thus,

there arose an injustice—an inequity visited upon many thousands of career officers who bravely sought to preserve this Republic in times of crisis and national emergency.

The Congress now has an opportunity to correct the inequitable treatment accorded pre-1958 retired career officers by amending the military pay bill now before us so as to permit the pre-1958 retirees to recompute their retirement benefits on the basis of the present active duty pay scales.

It is fair and necessary for the Congress to eliminate senseless inconsistencies occasioned by date and ill-conceived provisions of law. It is furthermore a matter of practical sense to correct these deficiencies so as to accord proper equality in retirement provisions applicable to all military officers.

If inequalities such as this computation provision are allowed to stand then indeed it is hollow rhetoric to call this bill before us today a career incentive bill. While purporting to encourage qualified Americans to pursue careers in the military service, the bill in effect punctures the morale of those who have already devoted their lives to the service. This unfairness will be of no little concern to the present members of our Armed Forces and to those prospective applicants to the military service. These men and women can only be adversely impressed by a policy of inequality and unconcern for corrective measures. In a sense, a disparity of values exists today—a disparity having no moral justification. It is fortunate, however, that we in this Chamber now have an opportunity to rectify a past wrong, and to give evidence of our concern and awareness that all the officers of our armed services can be treated with a similar degree of equality and recognition for the many years they have spent in defense of their Nation. I commend to my colleagues the wisdom and tenor of the amendment now before us, and I voice my wholehearted support in favor of its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have here a copy of a report by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., "Can Government Maintain Vital Scientific Leadership." In this report Dr. Killian says that one of our least recognized but most critical national problems is the recruitment and retention of top scientific and engineering talent in Government. This problem is particularly acute in our uniformed services.

All agencies have reported lack of success in recruiting and retaining engineers, scientists, physicians, and research and development specialists. These people are highly sought after by universities, industry, and nongovernmental research organizations.

As a graduate engineer, I am particularly conscious of the fact that the services are experiencing great difficulty in their attempts to attract young gradu-

ate engineers from California colleges and universities to careers as engineer officers because of a salary differential. For example, the entrance salary for an engineer with a bachelor's degree under the State merit system of California begins at \$562 per month. Within 6 months, the individual is eligible for a promotion to a salary of \$590 a month. The same engineer under the Federal civil service compensation plan would qualify for a GS-7, with a starting salary of \$538. Under H.R. 5555, however, an unmarried engineer with a bachelor's degree commissioned in the "O-1" grade of the uniformed services would receive \$358.50 per month. Even taking into account the tax advantages enjoyed by commissioned officers, there still is a serious disparity in these pay scales.

But it is not in the entering grades that the greatest disparity exists. As I understand the situation, the bill before us still leaves officers in the grade of colonel with a ceiling on their pay and allowances about \$1,500 less than the ceiling for GS-15 civil service employees. The disparity between the ceiling for officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel and civil service employees in grade GS-14 is well over \$2,000.

While I intend to vote for this bill, Mr. Chairman, it seems clear to me that we are doing far too little in our efforts to provide attractive careers in the uniformed services, especially for the kinds of leadership necessary in an era when science is on the ascendancy. The Armed Forces who need more and more technically trained personnel, and the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, which utilizes only manpower trained in the sciences, will be severely disadvantaged in trying to maintain adequate staffs of officers in the higher grades.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, Secretary McNamara said this:

For two reasons the Department of Defense has concluded that the first course of action should be taken—

That is the 3-percent escalator clause:

First, those who are on active-duty force prior to 1958 and retired prior to June 1 had every reason to expect that their retirement pay would be based on active-duty scales, which was the law for 100 years.

And it is the law today. We are repealing it by this Act. This is the law now. We suspended it in 1958. What is wrong with being an admiral or a general? For 40 years a four-star general did not have a pay raise.

For 40 years at least a three-star general was paid by the same scale as a two-star general. Only in 1958 did we have a pay raise for these men. What is wrong with that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I trust the House will support the committee's position.

You should know before you vote for this amendment where the money goes.

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7611

It goes to 23,000 officers: 11 Chiefs of Staff get an increase of \$4,586; 39 generals and admirals get an increase of \$2,957; 139 lieutenant generals and vice admirals get an increase of \$2,359; 729 major generals and rear admirals get an increase of \$1,928; 934 brigadier generals and admirals get an increase of \$1,345; 753 colonels and captains get an increase of \$1,070; 5,000 lieutenant colonels and commanders will get an increase of \$561; 7,000 majors and lieutenant commanders will get an increase of \$87.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 126, noes 110.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and Mr. HÉBERT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 152, noes 126.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I supported the Rivers amendment that was just adopted by the Committee. It is my intention to support the bill on final passage if there is a rollcall vote.

However, I think an interesting observation may be had within a few days when we have a rollcall vote to increase the debt limit.

It is going to be rather interesting to see how many people, notwithstanding the Rivers amendment—those who have supported the Rivers amendment today and those who will support this bill, which as the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the committee says will eventually generate a cost in the area of \$35 billion—who will vote to saddle the responsibility of paying this obligation on the Treasury Department, yet they will not vote to give it the authority to raise the money with which to pay the obligations that they require him to meet.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

Insert the following new section at the end of the bill:

"SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE

"Sec. 14. (a) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) The following new section is added after section 309:

"§ 310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire

"(a) Except in time of war declared by Congress, and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service may be paid special pay at the rate of \$55 a month for any month in which he was entitled to basic pay and in which he—

"(1) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

"(2) was on duty in an area in which he was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period he was on duty in that area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; or

"(3) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

A member covered by clause (3) who is hospitalized for the treatment of his injury or wound may be paid special pay under this section for not more than three additional months during which he is so hospitalized.

"(b) A member may not be paid more than one special pay under this section for any month. A member may be paid special pay under this section in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

"(c) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress by March 1 of each year on the administration of this section during the preceding calendar year."

"(2) The following new item is inserted in the analysis:

"310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire."

"(b) The Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 (50 App. U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is repealed."

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment puts into this bill what has already been the law with regard to combat or hostile fire pay, with certain modifications in World War II and the Korean war. There are improvements on it that have been made in this, but these improvements that have been made come from the requests of the administration, they are approved by the Bureau of the Budget, they were requested by the Department of Defense. Administration approval was full. Although it has been said that the Committee on Armed Services turned down this proposal, the special subcommittee which held hearings on this legislation—and they were quite extensive and quite full—approved this provision, as has been requested by the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and others.

In a very brief manner, in hearings not before you today, except in typewritten form, the committee did reverse this position of the subcommittee by a close vote. Now, you say the Committee on Armed Services turned this down. The truth of the matter is that the committee that actually studied this legislation and heard witnesses on this legislation approved the legislation which I am asking you to put into this bill. It has departmental approval; it has Bureau of the Budget approval; it is at the request of the administration. It will cost between \$1 million and \$2 million a year. It is for the men who are actually fighting in Vietnam. How anybody can turn down these men for \$55 a month,

payable only in accordance with the strict regulations set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I cannot understand. There is no administrative difficulty about it. We have had this matter up before. We have administered it before. There is no administrative difficulty about it. There is certainly no moral objection to this, because upon this rests all the benefits which are peculiar to the military. Who would be eligible for retirement, who would be eligible for these generous veterans benefits we have, if the frontline soldier was not the reason for doing it? So, on the basis of these frontline soldiers—actually they are few in number—who are required to take the lives of other men, at the same time protecting their own, these are the men who give the justification for all these other multitudes of programs. Now, we have this group which says we are not going to give them the benefit. How ridiculous, how absurd, how cold, how cruel can we get? Is it possible that anybody here could say that this amendment is not right, is not proper, is not justified, is not the moral responsibility of our country?

Mr. Chairman, I hope that you will overwhelmingly vote for this amendment. This amendment is approved by all the people I have referred to. It has ever moral justification behind it. If it fails, this whole bill ought to fail.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Assuring the gentleman I am not being facetious, would this apply to troops, including National Guard troops, called out in situations like the Mississippi and Little Rock cases?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. It would not.

Mr. VINSON. If federalized, it would.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Well, since we are making a little history, like you do so often on the floor, there is nothing in the amendment that says that. Since I am the man that offered it, as a matter of legislative history, I would say it would not apply to Little Rock, and if it does, I say it should.

## OVERDUE RAISE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services. An overdue pay raise for the Armed Forces appears at long last assured. I applaud the additional provisions for a family separation allowance. It is regrettable that the committee has not adopted recomputation features and I shall support an amendment to that end. I shall also support Mr. BENNETT's hostile fire amendment with the suggestion that its provisions should be made retroactive, as a small tribute, pitifully small, to the brave men who have already died in South Vietnam. Two of these brave men have left proud but grieving families in my district. I refer to the parents of Sgt. Robert Gardiner of Nashua, N.H.,

7612

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 8

and the mother of Maj. David Webster of New London, N.H.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND to the amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Florida: Add a new subsection to section 310, as follows:

"(c) This section shall be effective from January 1, 1961."

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is simple. It makes provision that the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], with which I am in favor, be retroactive to January 1, 1961. I concur with his remarks. However, it seems to me that if what he says is correct, then it should be just as correct that those people who have already lost their lives and who have already risked their lives in Vietnam, be entitled to the provisions for special combat pay. There have been two brave men killed in action in South Vietnam who have left parents residing in my district. I refer to the parents of Sgt. Robert Gardiner, of Nashua, N.H., and to the mother of Maj. David Webster, of New London, N.H.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, to the extent possible, to have fairness apply in all matters of military pay. In all fairness the gallant men who have already risked their lives and lost their lives in South Vietnam should be entitled to special combat pay. We can never repay our debt of gratitude to them. We can at least attempt in a small way to pay them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment to the amendment will be adopted. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], has no objection to my amendment making his hostile pay provision retroactive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

(Mr. PIKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, anybody who follows my lead on any military bill is in serious trouble. I marched against the chairman on the subject of the B-70 and I was wrong or at least was outvoted. I marched with the chairman today on the subject of recomputation and I was wrong again. Now I understand—

Mr. VINSON. Yes; and you are about to be wrong again.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect any other remark from you than just exactly that. But I am prepared to be wrong in this instance if you so deem it to be, because if we were doing an injustice to those affected by the recomputation provision I say we are doing a tragic injustice to those affected by this combat pay provision.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to spend in this bill that we are about to approve \$632½ million for incentive pay for different kinds of hazardous duty. We are going to pay people extra money for parachute jumping and for flight training, for thermal stress duty, and submarine duty, and for glider training, as well as for human acceleration duty. We are going to pay them for low-pressure duty, and for the first time we are going to pay them for high-pressure duty.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the members of the committee that there is not any higher pressure duty that any serviceman serving his country can ever perform than to be on the receiving end of a bullet or shell. This particular amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], will not cost anything like \$632½ million. It will cost \$2 million.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who say that we should not support this amendment because everybody in the service is supposed to be ready for combat duty. Well, certainly they are. But everyone who volunteers for flight duty is supposed to be ready for flight duty and they volunteer for flight duty, by the way, but we pay them extra for it. They volunteer also for submarine duty, but we pay them extra for that too.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest however that nobody ever volunteers essentially for the privilege of being shot at. When we can take care of these people involved in these undeclared wars, in these dirty little wars, who are carrying the real brunt of the cold war, and can take care of them for \$2 million I think it is incumbent upon us to do so.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bennett amendment to provide extra pay for our men serving in combat areas. I particularly want to join with my colleague from New York [Mr. PIKE], in his remarks.

Additionally, I would note that men do not fight, risk death and die for their country because of the pay which they receive. Performance of this duty is dependent on individual courage and a high sense of loyalty to this Nation and the freedoms which it provides for all of us.

Combat pay is not incentive pay in any sense of the word. Rather, it is a small gesture, but a gesture still, on the part of this Congress and the people we represent to our servicemen who are fighting and dying in the cold war. It is a small but I hope significant expression of the deep gratitude every American feels for the sacrifices and dedication of these few men.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. TEAGUE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

In my opinion this amendment is the most deserving, the most honest, and the

finest part or will be the finest part of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, during World War II approximately 15 percent of all the troops serving their military establishments suffered approximately 80 or 90 percent of all the casualties. That group of men involved the men who faced hostile fire. I was in a group of about 1,000 American soldiers who went ashore at Utah Beach. Six months later 300 of those men had been killed and about 500 wounded.

Mr. Chairman, to say that parachute duty, that submarine duty, that demolition duty, that flight duty, thermal stress duty, and lower-pressure duty is more hazardous than that duty which is being faced by the men in Vietnam who are facing hostile fire in my opinion is an insult to our men who suffer these losses and who are serving under the most hazardous duty of all duty we have in our services.

Mr. Chairman, we have just voted on an amendment on which no doubt every Member of this House has had a number of communications urging them to support that amendment. Yet I would venture to say that not a single Member of the House has had one letter, one telegram in behalf of combat pay. Why have you not received any such communications? Because those men who have faced hostile fire are so very glad to get home and get out alive that they are not interested in combat pay. However, that does not detract from the fairness and justice of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will vote for this amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services nor do I serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, but I do think I know something about this matter, since I believe I am the only Member of the House who has been with our Special Forces troops in Vietnam. I went out into the so-called strategic area with these troops and saw how they work, saw how they live there during the day, and saw them under attack at night.

I question what the gentleman from New York who preceded me said, that these men are not volunteers. The special forces are volunteers. They are so-called instructors, but they are mainly instructing in killing and being killed. So far 73 of them have been killed. Unlike those of us who served in World War II and got combat pay, these people do not even have the chance that we had, because if we were wounded or captured at least we were given some niceties. Under civilized rules of war if captured you would have spent time in a prison camp. But if you are wounded or captured in Vietnam, the Viet Cong, the Communist Army, are under orders to shoot, torture and kill every wounded American soldier they take. And they have been so doing.

I think not to pass this amendment today would be an affront to our Armed

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7613

Forces who have done much a great job. I urge that it be passed.

The Secretary of the Army estimates that under existing conditions between 1,500 and 2,000 Army personnel would qualify for "hostile fire" pay at an annual cost of about \$1 million. This is a comparatively small price to provide hot war benefits to those serving on the frontlines of the cold war.

Mr. Chairman, we may call our military personnel in South Vietnam special forces advisers but the casualty lists and the helicopters shot down by the Communists are factual testimony that our Armed Forces are engaged in a shooting war. Perhaps a parent of a young man who lost his life on the frontlines of this so-called cold war expresses the problem more eloquently. Maj. Gen. William F. Train, commandant of the U.S. Army War Office College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., is the father of Lt. William F. Train III, who was killed in South Vietnam in June 1962, while traveling with a Vietnamese Army convoy. Major General Train said:

The desirable thing would be to have everyone fully understand the term "cold war." Insofar as the Vietnamese are concerned, their nation is a battleground and the shooting makes it a hot war for them.

Lives are frequently lost in the periphery of the Nation's interest, whether it be the opening of the West in the 1870's or stemming the flow of communism in Vietnam.

I think my son's loss of life in the service of his country is similar to the loss of life in any operation providing the freedom we know—in war or peace.

This amendment would permit greater recognition of the hardships and sacrifices of our Armed Forces who are working under hazardous conditions which differ little from conditions of actual warfare. These members of our military are doing a job for our country of which our country should be very proud. I urge my colleagues to recognize their contribution by voting for the "hostile fire" amendment.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bennett amendment.

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to all that has been said in favor of combat pay. I hope we do not delay long this vote. However, at this time I want to emphasize another issue in this bill. On February 20, 1962, the President sent to the Congress a civil service salary reform bill. In the message transmitting this bill, the President said:

These are the very levels—upper levels—in the career service in which our need for quality is most acute—in which keen judgment, experience, and competence are at a premium. It is here that we face our most difficult personnel problem. It is at these grades that we employ our top scientists, doctors, engineers, experts, and managers. As a practical matter, the full principle of comparability cannot be applied to the higher salary levels of Government; but I consider adequate adjustment in our top executive and professional positions to be the most vital single element of correction in this entire proposal.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I supported the President's bill for salary reform in civil service. I felt the principle of comparability he expressed was a true and necessary one. However, on examining H.R. 5555 and comparing the upper level pay increases with those authorized for similar grade levels under the Federal Salary Reform Act, I find that little comparability exists. This point is recognized in the report of the Armed Services Committee. On page 3 there is a most interesting chart which shows that the average uniformed services pay, including that which would be authorized under H.R. 5555, would still be over 11 percent less than the second step increase which is provided for civil service personnel under the Federal Salary Reform Act.

I feel strongly that there must be some relationship between the pay system of the uniformed services and the other pay systems of the Federal Government. If there is none, there will be continued loss of personnel, continued loss of morale, and there can only be a deterioration in our military might and in our research and development programs.

Our uniformed services are losing experienced and competent people just as they reach their years of full experience and productivity. The Government must help the uniformed services to retain these people by providing adequate salaries which are at least comparable to those provided other Federal officers and employees. If the Government cannot, the services will suffer, and, in turn, the Nation will suffer.

I submit we have been paying too little to professional classifications in the uniformed services. I hope this body will have another chance to provide greater increases in this area. I hope the other body will provide such greater increases and that we will conference the items and concur.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have probably had the doubtful privilege of drawing more parachute pay than anybody else in this Chamber. Having drawn that pay I certainly would not vote to take it away from those who now earn it, but I would say also, if you are going to pay a man on the basis of risk involved, hazard involved, on the basis of real danger, there is no comparison between parachute pay and combat pay for men who are under fire. Having experienced both I would urge you very sincerely to vote for the Bennett amendment for combat pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANGEN: On page 8, immediately below line 3 insert the following:

"(1) Section 1210(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end there-

of the following: 'Provided, That an officer heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retired pay for disability rated 80 per centum or more shall be considered, for purposes of computation of retired pay, to have not less than six years of service'."

(Mr. LANGEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time I shall be very brief for I present to you an amendment that is rather simple compared with those we have just been considering. This amendment merely provides that officers who are retired or granted retired pay for disability of 80 percent or more shall be considered to have had a minimum of 6 years of service.

On April 4 of this year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an itemized account of what was involved in the retirement provisions that has been available to officers who have had this disability experience during the course of their service.

Let me point out that this involves a group of officers who literally made every sacrifice but that of life itself during the course of their service to their country. Consequently, because of the limited period of their service, the retirement provided to them has certainly not been commensurate with the degree to which they have served their country.

In these instances, the best example of the inequity that exists is possibly the fact that under certain circumstances these officers by a process of demotion and application to the Veterans' Administration can actually receive more money than they are entitled to in their own retirement.

I have listened to the gentlemen here this afternoon who have so eloquently proclaimed the need for equity in the veterans' retirement program. Here is an opportunity to provide that kind of equity, an amendment I think you all can vote for, that will provide a just consideration for a group of people that have made a great sacrifice in the defense of their country.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would have to be for this amendment but I am compelled to oppose it for these reasons.

The gentleman's amendment seeks to change the disability retirement system. Our bill under consideration today has to do with compensation. His section applies to disability retirement. This is a complex matter and should not be considered in a pay bill, and this is a pay bill. The amendment seeks in so many words to distinguish between two groups of officers by providing one with a high retirement pay simply because his disability rating is, say, 5 percent higher than that of a man with a 75-percent disability rating.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment does not have a place in this bill. This is a very complicated thing, this disability section of the compensation law. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a step in the right direction to compensate those who are making maximum contributions to the national security. But it is by no means adequate, nor is it comparable in all respects to that which is being done by the Government in terms of pay and benefits for employees of our civilian branches.

I will support the bill, however, as a measure of equity and justice for the armed services, and I will also support the pending amendment for recomputation for combat pay and perhaps some other amendments designed to strengthen the bill.

It is clear that with but short interruption retired military pay has been based on active duty pay for the past 100 years or more.

That fact is known to the military, to the Department of Defense, to the Comptroller of the United States, to the courts and everyone else who is familiar with this question.

In 1958, we departed from that tradition and that practice and by that act the Congress has perpetrated a grave injustice upon some of the most outstanding leaders of our armed services—those who in many instances served gallantly in bloody battles of World War II and the Korean war.

We must redress that wrong. President Eisenhower said so; President Kennedy says so, Secretary McNamara said so, and the very able chairman of the House Armed Services said so, when this provision was pending here before.

Many leading military, civic, labor, veteran, patriotic, and business groups favor this recomputation proposal. The House has previously unanimously voted for it. The country has approved it and the country wants it.

As a matter of simple equity and justice to those who have rendered the Nation such peerless service in time of peace and unrest as well as in time of war, Congress should repair the damage to morale and the breach of faith that failure to provide recomputation has imposed upon our armed services.

I urge that the House may overwhelmingly rectify the wrong that has been done and vote in favor of this amendment and also the bill.

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from a sergeant in my district, and I should like to ask whether or not the statement he makes is correct. His letter reads as follows:

As the bill stands as reported in the Air Force Times (which is the only way we have of knowing what's going on) a staff sergeant (E-5) with over 12 years' service will receive a \$30-per-month raise, which isn't enough by a long shot if Congress hopes to keep well-trained men in uniform, but at the same time the bill proposes to cut the subsistence

allowance for men on this type of duty where messing facilities are not available from \$2.57 per day to \$1.25 per day or a loss of \$39.60 per month. It doesn't take much knowledge of math to see where this raise as proposed will cost \$9.60 plus paying income taxes on the raise. If Congress cannot give a raise without cutting our pay somewhere else, I say leave it alone.

I asked the Department of Defense for an explanation of this, and if that letter is correct. I had a reply from the Defense Department which indicates there may be some merit to the statement. I wonder if the chairman would be good enough to clarify the record at this point.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like to answer the gentleman in this way. To begin with, whoever wrote that letter in the Defense Department is wrong. They did not write this bill, we wrote it, and I can state to you categorically it is not true. Where rations are not in kind, he gets \$3.25 and I would like to get the defense official who said this is not true.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have the letter here if the gentleman wants to see it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will get him. You need not worry about this because this is absolutely wrong and they do get \$3.25 and I do not care what the official says.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We are correct then and the conclusion drawn in the Air Force Times is not correct and these men are not suffering a reduction in subsistence; is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My able assistant on my right here, our distinguished clerk of the committee, Mr. Blandford, who is familiar with all this and who has forgotten more than any Defense Department official ever learned advises me that the man is wrong. We will change him if he continues to be wrong.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the distinguished chairman for setting the record straight.

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

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, now that this bill has been busted wide open, I wonder if the House could not remain in session tonight long enough to settle the TFX controversy, or should that be referred to the United Nations?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Boggs, 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. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 335 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 en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

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.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] rise?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5555, to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). The yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and Mr. CURTIS.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 293, noes 10.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 41, I was unavoidably detained in talking with a constituent. Had I been present I would have voted against recommitment of the conference report.

#### COLLECTIVE DEFENSE AGREEMENT WITH ISRAEL

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution identical to one being introduced today in the other body by Senator Javits which, if adopted, would urge that the