

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4913. A bill to grant pensions to certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 4914. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. Res. 447. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4199, a bill to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4915. A bill for the relief of Irving W. Learned; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. R. 4916. A bill for the relief of Abraham Spevak; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4918. A bill granting a pension to Benjamin Cowden Ash; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Archibald J. Alcorn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of the estate of Curtls Wilson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1382. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution from the Otsego County, Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, Pomona Grange, demanding equality of farm prices with those of labor and industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1383. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the crew of steamship *Henry Hadley*, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their support of H. R. 2346; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1384. Also, petition of the crew of the steamship *Henry Hadley*, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee; to the Committee on Labor.

1385. Also, petition of the crew of the steamship *Henry Hadley*, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to S. 1171; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

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

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

Our Father God, in a world where all without is change and decay, and within fear of failure and of the unknown future haunts our hearts, at the springs of Thy abiding presence, we keep alive our faith in values that are permanent and of the kindly light behind all the shadows. Whether joy or pain be our lot, fulfillment or disappointment, even though the waters roar and though the mountains are shaken into the seas, still may we be upheld by an encompassing strength which is of Thee and by that sustaining power enabled to face the light of any day or the terror of any night. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 6, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Revenue Act of 1945" as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to

the enrolled bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD (S. Doc. No. 122)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board, amounting to \$1,200,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of two individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by Attorney General Biddle, and a report of the cases of 145 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED MAGNESIUM PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to Government-owned magnesium plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report of the Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 6, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney;

S. 693. An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells;

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse;

S. 1117. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda Estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss;

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan;

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI; and

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a petition of several citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the enactment of President Truman's proposal providing for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMELAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in view of the misrepresentations which have been made concerning the objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 112, the resolution on Palestine which was introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself, and in which the senior Senator from Massachusetts has joined, the Senator from Ohio and I have addressed a communication to President Truman in which we demonstrate the falsity of these misrepresentations. What we say in our letter to President Truman is supported by historical utterances made by President Wilson, Lloyd George, General Smuts, and the British Royal Commission itself. Because of the widespread interest in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that our letter to the President be printed in the RECORD, and I urge all Senators to read the letter and give its contents their careful consideration.

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

DECEMBER 6, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Ever since we introduced Senate Joint Resolution No. 112 on Palestine, a continuous campaign, both open and covert, has been conducted against the bill, and more particularly against its basic proposition—that the Jews shall have the right of free entry into Palestine so that they may reconstitute it as a democratic commonwealth. Whoever may be behind this opposition and whatever their motives, their campaign has taken the form of a gross misrepresentation of our position and of the intentions of all who support Jewish aspirations in Palestine. The misrepresentation centers in the astounding and baseless charge that it is proposed to establish in Palestine a theocratic state, or a state based upon religious or racial discrimination. This insidious campaign has now been carried to the White House in an obvious attempt to influence the administration. We, therefore, find it necessary to make a full statement of our position in order to dispel such fantastic misconceptions so assiduously fostered.

1. In drafting our resolution we had before us the Palestine planks of the Republican and Democratic platforms adopted by the national conventions of the two parties in Chicago, 1944. The relevant words in the Republican platform are as follows:

"In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth."

The corresponding language in the Democratic platform is as follows:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

Our resolution is, therefore, no more than a restatement of the position taken by both major parties representing, as they do, the great majority of American citizens.

2. The expression, "Jewish Commonwealth," is not novel. It was not recently invented to represent a new idea. It antedates the Palestine mandate and was used repeatedly by the leading statesmen of Great Britain and the United States in the crucial years preceding and following the Peace Conference at Versailles when the territorial settlements were in the making.

3. That this was the sense in which the British Government had understood its commitment was stated by Mr. David Lloyd George, Prime Minister at the time of the Balfour Declaration, who testified before the British Royal Commission on Palestine as follows: "It was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national home and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish Commonwealth."

General Smuts, Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, on November 3, 1919, spoke of "an increasing stream of Jewish immigration" and of "a great Jewish state rising there once more."

Mr. Winston Churchill spoke in the same vein: "If, as may well happen, there should be created in our lifetime on the banks of the Jordan a Jewish state under the protection of the British Crown which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred in the history of the world which would from every point of view be beneficial."

The British Royal Commission attested that "Lord Robert Cecil, in 1917, Sir Herbert Samuel, in 1919, and Mr. Winston Churchill, in 1920, spoke or wrote in terms that could only mean that they contemplated the eventual establishment of a Jewish state."

4. The position of the United States in favor of the evolution of Palestine into a Jewish state was equally clear. That this was the understanding of the American delegation at the Peace Conference appears explicitly from the Outline of Report and Recommendations prepared by the intelligence section of that delegation, in accordance with instructions for the American plenipotentiaries. This report, dated January 21, 1919, summarized the American attitude in the following recommendation: "That the Jews be invited to return to Palestine and settle there, being assured by the (Peace) Conference of all proper assistance in so doing that may be consistent with the protection of the personal (especially the religious) and property rights of the non-Jewish population, and being further assured that it will be the policy of the League of Nations to recognize Palestine as a Jewish state as soon as it is a Jewish state in fact."

5. In harmony with this position, President Woodrow Wilson on March 3, 1919, declared: "I am persuaded that the Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."

6. It cannot be suggested that the statesmen we have quoted, from Lloyd George to Woodrow Wilson, lacked the capacity to express themselves in clear and precise terms. Each of them was a master of the English tongue. Nor would anyone in his senses impute to those enlightened statesmen the advocacy of a "racial state" or a "theocracy" when they used the term "Jewish Commonwealth" so freely. What they obviously intended and stated in so many words was that in Palestine, their ancestral land, the

Jews should be free to grow into a majority and not be kept down artificially to the position of a minority in which they find themselves in every other country in the world. This is the core and essence of the proposal.

7. It is clear from the foregoing that our resolution does no more than give renewed expression to the purposes of the British and American statesmen who framed the policies of the Allied Nations. Their statements are, if anything, more explicit than the terms of our resolution. The objective remains simple and clear: To insure that all Jews who desire to settle in Palestine shall be guaranteed the right of entry so that they may develop and repopulate their ancestral land and so that Palestine may become a Jewish state in the sense that Jews will constitute the majority. Our resolution adds the proviso that the Commonwealth thus to be created shall be one in which "all men, regardless of race or creed, shall enjoy equal rights."

8. This is also the official position of the Zionist movement repeatedly expressed. Time and again, on countless occasions, the Zionist organization made it crystal clear that it contemplates a democratic state in which complete equality of rights and status shall obtain between all citizens, irrespective of race or faith, and between all religious groups within the state.

Under the circumstances, it should be impossible for any well-informed person to maintain in good faith the fantastic notion that the formula "Jewish Commonwealth" implies any domination of the Jewish religion over the adherence of other faiths.

9. Millions of Jews in the Old World regard themselves, and are regarded by their neighbors, not merely as a religious denomination, such as Moslems or Baptists, but also as a people with a distinctive culture, characteristics, and traditions. By the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, the nations of the world recognized that just as the Czechs, the Greeks, the Magyars, and the Irish, or any other recognized nationality are entitled each to a homeland of its own, so the Jewish people was likewise entitled to its national home. The mandate, therefore, speaks of the recognition "given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the ground for reconstituting their national home in that country."

10. We are reluctantly driven to the conclusion that the misrepresentations to which we have referred and the false issues raised with regard to the projected Jewish Commonwealth are intended to confuse the public, to deprive the Jewish people of their established rights, and to assist the British Government in evading its obligations under binding international agreements. Neither we, nor other Senators who share our views, nor the American people will be deceived by these tactics.

11. Finally, Mr. President, it is our conviction that the passage of such a resolution is more urgently required now than ever before, in view of the joint Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry about to be organized. Our country can only proceed on the assumption that the pledges given to the Jewish people and embodied in international covenants shall be honored. If the joint committee proceeds on that assumption, its hands will be strengthened by the passage of the resolution. If the committee is not instructed to proceed on that assumption, it is the more necessary that the traditional and basic position of the United States with regard to the Palestine question should be reaffirmed so far as it lies in the power of Congress to do so.

We trust, Mr. President, that this statement will contribute to a clarification of this question touching an important aspect of our foreign policy.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.
ROBERT A. TAFT.

RETURN OF EXAMINING CORPS OF PATENT OFFICE TO WASHINGTON—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the American Patent Law Association, October 9, 1945, relating to the return of the examining corps of the Patent Office to Washington.

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

Whereas—

1. The most important problem facing the Nation today is the reconversion to peacetime production, with maximum employment, and in the shortest possible time;

2. Attainment of maximum employment will be greatly aided by the establishment of new industries and the manufacture of new products, and the national interest requires that every condition which retards the establishment of new industries and the manufacture of new products should be corrected promptly;

3. Investors and manufacturers will not establish new businesses or manufacture new products without obtaining reasonable assurance against infringement of valid patents and without reasonable expectation of being able to obtain good patent protection on new products;

4. The present divided condition under which the United States Patent Office is operating, with the examining corps located in Richmond, Va., and the public search room and other service divisions located in Washington, D. C., greatly impedes the making of patent investigations required for the establishment of new industries and the manufacture of new products;

5. The public search room of the Patent Office in Washington is now operating in only one-half of the space which it occupied before the recent war and the increased demands placed on this service in recent weeks has exceeded its capacity to such extent that the crowded condition is intolerable;

6. When the examining corps of the Patent Office was moved to Richmond at the beginning of the war the examiners were assured that they would be returned to Washington immediately after the end of the war emergency, and that this office would be the first of the displaced bureaus to be returned;

7. More recently, and before the surrender of Japan, it was officially stated that the examining corps of the Patent Office would be returned part by part to its own space in Washington as fast as the space became available;

8. Since the signing of surrender terms with Japan certain space in the Commerce Building formerly occupied by the Patent Office has been vacated without being reoccupied by the Patent Office, but is being occupied by the Surplus Property Board;

9. Other space formerly occupied by the Patent Office in the Commerce Building is now occupied by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, which are not under the Department of Commerce and have no connection with the Patent Office;

10. The north end of the Commerce Building was originally constructed to meet the peculiar needs of the Patent Office, and is the logical place for this Bureau;

11. About one-half of the examiners have continued to own their own homes in Washington, and many still have their families in Washington;

12. The public announcements that the Patent Office would be returned to Washington in the immediate future have created an

uncertainty as to the tenure of the examiners in Richmond, and as a result many Richmond landlords refuse to rent living quarters to examiners;

13. The Patent Office has lost more than 200 highly trained examiners since the examining corps was sent to Richmond, about one-half of this number having transferred to other Government agencies in Washington and more than 100 having gone into the armed services, and most of these examiners will remain lost to the Patent Office so long as the examining corps remains in Richmond;

14. In its divided condition, and with its loss of trained examiners, the Patent Office is working at a great disadvantage and with serious inefficiency, and is not in a position to render the greatly increased service that is being required of it in the reconversion program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national interest will be greatly served and the reconversion program will be substantially aided by the immediate return of the examining corps of the Patent Office to Washington, and to this end it is requested that the space formerly occupied by the Patent Office in the Commerce Building be vacated immediately, and the entire Patent Office be reassembled in the Commerce Building; and

That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Commissioner of Patents, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, the Commissioner of Federal Housing, to the chairmen of the following congressional committees: Senate Committee on Patents, House Committee on Patents, Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, House Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD some resolutions adopted by the National Reclamation Association at its annual convention in Denver, Colo., November, 14, 15, and 16, 1945. These resolutions are extremely timely, especially in the light of pending legislation before the Congress.

The convention was attended by more than 800 delegates, representing all the land and water interests of the 17 arid and semiarid States of the West. The resolutions reflect the careful thought and study of those attending the convention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution 7

"Whereas there have been introduced in the Congress five bills proposing the creation of valley authorities and such proposed legislation is designed to encompass the entire United States in water, natural resource, and social resource development under the control of authorities; and

"Whereas the National Reclamation Association since 1937 has consistently opposed the development of natural resources through regional authorities; and

"Whereas the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the United States Senate have recommended that the pending Missouri Valley Authority bill do not pass and also have

denounced the authority principle for the following, among other reasons:

"1. Existing laws and procedures provide for full integration of the activities of established Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the several phases of water and land resource development. These policies and procedures protect State rights and interests, as well as State water laws, and provide for full cooperation between the local, State, and Federal interest.

"2. The Bureau of Reclamation affords the benefits of resource development on a regional basis without the objectionable features contained in proposed authority legislation.

"3. Under the pending authority legislation, policy and laws respecting the use and control of water, heretofore established by the Congress, are abandoned and State water laws and States' rights and interests in water and its utilization and control are destroyed.

"4. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Bureau of Reclamation would either be eliminated entirely from a river basin under the control of an authority, or their activities would be curtailed at the will of such an agency. The laws under which these agencies now operate and the basic provisions of the present reclamation law would be drastically changed by the enactment of proposed authority legislation.

"5. Enactment into law of the bills would seriously delay the construction of works planned by existing agencies of Government-coordinated regional developments and authorized by Congress.

"6. The authority bills provide a means for the expansion of Government control of States, natural resources, and individuals by Federal corporations. In essence they propose to create instruments of government with questionable and irresponsible powers affecting the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the people of every section of the United States.

"7. The creation of authorities constitutes the surrender to Federal corporations of power which the Congress does not possess under the Constitution. It is contrary to democratic traditions.

"8. Local self-government would be denied by the enactment of such legislation.

"9. The Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the United States Senate correctly appraised authorities when it said:

"It would mean the substitution of arbitrary power for democratic processes. It would mean the creation of a superstate—neither Federal nor State, and not contemplated by our Constitution. It would subject the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the Missouri Basin to the dictates and whims of a three-man board, not responsible to the people and largely irresponsible to the Congress itself. It would constitute a virtual abdication by the Congress in favor of government by Federal corporations wielding autocratic powers. It would challenge State sovereignty and destroy systems of laws, both State and Federal, under which western agriculture has grown and prospered."

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the National Reclamation Association at its fourteenth annual convention, That it reaffirms the position of the association in opposition to the creation of regional valley authorities and that the association shall continue to take all possible measures to prevent the passage of the pending authority bill and any and all other similar legislation which may hereafter be introduced in Congress."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolution 10

"Whereas Congress has authorized many water projects for postwar construction, within the 17 Western States; and

"Whereas hostilities have ceased and the time has now arrived for construction thereof; and

"Whereas a number of these projects have as yet received no appropriations of money from the Congress, or in some cases, where such appropriations have been made, funds so appropriated have been impounded by the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such impounding of funds appropriated by the Congress after extensive and thorough hearings on all points involved is entirely unjustified and constitutes an unwarranted interference with the legislative branch of the Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the officers of this association are authorized and directed constantly and diligently to urge Congress to appropriate money for the immediate construction of projects authorized by Congress and, whenever funds which have been appropriated are impounded, to protest vigorously against such action and urge their immediate release."

To the Committee on Commerce:

"Resolution 2

"Whereas there are now at least three bills before Congress providing for Federal activity in the field of stream pollution abatement; and

"Whereas the responsibility for the formulation and execution of stream pollution abatement programs rests principally with State and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association expresses itself in favor of the inclusion of a congressional declaration of policy in all Federal stream pollution legislation which will appropriately recognize and protect the rights and responsibilities of the States in stream pollution abatement programs."

"Resolution 3

"Recommends that States establish machinery necessary to carry out States' responsibilities under 1944 Flood Control Act and 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act

"Whereas the Federal Flood Control Act and the 1945 Federal Rivers and Harbors Act each contain a congressional declaration of policy which requires that the interests and rights of the States in water utilization and control shall be recognized, preserved, and protected; and

"Whereas under such policy, Federal administrative agencies are directed to cooperate fully with State governments in the planning of flood-control and navigation projects; and

"Whereas the requirement for cooperative Federal-State participation in Federal flood-control and navigation programs squarely places the responsibility upon State governments to provide governmental machinery necessary for their effective participation in such programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association recommends that the States establish such machinery as is necessary to carry out their responsibilities under the policy enunciated by Congress in the enactment of the 1944 Flood Control Act and the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act, and requests the Council of State governments to undertake a program to effectuate this objective."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution 9

"Whereas it is the position of the National Reclamation Association that the States are vested with the right and power to regulate and control the use of water within their respective borders; and

"Whereas the rights and property of citizens and the local tax structures which support local government in the States

and areas comprising watersheds are seriously affected by present and proposed policies aimed at perpetual Federal ownership of water-use facilities erected in or adjacent to these streams; and

"Whereas statutory provision should be made for declaring, defining, and protecting the rights, titles, and interests of the several States in and to such facilities, and the income derived therefrom; and

"Whereas provision should be made for the effective and economical administration of all such facilities with direct representation for all interests properly concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the president of the National Reclamation Association be empowered and directed to appoint a committee of five members of the association to assemble data and make a study of the rights, titles, and interests of the several States concerning all such facilities and to make report thereon, with recommendations for such procedures as will protect the interests and welfare of the people in the areas affected; and be it further

Resolved, That said committee be empowered to call to its assistance such persons as the directors of the member States of the National Reclamation Association may designate as representatives of such States; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of the National Reclamation Association be authorized to invite cooperation in the study proposed herein by such other States, organizations, or individuals as are interested in these basic problems."

To the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Resolution No. 1

"Whereas the intent of the Reclamation Act of 1939, as indicated by its legislative history, as viewed by the reclamation interests of the West, and as interpreted by the Bureau of Reclamation for 5 years following the adoption of the act, was that costs chargeable to power, in addition to operation and maintenance costs, should be sufficient to return to the United States the power construction cost plus interest at 3 percent per annum on what is described in the act as 'an appropriate share of the construction investment'; and

"Whereas the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, under an opinion given on September 29, 1944, held:

"That a proper interpretation of section 9 of the Reclamation Act of 1939 and the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the Department's Appropriation Act of 1939 require that the minimum rate schedule be such as to produce revenues sufficient only to meet in addition to the return for operation and maintenance cost, an amount equal to 3 percent of the power construction costs with the proviso that if total revenues thus produced are insufficient to repay all costs allocated to power to be repaid by power revenues 'other fixed charges' must be included in the rate schedule to produce revenues sufficient to repay such costs' * * * and

"Whereas although the Solicitor's interpretation of the 1939 act provides for minimum power rate schedules only, it nevertheless lays a basis for fixing costs chargeable to power, and adjusting rates in accordance therewith, contrary to the accepted intent of the 1939 act at the time of its adoption, with results and implications of vital concern to the reclamation programs and to the national interest; and

"Whereas the application of the Solicitor's opinion particularly to a broad program of basin-wide development may have wide-reaching effects contrary to the intent of Congress and to the policies now and heretofore supported by this association, which have asserted the principle that power production should be incidental to reclama-

tion and should return, in addition to its share of operation and maintenance costs, at least a sufficient amount to repay the power construction investment, plus interest as provided in the act, and, where possible, and in returning the cost of the irrigation features where the latter, if charged in full, would impose a burden beyond the ability of the water users to repay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That the policy in Reclamation development which would be effectuated by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, above mentioned, should not be permitted to prevail; and be it further

Resolved, That this association hereby registers its belief in, and approval of, the intent of the law as originally interpreted, and directs its officers to seek the enactment by the Congress of legislation making such intent effective and rendering nugatory the opinion of the Solicitor referred to herein."

"Resolution No. 3

"Whereas the reclamation of arid lands is increasingly an important undertaking in the vital reconversion program, through providing homes and occupations for war veterans, and for meeting the urgent need for increased food production; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation's plans for the fullest utilization of the Nation's water require a great deal more information on the quantity and quality of the surface and ground waters of the West; and

"Whereas continuance and expansion of the Geological Survey's stream-gaging, ground water, sedimentation, and quality of water programs are essential in planning the development and administration of irrigation enterprises; in dividing waters of interstate streams equitably between States, by compact or otherwise, for assuring a better understanding between water users; and for promoting a more effective use and control of water; and

"Whereas a deficiency now exists in funds available to the Geological Survey for carrying on its present water resources investigations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary-manager, officers, and directors of the National Reclamation Association are authorized and urged to support the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey in their efforts to provide now and in the immediate future additional stream-gaging facilities and to expand investigations of ground water, sedimentation, and quality of waters in the West, and to that end to take all steps necessary to advise Members of Congress of the importance of more adequate water investigations, and to urge the appropriations required therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That this association, through its officers, members, and associate members, strongly urge upon our representatives in Congress the necessity of providing an adequate supplemental appropriation to the gaging-stream item in the Interior Department budget to match all State offerings for the present fiscal year."

"Resolution 4

"Whereas the National Reclamation Association, by resolutions adopted at its annual conventions in 1943 and 1944, has consistently advocated the development of a comprehensive program of watershed research in the upstream portions of western drainage basins; and

"Whereas in spite of past efforts of the association, wartime restrictions on research appropriations have prevented the development of such a comprehensive program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the officers of the National Reclamation Association again be authorized and requested—

"(a) to promote the development of a comprehensive western-wide program of investigation by the Forest Service into the management of forest and range lands in relation to the water resource;

"(b) to give their full support to such a program of watershed research;

"(c) to take all necessary steps to advise Members of Congress of the importance of such investigations; and

"(d) to urge adequate appropriations for their full development."

"Resolution 5

"Recommends adjustment of 40-hour-week provisions to permit Federal ditch riders to work longer hours during irrigation season, less at other periods

"Whereas as the result of a Federal Government regulation establishing a 40-hour week for Government employees, the Secretary of the Interior has applied the regulation to all employees of the Bureau of Reclamation, including those engaged in the operation of Federal irrigation projects; and

"Whereas though the 40-hour week can be successfully applied to some groups of employees operating irrigation projects; it is not feasible to apply this regulation, during the irrigation season, to employees engaged in the delivery of water for the reason that water is run in irrigation canals 24 hours per day, each day, during that part of the irrigation season when continuous use of water is required; and

"Whereas when operating employees are restricted to a 40-hour week, responsibility for the operation of irrigation works must be divided among two or more employees, a situation which has resulted, and will continue to result, in friction, misunderstanding, and evasion of responsibility among such employees; and will cause an impairment of irrigation service, waste of water, and crop loss on project farms; and

"Whereas the aforementioned difficulties find a practical solution in applying the 40-hour week to such employees engaged in the delivery of water during the period of minimum water use; and to permit such employees to work such hours per week during that part of the season when continuous use of water is required, as has been the practice in the past, thus continuing the unimpaired service heretofore enjoyed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this association urgently recommends to the Secretary of the Interior that he designate as essential overtime workers, during the period of afore-mentioned continuous use of water, employees engaged in the delivery of water to water users in Federal irrigation projects; and if such designation be found not feasible that appropriate action be taken to bring about the desired effect herein set forth."

"Resolution 6

"Whereas the reclamation law and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto provide for the delivery of operation and maintenance of federally constructed projects or divisions thereof to the properly organized bodies of water users in such projects or divisions when certain conditions

prescribed by that law have been complied with; and

"Whereas such delivery of operation and maintenance is in the interest of the water users and the reclamation program in general; and

"Whereas it has been called to the attention of the National Reclamation Association that there are instances wherein the Bureau of Reclamation has failed to deliver operation and maintenance to a district for many years after it had complied with all legal conditions and repeatedly made formal request for a delivery contract; and

"Whereas this association, by Resolution No. 14, adopted at Denver, Colo., on October 29, 1943, and by Resolution No. 9, adopted at Denver, Colo., on November 17, 1944, declared that, in view of the above premises, it was the opinion of the association that operation and maintenance of all projects and divisions thereof, constructed under the above laws and being operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, should be given over to the properly organized bodies of water users at the earliest possible date after they have complied with all legal conditions; and

"Whereas it has not been observed by the association that any change of policy has been made by the Bureau since the adoption of said Resolutions Nos. 14 and 9: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association does hereby reaffirm the principle declared in said Resolutions Nos. 14 and 9, and does hereby respectfully request that the Bureau of Reclamation correct its policy and initiate action to conform to that principle; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation with the request for a statement of the views of the Bureau; and be it further

"Resolved, That the officers and representatives of this association are directed to endeavor to carry into effect the objects of this resolution."

"Resolution 11

"Whereas the intent of the reclamation laws is to accord equal treatment to every type of water users' organization, and there should be no discrimination, under any Federal statute, between irrigation districts, water users' associations, mutual ditch companies, and other types of water users' organization: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That in view of that intent the reclamation laws and other Federal statutes should be clarified where necessary to insure that the application of water revenues and power revenues to repaying the cost of construction, to pay operation and maintenance expenses, and otherwise to reduce the cost of water to the farmer on a reclamation project by whatever type of organization it is operated, does not constitute a dividend or distribution of such revenues, but a proper disposition of the resources of a multiple-purpose project, as intended by Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That the officers and appropriate committees of the National Reclamation Association are instructed to present and en-

deavor to secure the adoption of clarifying legislation to the foregoing effect."

"Resolution 12

"Whereas in numerous reclamation projects in the 17 Western States customs of land use and occupation have developed and vested rights have attached through ownership and use which will make it difficult and uneconomical to conform to the fixed acreage limitations now required by the Reclamation Act of 1902, as amended: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the association strongly urges that the Congress give favorable consideration to the requests of all projects for the modification of the requirements of the acreage limitation provisions of said reclamation acts so far as the same apply to such projects, with due regard to the prevention of speculation in project lands to the end that conditions incident to long experience gained through past development and general usage may not be disturbed."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4683. A bill to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 833).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families; with amendments (Rept. No. 839).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of November 1945, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms

To the Senate:

DECEMBER 7, 1945.

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Alma B. Kidwell.....	113 Park Blvd. SE.....	Federal Communications Commission.....	\$1,800

B. K. WHEELER, Chairman.

DECEMBER 6, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual ¹	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Fred R. Miller.....	7535 17th St. NW.....	Veterans' Administration.....	\$5,810
Bertha M. Heck.....	3107 Mount Pleasant St. NW.....	do.....	2,166

¹ Both assigned to permanent Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation.

WALTER F. GEORGE, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1669. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Robert J. O'Connor; and

S. 1670. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Richard K. O'Connor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1671. A bill to give widows of any deceased person, entitled to wartime service-connected death compensation or pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of section 5 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, credit for each child regardless of number, removing present top limit of \$100 monthly; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1672. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus lands and property of Federal agencies on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS AND PUBLIC-HEALTH CENTERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DONNELL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DOCUMENTS BEARING ON TERMINATION OF ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AND TRADE DISCUSSIONS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement made in Washington by the President of the United States and in London by the Prime Minister

of Great Britain on December 6, 1945; a joint statement by the United States and the United Kingdom regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy; a joint statement regarding settlement for lend-lease reciprocal aid, surplus war property, and claims; and a financial agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE SHRINE LUNCHEON MEETING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him before the Shrine luncheon meeting at Washington, D. C., on December 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR MITCHELL ON PROBLEMS OF ALUMINUM-PLANT DISPOSAL

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a memorandum prepared by him on the problems of aluminum-plant disposal, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HOSPITAL CENTER

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Hospital Center," published in the Washington Evening Star of December 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DAR NEGRO POLICY—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the column entitled "Fair Enough," by Westbrook Pegler, published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HURLEY CONTROVERSY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Exit Pat Hurley," by Maxwell S. Stewart, published in the December 8, 1945, issue of the Nation; and an article headed "Thinks Hurley might give Chinese benefit of his 1931 Oklahoma plan," by Lowell Mellett, published in his column entitled "On the Other Hand," which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED PEACE DEPARTMENT—ARTICLE BY JACK H. POLLACK

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Do We Need a Peace Department?" written by Jack H. Pollack and published in the January 1946 issue of Tomorrow magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Austin	Guffey	Myers
Ball	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hart	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltostall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Willis
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Gossett	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] have been excused. They are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, by unanimous consent H. R. 3603, to pro-

vide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, is now before the Senate for consideration, and all of yesterday was devoted to a discussion of the bill. It has developed, however, that some of the Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity to study the bill carefully. It is a long bill, a technical one, and quite complicated.

Therefore, Mr. President, in response to the requests of several Senators, and also in order that there may be a better opportunity to give consideration to the bill over the week end, I ask that the bill be laid aside. It is my intention to ask that it be taken up again early next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland call for the regular order at the present time?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I shall not object to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland that the ship-sales bill be temporarily laid aside. I wish to compliment the Senator from Maryland. I know how anxious he is to have the bill passed by the Senate, and how important it is that action be obtained on it. The Senator from Maryland has worked on the bill for about 2 months, and it is a complicated measure and one which requires much study. I hope the Senate will bear with us so that we can get the bill passed.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 1415.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to continue the discussion of the bill which is the unfinished business.

SPEECH BY PROFESSOR LASKI, AND THE PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is with grave concern that I invite the attention of this body to philosophies of government recently expressed by the head of the dominant party in Great Britain—the party now in control of the government of that great nation.

I refer to a speech delivered on Monday of this week at the Hotel Astor in New York by Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party. His position in relation to the party in control of the Government in England at the moment might be compared to that of the chairman of the Republican Party or the chairman of the Democratic Party. It might be more aptly compared to the position of Mr. Hannegan, who is chairman of the Democratic National Committee. While I have not been able to secure a complete copy of Professor Laski's speech, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this

point, the most complete summary thereof I have been able to obtain from articles appearing in the following newspapers: The Washington Post of December 4 under the caption "End free economy or bring a third war, Laski declares"; from the Washington Times-Herald of December 6, an article with a Chicago date line under the heading "Kennedy calls Laski arrogant apostle of Red anarchy"; and from the Washington Daily News of December 4, under the heading "No nation fit for atom trust, Laski asserts."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

END FREE ECONOMY OR BRING A THIRD WAR, LASKI DECLARES

NEW YORK, December 3.—Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, asserted tonight that free enterprise economies must be scrapped because they lead to war which, in the atomic age, would destroy civilization.

"There is no middle way," he contended. "Free enterprise and the market economy mean war; socialism and planned economy mean peace. All attempts to find a compromise are a satanic illusion. We must plan our civilization or we must perish."

Speaking in the Astor ballroom at a dinner closing the 3-day atom-bomb forum held by the National Associates, Professor Laski charged bluntly that even though atomic energy ultimately is no secret, American and British "great vested interests" are trying to keep the "secret" from Russia.

"You know the result—a halt to confidence and the rise of ugly suspicions about the imminent chances of a third world war," he said.

The 52-year-old British Labor chairman, a prolific and leftish writer and speaker, summarized in this way his answer to the challenge of the atom bomb:

"Every implication of this discovery means planned internationalism, economic, social, political. It is an international discovery. The planning of its application has been international. The organization of its future use must be international also. There is no nation state fit to be trusted with the development of atomic energy."

Professor Laski, a former lecturer at Harvard and Yale, making his first visit to the United States in 6 years, was emphatic in linking the atom bomb and future war problems to the project of getting rid of society "dominated by businessmen."

"It is clear to any honest observer," he said, "that a society dominated by businessmen could not be trusted to create the mental climate in which the development of atomic energy would be confined within the framework of peace. They would not give the common people the education because they fear its outcome."

"It is the businessman who has split our society into two—the political society and the economic society. They have made the policeman the sanction of the first, and the threat of starvation the sanction of the second."

"There is only one country in the world today where this dichotomy has been transcended. There is only one country, also, where science and technology can be developed without sacrificing the education of man and fearing the break-down of social well-being, or community consciousness."

"It is significant that only in the new world of Russia has the businessman ceased to count. It is also significant that one of the major preoccupations of the great vested interests is now to keep the 'secret'—which is no secret—from the knowledge of Russia."

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

KENNEDY CALLS LASKI ARROGANT APOSTLE OF RED ANARCHY—EX-ENVOY TO BRITAIN RE- MINDS SOCIALIST CAPITALISTIC UNITED STATES SAVED BRITAIN TWICE

CHICAGO, December 5.—Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain, tonight assailed Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, for his impertinence in suggesting that the United States should trade its system of free economy for some brand of socialism.

"How can Laski have the gall to assert that capitalism is dead when the British Empire has been saved twice in 30 years by the capitalistic United States?" asked Kennedy, who resigned his London post in 1941 after serving 4 years.

APOSTLE OF ANARCHY

"I know Laski, and he is an arrogant apostle of anarchy who has spent his time shuttling between Moscow, London, and New Haven peddling his particular brand of socialism."

Although denouncing Laski's theories, Kennedy warned that the United States is in danger of stumbling into some form of socialism or communism, the true nature of which the public has only the foggiest idea.

"Whether we keep our free economy or trade it for something about which we know very little is the big political issue ahead," he told an audience of 1,000 at a dinner meeting of the Economic Club of Chicago.

UP TO BUSINESSMEN

"It is up to businessmen to sell our economic system to the public," he asserted. "They must do as good a job on that as they do on their own products. Unless the advantages of our system over others is brought home to everyone there is no reason to believe that the trend toward more and more government will be checked."

Kennedy criticized business for delaying its complaints about Government policies until they have been put into effect. The only effective antidote for unsound Government policies is aggressive political action by businessmen as individuals, he said.

[From the Washington Daily News]

NO NATION FIT FOR ATOM TRUST, LASKI ASSERTS

National sovereignty, free enterprise, and market economy must go to assure peace in the atomic age, Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, announced last night, while priests, members of the Holy Name Society and Catholic war veterans picketed him at his New York hotel.

War is "the outcome of the exercise of governments of unlimited sovereignty," Laski said, and: "Socialism and planned economy mean peace."

He declared no nation is fit to be trusted with development of atomic energy, and demanded that secrecy be abolished.

Laski denounced British foreign policy and the economy of the United States—the direct road to serfdom—and spoke approvingly of Russia, because there the businessman has ceased to count.

The pickets were protesting an alleged slight to the church in a Laski radio speech several weeks ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. Preceding, as it does, the deliberations of this body concerning the authorization of a gigantic loan to Great Britain—a loan which, it is said will serve largely to stabilize the economy of the world, and, in particular, will save the British Empire from bankruptcy—the philosophy expressed by Professor Laski gives me much concern, and in my opinion should give

every Member of this great body much concern.

That would not be true were his statements those only of an individual British citizen, or those of a leader of a minority party in that nation, but the remarks I shall mention more specifically come from the head of the party now in control of the British Government—the same Government which we are now asked to save from bankruptcy.

Just what does the professor have to say concerning this Nation—our Nation—which is asked by his Government to be the Samaritan of the British Empire, and of the world. In the first place, as he is quoted by the New York Times, he criticizes our existing form of economy as “the direct road to serfdom.”

Frankly, I am surprised that the professor's party—and his party is in control—would be so free as to request aid of an economy headed direct for serfdom, unless it be sought to hasten such slavery. Again, the professor states:

Free enterprise and the market economy mean war; socialism and planned economy mean peace. All attempts to find a compromise are a satanic illusion. We must plan our civilization or we must perish.

Of course, the United States has been troubled always by wild-eyed idealists who wish to tell us how to conduct our own business, and how poorly we have been conducting it. Nevertheless, it is to be noted that most of them, including the learned professor, like to receive the remunerative compensation derived from lecture tours and writing in this country.

The professor, strange to say, hinges any possible solution of what to do with the atomic bomb and the avoidance of future wars upon getting rid of society dominated by businessmen. He states:

It is clear to any honest observer that a society dominated by businessmen could not be trusted to create the mental climate in which the development of atomic energy would be confined within the framework of peace. They would not give the common people the education because they fear its outcome.

That is not all. The professor continues:

It is the businessman who has split our society into two societies—the political society and the economic society. They have made the policeman the sanction of the first, and the threat of starvation the sanction of the second.

It is not strange that this Nation—so dominated by businessmen, as the professor charges—should have done as well as it has to this date. Is it not fortunate for the British Empire that such businessmen were able to provide so many billions of dollars to save the Empire from destruction in the recent war? Is there not some significance to the fact that this Nation did, using the professor's own words “create the mental climate” necessary to building the greatest fighting force in the history of the world, and contributed so much to the winning of the struggle from which we have just emerged? Is it a mere coincidence that the same Nation—the United States, if you please—is taking the lead in creating the mental climate necessary for the protection and welfare

of the small nations of the world, and for the establishment of peace?

By what strange quirk of human nature does the professor's party now seek further aid of the Nation whose form of government the professor so much deplores, and whose overthrow he seeks. Why does his party seek aid of our society, whose sanction, as the professor says, is “the threat of starvation”?

Where in the world can there be found the high level of education now existing in the United States? Not, even, in the British Empire. Nowhere else in the world can there be found the standards of living that we have here. In no nation does labor enjoy the position and freedom it here holds. And yet, the professor has the audacity to damn those very things which now make it possible for the United States to provide relief for the world. Incidentally, let me add, that I trust in doing so, we shall not become and be called—a “sucker.”

Apparently the professor regards Russia as the utopia of modern civilization. He says:

There is only one country where science and technology can be developed without sacrificing the education of man and fearing the break-down of social well-being, or community consciousness. It is significant that only in the new world of Russia has the businessman ceased to count.

It is a mystery to me how the professor and others arrive at such a high evaluation of Russian society. Shrouded in mystery, as it is; hidden behind the dark veil of secrecy, as it is; following a road of isolationism, as it apparently is; suspicious of the world, as it appears to be, I fail to see how anyone on the outside can properly evaluate either Russia's accomplishments or Russia's goals.

However, if the professor likes the society of Russia so well, why does he not select that nation as his domicile, and there dwell in prosperity and contentment?

There is an old adage that “those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.” If the professor is so interested in the advancement of society, why does he not lecture at home? Surely a few shekels could not influence his high motives. This is not the first time a labor government has been in control in Great Britain. How much advancement has labor made in that nation? Compare its progress with the progress of labor in this country. That is all that need be done.

So much for the professor and his individual philosophy which would always tear down, but offers no stones or mortar for sound and stable reconstruction. What concerns me is this: Does he speak for the Government of Great Britain? Occupying the position that he now holds, I must assume, for the present at least, that he does.

If that be true, then I, for one, am now serving notice upon the Members of this great legislative body, and upon the world that unless Professor Laski is repudiated, I cannot support legislation granting any appropriation for the salvation of any such government. If such is the philosophy underlying the government which seeks such enormous finan-

cial assistance, such a loan would be a betrayal of American principles and ideals, and would serve only to make insecure the future peace of the world.

I have a high regard for the British Empire. I wish to do anything I can, consistent with American interests, in aid of that government. I wish to see international cooperation and good will. I hope and pray that in conjunction with the other nations of the earth we may achieve permanent peace. My vote has supported those beliefs and principles. I expect to continue along that line.

However, I point out that cooperation is not a one-way street. Good will cannot be bought. He who constantly bestows gifts frequently receives only the envy or condemnation of the donee.

I feel that those I represent expect of me the upholding of the principles I have mentioned. On the other hand, I was not elected a United States Senator to sell America short, or to hand over our pocketbook to those who denounce and seek to destroy the system which filled that pocketbook. I remember when the able Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, made the statement that he was not elected Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I am serving notice at this time that I was not elected a United States Senator to assist in liquidating the American form of government.

Unless the British Government, through the medium of the Prime Minister thereof, expressly and clearly disavows and renounces the position taken by Professor Laski, I cannot and will not support the making of the loan sought by that Government. I, for one, am sick and tired of doing things for other countries and other peoples and then having them come to our shores and try to undermine and ruin our form of government. I am in favor of making a loan to Great Britain on a practical basis, and will support it, but I will not support a loan when the head of the Labor Party, which is in control of the Government in England and who must have some responsibility and something to say about policies, comes to our shores and stands on the platform in one of our hotels and tells an American audience that our private enterprise system must go, that if it does not it will lead to slavery and serfdom, and that the only system worth while, and the system we must adopt, is a system of socialism or communism. I, for one, will not support it. The time has arrived when we must stop appeasing—when we must call a spade a spade. I sincerely hope that the Government of Great Britain will repudiate the statement which Professor Laski made in New York City earlier this week.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before addressing the Senate on the pending bill, I wish briefly to advert to another matter.

At the last call of the calendar, when we reached House bill 2716, dealing with the proposal to provide doctors and dentists for emergency attention to employees in the Federal agencies, the

Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Bilbo] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Overton] objected to the passage of the bill by unanimous consent. They desired to have time to investigate it. They have reported to me that they have investigated the bill and that they have no objection to it.

Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that the bill is a rather simple routine measure, providing for the same type of medical service in Government agencies as is provided by practically all our great corporations, and even by the Senate of the United States. There were extended hearings in the House, and the American Medical Association representative approved the bill. The National Safety Council and the representatives of several large corporations also approved it. There were hearings before the Civil Service Committee, and there was no objection of any kind from any member of the committee.

The bill is in charge of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], and I can assure the minority leader that there is no objection to it.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator again identify the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. It is House bill 2716.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Magnuson in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees.

Mr. WHITE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the bill was reported to the Senate with the approval of the entire membership of the Civil Service Committee?

Mr. DOWNEY. It has the approval of both the House and Senate committees.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The bill referred to by the Senator from California was reported by me from the Committee on Civil Service. I merely wish to explain to the Senate the present situation and my attitude on the bill.

So far as I am personally concerned, I am reasonably well satisfied with the bill. I was sufficiently satisfied not to object to its consideration the other day. However, since objection was made by the Senator from Mississippi, I have received vigorous objection from one of the State agencies, not to the general principles of the bill, but to some of its provisions, which it is believed were left in the bill through inadvertence. This morning I had a conference with some of the members of that agency. I do not fully agree with their apprehensions. Yet I must say in all fairness that there is some reason which would stimulate their apprehensions in the language of the bill. I can very easily understand how they could be misled by some of the language of the bill which, to say the least, is somewhat vague and indefinite.

I may say that one of the objections was in regard to the language of the bill on page 2, in respect to the question of the limitation of health activities which the Civil Service Commission would be authorized to go into. The language is as follows:

The health services * * * shall be limited to (1) treatment on the job of minor illnesses and minor general conditions except in cases of emergency, or of injury or illness sustained while in the performance of the employee's duty in accordance with the act of September 7, 1916,

Objection was made that that flies directly in the face of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission's activities already set up by law and functioning.

I hesitate to bring up this matter at this time, because in regard to a subject so far reaching as this, I believe amendments should not be simply tacked on willy-nilly to a bill of this character. However, let me say this morning it was suggested that that sentence be changed so as to read:

Treatment on the job of minor illnesses and minor dental conditions, together with emergency attention.

The object of that suggestion was to get away from any implication that the provision of the very limited service which we are hoping to set up in the departments would be enlarged to permanent treatment if a major emergency occurred while an employee was on the job. In other words, if an employee broke a leg while on the job, the emergency treatment would not be continued over a period of weeks or months by the department until the employee had recovered.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator satisfied that with the amendment which he has just read, Senators who have previously objected to the bill are now content that it should be passed?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have had no conversation with the Senators who have objected, so I do not know. The Senator from California has discussed it with them, I believe.

Let me say to the Senator from Maine that in respect to this particular provision, the language I just read by way of amendment satisfies me, as an individual member. I am not prepared to make an all-out recommendation that it answers the purpose. I believe it does, but it has not been studied very carefully.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I repeat what I said a moment ago, namely, that if the members of the committee are a unit in support of the proposal, I do not feel inclined to object to it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say that I submitted this amendment to the Senator from California this morning; but no other member of the committee has seen it, so far as I know. I am not raising objection, because so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to go ahead with the bill. But I rather hesitate to face the other members of the committee with proposed amendments unless they

have had an opportunity to examine them.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator need be apprehensive in that respect. In my own judgment, the bill is all right. If it is not, this change will make certain the accomplishment of what all of us in the committee favored. As chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I am very happy to accept the amendment which I understand the Senator is proposing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is a member of the committee. I am quite certain that he has not seen the amendment. He is one of the members of the committee who made inquiry of me at some length subsequent to the committee's recommendation of the bill. I certainly do not wish to take advantage of his situation. I have not even answered his inquiries in detail.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Iowa would prefer that the bill not be considered now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. From my own standpoint, I say that as an individual I would just as soon have the bill considered, because personally I am reasonably well satisfied with it. I believe it will accomplish the desired objective, provided this amendment is added to it, and also in view of the fact that there also is an amendment, proposed by the objectors to the bill, with respect to clause (4), on page 2. That clause reads as follows, including four words in the first proviso:

Shall be limited to * * * (4) education and preventive programs relating to health, including the alleviation of health hazards in the working environment.

The objection raised to that—and it has been raised subsequent to the hour or two of hearings which were held on the bill—is that it tosses the Civil Service Commission directly into competition with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, which already has the duty of supervising, regulating, and changing health hazards and providing for their elimination, and that we are now setting up the Civil Service Commission with a duplicating power in the vast field of Government service. I think that is their objection. I am not prepared to say whether the objection is valid, because we have not gone into the matter.

Mr. BYRD. I referred to a letter which I received from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and I told the Senator about it and gave it to him. I was informed that a special study of the question had been made.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator that the so-called exhaustive study which we made on the bill occurred under the following circumstances: The bill came up unexpectedly one day in the Civil Service Committee. The Member of the House of Representatives who had had charge of the bill in the House appeared before the committee, and for 30 or 40 minutes we discussed the provisions of the bill. From an over-all standpoint, I became convinced that the objectives of the bill were desirable, but

that it was somewhat detailed and complicated. Then we left the subject. The next morning some other members of the committee were present at the committee meeting, and the bill was again considered.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that he is in charge of the bill. It is his duty to present it and endeavor to secure its passage by the Senate. In whatever the Senator desires to do about the bill the chairman of the committee will be happy to acquiesce. It is agreeable to me to have the bill go back to the committee for further consideration if the Senator desires that course to be followed, or if he does not wish to have the bill considered today, I shall make no complaint.

I may say to the Senator that the bill is considered to be of rather imperative nature by Mr. RANDOLPH and the other members of the House committee and the persons who have appeared for it. But the obligation and responsibility are upon the distinguished Senator from Iowa. If he will now state to the chairman of the committee what he wishes to do in relation to the bill, the chairman of the committee will be very happy to acquiesce.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is my recollection that the Senator from California called up the bill this morning and asked unanimous consent to have it considered. If I am in charge of the bill, at least I did not call it up. I am merely attempting to give the Senate the benefit of the meager information which I have had on the bill, and I state that, so far as I am concerned, I shall vote for the bill with the amendment, hoping that the controversial matters can be ironed out in conference.

If the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, wishes to have the bill passed at this time, he may proceed to do so; that is up to him. As I have said, the Senator from California requested unanimous consent for consideration of the bill. If he wishes to have the Senate proceed with its consideration, I have no objection. I simply offer that suggestion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he has the letter from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission which I sent to him?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the chairman of the committee answer the questions which are propounded in the letter.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know whether the chairman of the committee has a copy of the letter.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if it is necessary to go into those details at the present time, the chairman of the committee is happy to do so. Since the bill was approved by the committee, communications have been received from the Public Health Service and from, I believe, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, both of whom made certain recommendations and suggestions in reference to the bill.

I reviewed those matters with our attorneys and with the Civil Service Commission, as well as with Representative RANDOLPH, and we arrived at the conclusion that the bill, in its present form, is a proper bill. I likewise discussed the matter several times with the Senator from Iowa, and called up the bill only this morning after having consulted with the Senator and knowing that he was here in the Chamber.

The Senate committee has made certain amendments. It was agreed by Representative RANDOLPH and myself that if and when the Senate passes the bill and conferees are appointed on the part of the Senate, we will give representatives of the Public Health Service and the United States Employees Compensation Commission, as well as another group, the osteopaths, an opportunity to appear before the conferees and again state their position.

As I have already said, I do not wish to elaborate upon the argument, so far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, and so far as Representative RANDOLPH, who has made an extensive study of the matter, is concerned. However, we think the bill is entirely proper in its present form and, as I have already said, it was unanimously reported by the committee. The only objection I have heard is the one which was made on the Senate floor today.

Mr. President, I have a perfecting amendment relating to the definition of "physician." I should like to have the amendment read, and obtain unanimous consent to have it agreed to and incorporated in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 17, after "environment:," it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That wherever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be utilized under this act, the definition of 'physician' contained in the act of September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, ch. 15, sec. 790), shall be applicable."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, all the amendment would do would be to incorporate in the bill the same definition of "physician" that has been used in prior statutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has the Senator given consideration to the letter from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission stating that this bill would duplicate existing facilities?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I did not receive a copy of the letter to which the Senator refers, but a representative of the Commission came in and discussed the matter with me.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Iowa should read the letter from the Commission and see what objection it has to the bill. The letter states that this bill would duplicate many of the facilities which are already in existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House

bill 2716 to provide for health programs for Government employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from California if he has considered the letter from Mrs. Jewell W. Swofford, Chairman of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, which contains suggestions of a number of amendments to the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I can only restate to the distinguished Senator what I have already said. This bill was developed primarily under the leadership of Representative RANDOLPH of the House of Representatives and a committee of that body held extensive hearings in regard to the matter. A minor hearing was held before our committee, and I personally read from rather exhaustive hearings which had been held on the bill. When questions were raised by the Public Health Service and by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, I referred those issues to Representative RANDOLPH for discussion. He and I agreed that there was no necessity and no cause for any amendment being made to the bill, but that instead, the bill should be passed by Congress as reported from the committee. However, we agreed that if the Senate amended the bill and the bill went to conference, Representative RANDOLPH would see that the conferees would call before them representatives of the Public Health Service and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

I wish merely to make this statement and then, so far as this bill is concerned, I shall be through. If the procedure to which I have referred, and the statement which I have made are not satisfactory to the Senator from Virginia, I have no objection to his making an objection or having the bill recommitted to the committee for further investigation and study.

Mr. BYRD. I asked the Senator the question whether he had considered in detail the suggestions which were made by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have already answered the Senator twice. Yes; I have.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated that he talked with some Representative.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. I did not see the letter to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to read the letter. It is from Mrs. Jewell W. Swofford, the Chairman.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In view of your interest in bringing about simplification of governmental procedures and the elimination of overlapping and duplication of functions in the Federal service, I wish to invite your attention to proposed legislation now pending on the calendar of the Senate, certain features of which I am constrained to believe may have escaped your notice at the time such legislation was reported from the

Committee on the Civil Service. I refer specifically to the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees.

The report of the Committee on the Civil Service of the House of Representatives upon this bill stated the legislation proposed therein would center in the Civil Service Commission "the responsibility for coordinating health services for all Federal agencies."

The report then outlines what is contemplated under the term "health services," as follows:

- "(1) Treatment of minor illnesses and dental conditions.
- "(2) Treatment of minor noncompensable injuries and diseases, with the objective of keeping employees at work.
- "(3) Health examinations.
- "(4) Referral of employees to private physicians.
- "(5) Educational and preventative programs relating to health, including the alleviation of health hazards in the working environment."

In respect to objective (2) above it appears that the provisions of the bill are much broader than is indicated in the committee report. In fact, instead of limiting medical treatment to "minor noncompensable injuries and diseases," as the report states, the proposed legislation would seem to provide for treatment without limit in any case of injury within the purview of the Federal Workmen's Compensation Act of September 7, 1916. The bill provides that health services "shall be limited to (1) treatments on the job of minor illnesses and minor dental conditions except in cases of emergency or of injury or illness sustained while in the performance of duty in accordance with the act of September 7, 1916."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, first, let the chairman of the committee say that he is totally at variance with the extreme statements contained in the letter. I think that the language of the bill is guarded and sufficient, but perhaps the Senator from Virginia does not understand that the Senator from Iowa has suggested an amendment which I believe is satisfactory to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and which makes very clear what the Senator from Iowa thinks the bill means, and what the Senator from Virginia and myself think it means. So, if the bill contains the error to which reference has been made—and I do not believe that it does—the error can be cured by the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to continue reading the letter:

It appears clear that the exception removes entirely the limitation which purportedly is intended to restrict such medical service to treatment of "minor illnesses." In other words, medical treatment in cases of occupational injuries could embrace any and all treatment required by the nature of the injury.

The Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, includes all necessary provisions for the medical care of civil employees of the United States who may suffer injury or illness caused by their employment. Such law provides that medical care will be provided through governmental facilities where practicable and it places upon the Compensation Commission responsibility for providing such medical care.

The enactment of the bill H. R. 2716 in its present form will invite confusion and probably give rise to conflict of jurisdiction in providing medical care for injured employees. It will bring another governmental agency, the Civil Service Commission, into a field of service now exclusively within the

jurisdiction of the Compensation Commission for the Civil Service Commission would be made responsible "for coordinating the health services" which, as indicated, would include medical care of injured employees.

In respect to objective (5) above, the report of the House committee states the authority contemplated in the bill would include functions also within the statutory jurisdiction of the Compensation Commission; namely, accident prevention. The report states "alleviation of health hazards in the working environment" would include attention to such matters as "lighting, ventilation" * * * and "elimination or control of occupational hazards—for example gas and dust."

The functions illustrated by example are now being performed under specific statutory authority directing the Compensation Commission to make studies and investigations of the causes of injury (which includes disease) and to develop means for preventing them. Enactment of the bill H. R. 2716 with present provisions for development of safe working conditions will bring the Civil Service Commission into another new field and result in overlapping and duplication of the functions of the Compensation Commission with the inevitable resulting confusion, inefficiency, and waste of public funds.

The Compensation Commission can see no justification for retaining in the pending bill the specific provisions to which attention is directed, particularly in the light of the effect they would have. If it is deemed necessary to enact such legislation at this time it would seem prudent at least to perfect it so far as practicable and to eliminate any questionable features prior to enactment. Although it would seem that responsibility for supervising the establishment of essential health services in the Federal establishments and coordinating such health work might be placed more advantageously upon the Public Health Service rather than in an agency without facilities in the health field, this Commission does not oppose the pending measure or the administrative plan it contemplates. However, it does urge modification of the bill so the final legislative enactment will not create confusion or bring about duplication of effort and conflict of jurisdiction in the administration of the medical and accident-prevention provisions of the compensation law.

The Commission knowing of your efforts to eliminate such conditions as presently exist in the Federal administrative structure suggests for your consideration amendment of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on the Civil Service, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, beginning with the word "except," strike out the language which follows to the semicolon in line 13.

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "preventive" and the language beginning with the word "including" in line 16 through the word "environment" in line 17.

The changes suggested above will not interfere with the purported objectives of the bill and in the opinion of the Commission will be in the public interest. I will be glad to discuss the proposed changes with you at your convenience if you so desire, or furnish any further information you may request.

Very truly yours,

MR. JEWELL W. SWOFFORD,
Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator reserving the right to object?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. This bill has been on the calendar for some time. It has been reached on the calendar, and objection has been raised to it. It seems to me, if I may say so to the Senator from Virginia, that it ought not be taken up now with all of the confusion that seems to exist as to its present form and as to amendments which might be offered. So, unless the Senator from Virginia objects to its consideration, I feel that I should.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Maine. Amendments should be considered, and that would be very difficult to do now with but few Members of the Senate present. I think this is a vitally important bill. It apparently gives the Civil Service Commission jurisdiction of certain matters over which other administrative agencies have heretofore exercised control. Therefore, I object to consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. As I have already said, the distinguished Senator from Iowa is in charge of this bill and has been since it was reported by the committee. I might suggest to him, in view of the circumstances which have arisen, that the wise thing to do would be to ask unanimous consent to recommit the bill to the Civil Service Committee for further hearing. Manifestly, if doubt is going to be expressed by members of the Civil Service Committee who were present at the hearings and voted to report the bill favorably, Senators who know nothing about it will be reluctant to support it. So I suggest to the Senator from Iowa the propriety of asking unanimous consent to recommit the bill to the Civil Service Committee for further hearings. He is in charge of the bill, and I do not desire to intrude upon what policy he may want to develop, but, as chairman of the committee, I make the suggestion to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, just a word to further clarify my position. I think I mentioned a moment ago that some of the objectors, who represent a large governmental agency that thinks its toes are being stepped on by this bill, were in my office this morning. They presented their objections and offered the suggestion which was contained in the letter read by the Senator from Virginia a moment ago. In one instance they wanted a very short statement to replace the rather verbose statement which is now in the bill. At that time they brought up the question of the confusing details of the bill which they thought should be changed. I said, "That fits pretty well into this bill. I am fairly well satisfied with it myself, but its language may seem confusing." I told them that I had reported the bill from the Civil Service Committee, and therefore would have charge of the bill on the floor of the Senate. I said further, "I will assure you that I myself shall not call up the bill for at least a few days, until we can go into this thing and see how these amendments will fit in, and I will consult the Senator from California, other members of the committee, and perhaps some Members of the House by telephone."

I came in this morning without any intention of calling this bill up today.

Since the Senator from California asked unanimous consent to have it considered I am not going to object to consideration of the bill because I am personally satisfied with it, but I believe there are others who are not, and it is an important piece of legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was not present during the hearings; I was present when the bill was reported. I think it a vitally important bill. I am entirely in favor of the objectives of the bill—I want that clearly understood—but to establish a new agency in the Civil Service Commission and to give it administrative functions which now belong to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, as it apparently does, is a question that should be carefully considered. I think it is an important subject, and as a member of the committee who was not present at the hearing, but who was present when the bill was ordered to be reported, I believe that the bill should be recommitted, not for the purpose of killing it but for arriving at a more thorough understanding of it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of the suggestion of the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, and in view of the statement of the Senator from Virginia, who is a member of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the remainder of the afternoon. I wish to appear before the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, shortly before I concluded my address to the Senate yesterday on Senate bill 1415, the Federal pay bill, I had expressed the repeated opinion that of all of the great labor groups in the United States the Federal workers had been the least favorably dealt with. I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that while the cost of living index has gone up 33 points from January 1, 1944, to the present time, the basic increase of the Federal worker has gone up only about 16 percent. Indeed, I might say to Senators that, since in the last pay bill we gave the advantage to the workers in the lower brackets, some of the workers in the upper brackets have had less than a 9-percent increase in the last 5 years, and consequently their real wage or buying power has been cut some 24 or 25 percent.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to his own report, where it says, at the bottom of page 2:

With increase under the 1945 Pay Act, average straight-time annual earnings of Federal workers have increased only 21.3 percent.

That is in the report submitted by the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, that is not a report made by the chairman of the committee except as reflecting certain testimony which was given before the committee; but taking that testimony at its full value, it does not in any way deny the validity of what I have just said. The basic increase in wages has been 15.9 percent. We speak of it roughly as 16 percent. Beyond that 16 percent, away back in 1942, we raised the minimum of custodial workers to \$1,200 a year, and gave slight increases to some other workers. A very small fraction of the workers in the Federal service received that increase, and it did amount to an average of 1 percent, spread over the entire pay roll. About 25 percent, as a result of long-time service in the Government, some within-grade employments that can affect the total, average about 2½ percent. Because of the critical situation of the labor market, the Army and Navy were compelled to do some upgrading to a total extent of about 2 percent, spread over the whole pay roll.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. In just a moment. I have carefully examined the records of the Government, and I find 80 or 85 percent of the workers in the upper brackets are still receiving about the same basic pay they received in 1941. I think a worker who was getting \$8,000 in 1941 is now getting \$8,750. Consequently those workers have had about a 9-percent increase. They have not had any within-grade promotion; they have not had any upgrading. They did not benefit by the raising of the minimum. They are left here, at the end of 4 or 5 years of long, arduous work, with 25 percent less buying power than they had 4 years ago. It does not matter how one may quibble or deny that, that is the simple conclusion.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Am I to understand that the Senator does not agree with the report of his committee with respect to his own bill? As a matter of fact, here it is, in plain, unequivocal language—I will read it again:

With the increase under the 1945 Pay Act, average straight-time annual earnings of Federal workers have increased only 21.3 percent.

Mr. President, that does not include any upgrading. That was fully brought out in the testimony, in which Mr. Fleming, representing the Civil Service Commission, said that no figure of upgrading was included; in fact, he indicated that he did not know how much upgrading there had been, that is, employees promoted from one grade to another involving an increase in salary and percentages on pay increases. That should be included.

The Senator said yesterday that the increase was only \$5 a month. Evidently the Senator did not have before him the schedules. An employee who re-

ceives \$2,000 now gets \$100 a year in-grade increase every year, under the 1945 act. In other words, there is an automatic increase of \$100 each year for a period of 6 years.

As the employee goes higher, the increase is greater. A \$2,540 employee gets an automatic increase of \$110; a \$2,650 employee an increase of \$110; a \$2,830 employee an increase of \$110 a year; a \$3,310 employee, \$110; a \$3,640 employee, \$110. That is an automatic increase every 12 months.

In the higher brackets, which increase every 18 months automatically, there is an increase as high as \$210 a year, for the \$4,300 employee, and the \$5,180 employee gets \$210 a year. I do not see how the Senator can repudiate and disclaim the fact that here is a report made by his own committee, on his own bill, and I assume he had some part in preparing it—which specifically and unequivocally states that straight-time annual earnings have increased since 1941, for Federal employees, by 21.3 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. First, Mr. President, let me categorically correct the Senator on one statement. The declarations I made about the time of within-grade employment, and the amount, had to do with the period before 1945, and if the Senator was on the floor of the Senate when I made the statement, he should have known it. What we were discussing was how much of a raise there was in the average straight-time earnings of Federal employees from 1941 to July 1945, and the statement I made had to do with that period of time.

As I stated on the floor at the same time, on July 1 we did liberalize the within grade employments as to amounts, and as to a decreasing time factor, and that is the figure the Senator has just given. But we have no way of judging yet the effect of those figures. We do know what was the effect of within-grade advancement from January 1, 1941, to July 1, 1945.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. We want to get the figures correct. The \$60 a year to which the Senator refers, under the old law, was paid only in the lower brackets, but under the Senator's bill an employee getting \$2,200 would get a \$100 increase, just as he does now.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is exactly what I stated yesterday.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said \$5 a month, and all he has to do is look at the record and see that he said it.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is \$60 a year.

Mr. BYRD. It is not a hundred dollars a year.

Mr. DOWNEY. The hundred-dollar-a-year provision has existed only since July the 1st.

Mr. BYRD. I differ with the Senator. I have a statement here from the Civil Service Commission showing that an employee who, under the old law, received \$2,200 a year, got an automatic in-grade promotion of \$100 a year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; but my statement about \$5 a month, or \$60 a year, was made with reference to workers getting less than \$2,200. I stated that in the cate-

gories higher than that, the increase was greater, but in the categories under \$2,200, it was \$5 a month, or \$60 a year. The period of time was 18 months.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated a little while ago that under the old law none of them got as much as \$100.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I did not. I was talking about workers in the lower category.

Mr. President, let me also say that Mr. Bowles appeared before the Civil Service Committee, as did Mr. Flemming. Mr. Bowles, in making his calculation, computed it upon basic earnings, eliminating the factors of within-grade employment, premium promotions, and upgrading.

Another difference also appeared. Before Pearl Harbor the workers were working a 39-hour week. After Pearl Harbor they worked 40 hours, and Mr. Bowles gave weight to that factor of 2½-percent increase in the number of hours required of the workers, and Mr. Flemming did not.

Again, I state unequivocally that the Senator inadvertently has been guilty of a serious inaccuracy. The 5.3 percent which Mr. Flemming testified appears in the average earnings above the basic allowance does include upgrading. Mr. Flemming said he did not know how much to allocate to upgrading and how much to allocate to promotions, but that both factors appear in the 5.3-percent figure. They would have to appear because what has been done is this: The number of employees as of January 1 was taken, and their total compensation figured, and the average was struck. The same thing was done on July 1, 1945. By that means we know how much was the average increase in straight hourly earnings. That comes to 21.3 percent. Since then I have been able somewhat to refine the figures, and we find that that 5.3 percent is made up in this way: One percent because of the increase to the custodial employees; 2½ percent because of within-grade advancing, and about 2 percent or slightly less from what we call premium promotions or upgrading.

I might at this time pay a high compliment to the Army and Navy and to our Government agencies because the figures clearly indicate that during this critical war period upgrading in governmental agencies was kept down to 2 percent, while in private industry it reached 19 percent. I am not criticizing private industry for that. There was a great dearth of workers, and a man of a lower category could sell his services above his natural category, and industrialists, in order to get work done, in many cases, had to pay substantially above the common category or standards. The figures of both industry and employees indicate very clearly that upgrading in industry during the war raised wage compensation by 19 percent, and the figures are just as plain that in the Government the increase has been kept down to less than 2 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Civil Service Commission has repeatedly stated that it cannot give the number of upgradings.

That is one thing that I, as one Member of the Senate, have been trying to obtain for a long time. The Commission is not even able to give a list of them. So exactly how the Commission can make an estimate of cost I do not see.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think that Mr. Flemming's testimony was crystal clear on that point.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator will not deny, however—

Mr. DOWNEY. May I finish, please? His testimony very clearly established that above the basic allowance the increase had comprehended about 5 percent-plus. Included in that 5 percent was within-grade employment, upgrading, promotions, premium promotions. Mr. Flemming stated in the hearing that he could not allocate those figures precisely among that 5.3 percent. But I might say to the distinguished Senator that since the hearing was concluded the Senator, I am sure, has received from the Civil Service Commission a letter which indicates that 1 percent of that raise was due to the custodial raise, and 2½ percent was due to within-grade employment, and the balance was due to upgrading or promotion.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not deny, does he, that the over-all increase amounts to 21.3 percent? No matter how it was made, salaries were increased to that extent. I think the Senator is wrong about including the upgrades, but I am unable to locate the testimony now. I will find it later.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall appreciate the Senator finding it so.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator a letter from the Civil Service Commission to the effect that the other grades are included in the 21 percent?

Mr. DOWNEY. That the upgrading is included?

Mr. BYRD. The upgrading; I mean promoting employees from one grade to another grade. Where is that letter? Does the Senator have it?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that if an employee in the Government receives a promotion to an already existing position, that does not show in the upgrades, and it should not show in the upgrades. If one man were to leave the Government and another man were to come in and take his job—

Mr. BYRD. That is what I have been talking about. The Senator and I apparently have been talking about different things. I mean that the upgrading, the taking of a man from one position and putting him in another grade, is not included in the 21 percent. What is the Senator's opinion about that?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; all those things are included. Promotion is included. Where the promotions have not tended to raise the average, that is if the promotion of an employee did not raise the total average, it would not appear to the extent that there are more employees in the higher brackets.

Mr. BYRD. Let us take this case. Suppose a man is in grade 10, which now pays \$3,970. He is put in grade 11 which pays \$4,300. Does the Senator contend that that increase is included in the 21.3 percent?

Mr. DOWNEY. If his being put in that grade made an extra man in that grade, one more than there was—

Mr. BYRD. I am not putting "ifs" into the question. The Senator stated that I was totally wrong when I stated that the upgrades were not included in this estimate. Did the Senator intend to say that when an employee is taken out of one grade and put into another grade at a \$500 increase in salary, such increase is not calculated in the 21 percent?

Mr. DOWNEY. It would be included, but let me say that if it did not increase what had been the existing number of workers at that salary it would not raise the average. It would be there, but it would not affect the average. If it brought an extra employee into a higher category it would appear.

Mr. BYRD. But the particular employee received an increase. That is the point I am making.

Mr. DOWNEY. He might receive an increase to take the place of a man who left the job, and if the other man left and he took his job at the same salary, and somebody took his job at the same salary, coming in from the outside some place, while the figures would be calculated in this problem, it would not raise the average.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but the employee who was promoted to a higher grade received an increase. That is what I contend.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot find in the testimony the exact statement at the moment, but it is quite definitely my recollection that Mr. Flemming testified, and repeated, and produced the figures, showing that in such a case as the Senator from Virginia referred to, that is an advance in salary, say, of \$500 by promotion to another grade, that is not taken into consideration in the 21.3-percent increase. His explanation is, and I think there is some soundness to it, that that does not change the general over-all pay averages. It is not taken into consideration when we talk about a 21.3-percent increase. If it were, it would increase the 21.3 percent by a considerable amount. That is my recollection of the testimony.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I now want to demonstrate from figures how very minor is the effect of upgrading, particularly in the higher brackets. Our highest category of pay starts at \$8,750 and goes to \$10,000. On December 31, 1944, there were 1,134 such employees, a very small number in the higher brackets. By September 30 of this year the number had dropped to 1,021. In other words, in the last year we have materially reduced the number of men in the upper brackets of pay in the classified list. Of the 1,021 men only 120 were receiving \$9,000; only 42 were receiving \$9,275; only 13 were receiving \$9,500; only 140 were receiving \$9,800; and only 82 were receiving \$10,000 and over, while at the bottom of the grade were the remainder of the 1,021 men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the

RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Estimates of employment subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by salary levels

Base rate July 1, 1945, Public Law 106	Number of employees, Dec. 31, 1944 (actual)	Percent of total		Estimated number of employees	
		At each level	Cumulative	Sept. 30, 1945	June 30, 1946
Total	1,221,272	100.00	100.00	1,100,000	860,000
\$864.00	220	.02	.02	198	155
536.00	48	(¹)	.02	43	34
1,008.00	2	(¹)	.02	2	1
1,680.00	3	(¹)	.02	3	2
1,152.00	8	(¹)	.02	7	6
1,440.00	25,166	2.06	2.08	22,667	17,721
1,506.00	31,194	2.55	4.63	28,096	21,966
1,572.00	33,583	2.75	7.38	30,248	23,649
1,638.00	5,915	.48	7.86	5,328	4,165
1,704.00	128,736	18.73	26.59	206,023	161,072
1,770.00	31,951	2.62	29.21	28,778	22,499
1,836.00	8,164	.67	29.88	7,353	5,749
1,902.00	219,187	17.95	47.83	197,422	154,348
1,968.00	34,153	2.80	50.63	30,762	24,050
2,034.00	4,814	.39	51.02	4,336	3,390
2,100.00	128,227	10.50	61.52	115,494	90,295
2,166.00	55,323	4.53	66.05	49,829	38,953
2,232.00	8,523	.70	66.75	7,677	6,002
2,298.00	3,720	.30	67.05	3,351	2,620
2,364.00	76,601	6.27	73.32	68,995	53,941
2,430.00	14,853	1.22	74.54	13,378	10,459
2,496.00	12,374	1.01	75.55	11,145	8,714
2,562.00	1,479	.12	75.67	1,332	1,041
2,628.00	4,281	.35	76.02	3,856	3,015
2,694.00	211	.02	76.04	190	149
2,760.00	44,044	3.68	79.72	40,481	31,640
2,826.00	5,957	.49	80.21	5,365	4,195
2,892.00	2,245	.18	80.39	2,022	1,581
2,958.00	64,846	5.31	85.70	58,407	45,663
3,024.00	9,599	.79	86.49	8,646	6,700
3,090.00	2,560	.21	86.70	2,306	1,803
3,156.00	21,106	1.73	88.43	19,010	14,862
3,222.00	2,282	.19	88.62	2,055	1,607
3,288.00	927	.08	88.70	835	653
3,354.00	45,653	3.74	92.44	41,120	32,148
3,420.00	6,999	.57	93.01	6,304	4,920
3,486.00	2,028	.17	93.18	1,827	1,428
3,552.00	8,474	.69	93.87	7,633	5,967
3,618.00	1,636	.13	93.00	1,474	1,152
3,684.00	501	.04	94.04	451	353
3,750.00	20,641	2.51	96.55	27,598	21,577
3,816.00	116	.01	96.56	104	82
3,882.00	2,725	.22	96.78	2,454	1,919
3,948.00	85	(¹)	96.78	77	60
4,014.00	1,161	.10	96.88	1,046	818
4,080.00	675	.06	96.94	608	475
4,146.00	17,233	1.41	98.35	15,522	12,135
4,212.00	2,215	.18	98.53	1,995	1,560
4,278.00	1,173	.10	98.63	1,057	826
4,344.00	707	.06	98.69	637	498
4,410.00	708	.06	98.75	638	499
4,476.00	7,812	.64	99.39	7,036	5,501
4,542.00	877	.07	99.46	790	618
4,608.00	666	.05	99.51	546	427
4,674.00	266	.02	99.53	240	187
4,740.00	350	.03	99.56	324	253
4,806.00	2,973	.24	99.80	2,678	2,093
4,872.00	343	.03	99.83	309	241
4,938.00	192	.02	99.85	173	135
5,004.00	87	(¹)	99.85	78	61
5,070.00	248	.02	99.87	223	175
5,136.00	1,134	.10	99.97	1,021	798
5,202.00	133	.01	99.98	120	94
5,268.00	47	(¹)	99.98	42	33
5,334.00	15	(¹)	99.98	13	10
5,400.00	156	.01	99.99	140	110
5,466.00 and over	91	.01	100.00	82	64

¹ Less than 1 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. The table clearly indicates that in the upper bracket the overwhelming proportion of employees—perhaps 75 or 80 percent—are at the lower limits of the bracket, and have been since the war started. Why have they been in the same position during the past 4 or 5 years? Because the Classification Act fixes the number of employees in a group and the amount of money they may be paid. Consequently, unless the Appropriations Committee

and the Senate desire to appropriate the money to pay additional employees in any bracket, high or low, the bracket simply cannot be increased.

I believe that some light will be thrown on this subject by reading a letter from the Civil Service Commission which was written at the request of the Senator from Virginia, and which gives members of the committee the information which I have been stating, contrary to the statements of the Senator from Virginia on the floor of the Senate today. I understand that every member of the committee received such a letter. The letter is dated November 26, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: At the hearings which were held in connection with S. 1415, Senator BYRD asked certain questions relative to advancements in salary from one grade to the next, and also relative to within-grade salary advancements.

It is impossible for the Commission to make an over-all study of the advancements from one grade to the next. Also, it is impossible for us to make a satisfactory study for any given agency or group of agencies. Such advancements do not necessarily have any effect on the average earnings in a given agency unless they result in placing a larger percentage of persons in the upper brackets.

I interpolate to say that that should be obvious to everyone—

Consequently, the only satisfactory kind of study would be to take case histories of individuals and indicate what their progress has been in the Federal service over a given period of time.

We believe, however, that such case histories do not necessarily have any bearing on the consideration of a bill such as S. 1415. If, for example, one person has come into the Federal service at a salary of \$2,600 and has advanced to a salary of \$5,600 while a second was hired initially at a salary of \$5,600, certainly it would not be argued that the first person, because he had received salary increases within the Federal service, should not be given the benefit of any over-all salary increases, while the second person who had been hired at \$5,600 and had stayed at \$5,600 should be given the benefit of such a salary increase.

We have, however, made an analysis of the within-grade salary advancement situation as of June 30, 1945. The results of this analysis are as follows:

An analysis of the salaries and grades of the Federal civilian employees in positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (i. e., approximately 1,220,000 employees as of June 30, 1945) shows that, as of June 30, 1945, 71 percent were at the minimum pay rates of their grade, and 29 percent above base pay for a given grade; 8 percent were at the middle or higher in the grade; only 1.6 percent of all employees had reached the maximum. There has, of course, been a shift in these percentages as a result of the passage of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945. The reductions in force which are now taking place in the departments and agencies make it impossible, however, to determine the nature of these shifts.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me finish this observation.

This letter and the records conclusively show that the overwhelming proportion of Government employees are below the middle of their grade, and the great majority at the minimum of their grade.

It would be hard to understand how there had been any undue within-grade promotions in view of those figures.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. That is easy to explain. These promotions are automatic. The employees have not served the required length of time. Prior to the last pay act promotions were given every 18 months. They are now received every 12 months. If an employee has just entered the service, he will be at the bottom of the grade until he has served for a sufficient length of time.

What the Senator has read confirms what the Senator from Virginia has stated, namely, that pay increases to employees by reason of upgrading, unless new positions are created, are not included in the 21 percent. If new positions are created, they are included. I know of some employees who have received increases of \$3,000 by upgrading. If such an employee is placed in an existing position it may not be considered by the chairman of the committee as an increase in the total amount of salaries paid, but the particular employee benefits to that extent. That is exactly the statement which I made at the beginning, and which was challenged by the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not know what is in the mind of the Senator from Virginia. I believe that the facts are crystal clear. The facts show that over the past 4 or 5 years there has been an average increase in straight-time earnings only of about 21.3 percent in the Government service. The distinguished Senator may reiterate to the contrary as long as he wishes, but he cannot convince me that the 5.3 percent does not include every possible kind of increase in the average earnings. If promotions tended to bring into the service a higher percentage in the upper categories, that would be reflected. If a promotion of one man were balanced by another man going out, or another man coming into the lower bracket, of course it would not show up.

Speaking as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, with some knowledge of the subject, I am satisfied, from the most careful examination of data, that what we roughly term "upgrading" in employment has been only 2 percent in governmental forces as compared with 19 percent in private industry. I am not criticizing private industry; but so far as I am concerned, I believe that governmental agencies, the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committees, and the Civil Service Commission, have done an outstanding job in this respect.

I wish to advert to a statement which was made yesterday. If, as the distinguished Senator from Virginia has repeatedly said, we have an extreme, swollen bureaucracy, the primary responsibility rests on the Congress of the United States. For months every year subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees in both the House and Senate review, analyze, and determine figures. No new employees can be added

in either the upper categories or the lower categories unless the figures are carefully reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget and carefully considered by the Appropriations Committees. I know that on the floor of the Senate we must largely take the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. So far as I am personally concerned, I congratulate the members of the Appropriations Committees. I congratulate the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget. I believe that they have done an excellent job. But to get back to the issue here involved, if we have been so inefficient that we have allowed money for a swollen bureaucracy, and there are 200,000, 300,000, or 500,000 more employees in the Government than there should be, the responsibility rests upon Congress, the Appropriations Committees, the Bureau of the Budget, the President of the United States, and the heads of the departments.

To suggest that because we have been inefficient and neglectful some unfortunate clerk making \$175 a month should not be allowed an advancement to bring him up to the index of the cost of living seems to me to be a harsh and oppressive suggestion.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have found the testimony of Mr. Flemming with respect to whether the upgrade promotions are included in the 21 percent. His testimony on that point appears on page 14 of the hearings, as follows:

Senator BYRD. Certain individuals, of course, have got a larger percent of increase.

I meant the upgrade promotions.

Mr. Flemming then said:

Yes; but you must take a look at the overall salary structure.

We have got to look at what is paid for a particular job. People have gone into and gone out of the jobs because of the high rate of turn-over.

So, although you can take individual cases and although you can show that an individual might have received advancements by being promoted, and might be earning more money now than he had received at the beginning, nevertheless, that does not affect the over-all average annual salary earning because the Government is paying the same salaries for the various jobs he has occupied.

In other words, this 21 percent I am using here for the Government and the better than 30-percent figure that Judge Collet uses for industry are absolutely comparable figures, and it does show what has happened to the salary structure of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Flemming, let me clarify this in my mind, if I can.

We have increased the average basic compensation slightly less than 16 percent.

Mr. FLEMMING. If you are talking about the base rate of pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. But you have increased the average compensation about 21 percent?

Mr. FLEMMING. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And that differential of approximately 5 percent, does it not cover the situations or conditions that Senator

BYRD is speaking about? That is, your within-grade promotions?

Mr. FLEMMING. That is right.

That was the testimony as to upgrade promotions. There is the evidence of Mr. Flemming that the upgrade promotions are not included in the figures for average increases in salaries, although the Senator was rather severe in his contradiction of me when I made that statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from Virginia has confidence in at least two governmental agencies; perhaps more; I have no indication to the contrary. One is the Office of the Comptroller General and the other is the Bureau of the Budget. I shall undertake, before some time next week, to secure from each one of them a letter, and I venture the assertion that the letters will indicate the accuracy of what I have said on the floor of the Senate, namely, that any promotions which resulted in additional pay to an employee—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that is not what the Senator said.

I made the statement that the upgrade promotions of an individual were not reflected in the average increased earnings, because of the fact—and naturally so—that when an employee is promoted to a job which already exists and which has been vacated by someone else, that is not an increase in the pay structure. The Senator challenged that statement and said it was not correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Oh, no, Mr. President; I totally agree with that. When one employee takes the place of another who has vacated a higher job, of course the average pay schedule is not affected—assuming, of course, that the man in the lower category has a successor who thereafter receives the same amount of pay which he was receiving. Again I state that the 5½-percent increase beyond any doubt includes every kind of upgrading, within-grade salary advancements, premium promotions, or whatever you please.

Mr. President, in addition to the issue which the distinguished Senator from Virginia and I have been so good-naturedly discussing on the floor of the Senate, we have had differences of opinions on some other issues. Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Virginia wrote me a letter stating his position on those issues, and in some cases gave out public interviews to the press thereon, I should like now very briefly to advert to some of the other issues which have been matters of controversy between the distinguished Senator from Virginia and myself ever since I have been on the Civil Service Committee, and—I simply express this opinion—with almost every other member of the Civil Service Committee. The distinguished Senator from Virginia objected to reporting the bill at the time that action was taken, and he urged that he desired to have a further investigation made. Among other subjects, he was quite anxious to have investigated what we term regional discriminations in the payment of Federal employees. The chairman of the com-

mittee took the position that it was not proper or advisable for our committee to undertake, as a part of its consideration of this bill, the laborious and exhaustive task of investigating the possibility of regional wage discriminations throughout the United States; and I should like to have the Senators who now are in the Chamber know why the chairman of the committee took that position.

In the first place, on every pay bill which has been before the Civil Service Committee since I have been a member of it—perhaps for 4 years—this same issue has been very ably and persistently raised by the Senator from Virginia, and just as regularly almost every other member of the Civil Service Committee has expressed himself not only as disinterested in such an investigation but as opposed to regional wage discrimination. When I first came to the Senate of the United States, I was soon thereafter appointed a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. That issue came before that committee for discussion; and every Senator on the committee, including the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEELAR], expressed unequivocal opposition to regional wage discrimination, believing it to be totally unjust, impracticable, and impossible.

As a result of that discussion, I made an investigation. I found that many times in the House and Senate there had been weeks or months of investigation of a most complicated nature to determine the cost-of-living standard in Washington, Baltimore, New York, Alexandria, Richmond, or Winchester—wherever it might be—and that after the most careful study, almost everyone reached the conclusion that regional wage discrimination because of lower cost of living was not possible. So during the recent committee hearing when this question was raised, I interviewed almost every member of the committee on the subject and I found that almost every one of them, from wide experience with this issue, had made up his mind that regional wage discrimination was impolitic, impossible, and unjust. Mr. President, I continued my investigation, and I found that frequently in Congress during the past 30 years there have been long and laborious investigations on this subject, and always with the same finding of impracticability.

At one time district judges of the United States were paid varying salaries, based on where they were conducting their courts. After a hearing, the rule was changed in 1891. At some time in the 1920's another hearing was held and a complete report was made showing the impracticability of paying judges varying salaries at different places in the United States.

The most dramatic case rose under President Coolidge in 1924. Congress had increased the pay of the postal workers. The committee had at length considered the desirability of establishing regional wage awards according to the cost of living in the various areas of the United States. The committee almost unanimously had reported against

a provision for regional discriminations, and the bill was passed without containing it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator explain what he means by "regional discriminations"? Those words contemplate the payment of salaries somewhat in accordance with the variation in living costs throughout the country.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator has more aptly stated the situation than I could, and if he desires to state his position in any further detail I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. BYRD. I have no desire to state it except to say that the word "discrimination" used in this particular case may not be understood. Inasmuch as the bill is based on the cost of living, some consideration should be given to the varying costs of living which, as everyone will admit, prevail throughout the country. I never suggested any investigation which would delay consideration of the bill. All I asked for was an opportunity to bring witnesses before the committee. The chairman of the committee denied me that right. I shall discuss the situation later.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, President Coolidge vetoed the postal bill on several grounds. Apparently, the major reason was that the bill did not provide for a variation in the wages to be paid to postal workers according to the living standards in the various areas in which the employees were performing their work.

Thereupon an argument took place on the floor of the Senate preliminary to voting upon overriding the President's veto. The Senate failed to override the veto by, as I recall, one vote. The vote was in the proportion of almost two to one against President Coolidge on the question, but inasmuch as the two-thirds rule prevailed the veto message was sustained. However, a substantial majority of both Republicans and Democrats voted against the President on that particular issue.

I wish to read first from the remarks which were made at the time by one of the distinguished Republican Senators who spoke upon the subject. Senator Moses, speaking in the Sixty-sixth Congress, page 1127 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, stated:

I am well aware, Mr. President, of the weight of the argument which may be advanced that there are living conditions in the great cities of the Union which are intolerable and which warrant a higher increase of pay to postal employees and Government employees generally in those centers above an increase which might be granted to postal employees or Government employees of any other character in a smaller community, but the committee in dealing with the whole question was confronted with certain alternatives, the first of which was proposed by the Post Office Department, namely, that we should set an arbitrary line, based upon the receipts of a given post office, above which line there should be large increases and below which line there should be small increases of salary. Necessarily, Mr. President, such a proposal carried with it a mere rule of thumb for dealing with the controverted question.

Necessarily also, sir, on either side of the line thus set arbitrarily there would be great injustices and consequent confusion and demoralization in the Postal Service.

We were confronted with another alternative, that we should set up a bureau in the Post Office Department which should constantly devote its time to figuring upon the index number of the cost of living in the various sections of the United States, with consequent and frequent readjustment of postal salaries based upon those computations. No one could forecast the number of clerks that would be so required; nobody could estimate the cost of maintaining such a bureau, but everybody could foresee that whenever such an adjustment of salaries took place there would be very great repining among those postal employees whose salaries were reduced and probably some feeling on the part of those whose salaries might be raised if their salaries should not be sufficiently raised.

Then we came, Mr. President, to the alternative which the committee adopted, namely, of treating the Postal Service as a unit. We discovered that every other service in the executive departments which touches wide sections of the country and comes in contact with large bodies of our fellow citizens is treated as a unit. A customs inspector, for example, at Vanceboro, Maine, which is a mere railway junction point on the Canadian frontier, receives exactly the same salary as a customs inspector of the same grade working in New York City. An immigration officer stationed at the same point in Maine receives the same pay in his grade that the immigration officer receives in New York City, and the various officials of the Public Health Service scattered throughout the country receive identical pay in identical grades for identical classifications of work. We saw no reason why we should differentiate as between the Post Office Department and other executive departments of the Government, and we decided to treat the Postal Service as a unit and to make uniform increases in salary, though we well knew that in some instances salaries would be provided in excess of those paid for comparable employment by private employers, and in some instances salaries would be much larger in their purchasing power than the same salaries would be in the more populous centers of the country, but our whole feeling was that the increase in salaries granted by this bill proceeded upon an accurate differential among the various grades in the Postal Service, beginning with the laborers and going up to the higher executives, and that as a whole the increase in salaries was justifiable.

I have before me quotations from the remarks of several other Senators on the same subject. As I have already said, a large majority of both Republicans and Democrats voted to override the veto of President Coolidge.

I have before me a quotation from the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who spoke on the floor of the Senate at that time. He said:

It is true that the President does talk about some other things in his veto message. It is quite true that he says something about differentials; but that is a part of his argument against the demand of the postal employees. He says that if the postal employees are anywhere underpaid we should find those centers in which the living costs are so high as to necessitate an increase in salaries. In other words, he argues for the principle of differentiation in salaries. The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads did not see fit to take that view of the matter. We very cheerfully recognize that there is a certain sense

in which that suggestion, which was made to us, makes a strong appeal to prevailing and accepted business methods, but for other reasons we reject it; and so far as I am concerned I always will oppose the fixing of postal salaries upon that principle and for reasons that to my mind at least are sufficient.

It may be interesting to know how the Senators who are still Members of the Senate voted on the question of overriding the President's veto. The Senator from Georgia Mr. George, the Senator from Rhode Island Mr. Gerry, the Senator from Virginia Mr. Glass, former Senators Harrison and McNary, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. McKellar, former Senators Robinson, Shepard, Walsh of Montana, Underwood, and many other Senators voted against President Coolidge in his contention. The only Senator who is now a Member of the Senate of the United States and voted to uphold the provision for regional wage variations was the distinguished Senator from Kansas Mr. Capper.

Mr. President, when I found that distinguished elder statesmen of my committee and of the Senate were thoroughly familiar with the issue, had grown up with it, and had formed fixed and conclusive opinions with reference to the impracticability of making variations in pay-roll compensation because of existing differences throughout the country in the cost of living, I was unwilling to consume months or weeks of the time of our committee in holding such an investigation as the one to which reference has been made.

Let us see how impracticable such a proposal is. Suppose a postal clerk in Buffalo carries identically the same amount of mail and works the same number of hours required of a worker in Omaha or Des Moines, Iowa. Does anyone think the distinguished statesmen from Nebraska or Iowa would consent that their postal workers be paid less for doing identically the same work as that being done elsewhere in the United States?

Would anyone want to pay a collector of internal revenue at Portland, Maine, if there is one there, a lesser sum for performing his duties if the amount of his collections and business were the same, than is paid in some other city in the United States?

In any event, Mr. President, let me say that, having found an overwhelming majority of my committee, after long years of consideration, with closed minds on this issue, having discussed it with many Senators and not finding one Senator favoring such a proposition except the Senator from Virginia, I concluded that in the press and pressure of Federal business my committee would be totally defenseless if we should spend weary weeks or weary months determining the relative cost of living at Alexandria and Washington, D. C., Baltimore, Chicago, Winchester, and Richmond, and then try to apportion salaries in conformity with the figures obtained. I reached the same conclusion arrived at by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the

then Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Moses, and other distinguished leaders of the Senate, that such a plan would never be accepted by Congress, and would be totally impracticable, and with a large majority of the committee with closed minds, I was unwilling to hold hearings on the subject.

Mr. President, I should like to take up another point at issue between the distinguished Senator from Virginia and myself—we have many—but he seems to have left the Chamber, and I do not desire to discuss the points in his absence.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, would the Senator care to yield while I make the point of no quorum?

Mr. DOWNEY. I should be glad to have that done, but first let me make the statement that the majority leader suggested to me that for some reason which he did not reveal to me he desired an adjournment or recess at 2:30 o'clock today.

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps we might move it up by half an hour on the majority leader, in his absence.

Mr. DOWNEY. While I value greatly the very high quality of the Senators who are listening, that very high quality is very much diluted by the lack of quantity, and I should very much prefer to try to find a larger attendance of the Senate upon which to exercise the privilege of setting forth the facts which I have. So it is satisfactory to me, if the distinguished Senator thinks it would be proper, to adjourn or recess.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it would be very unbecoming of me to assume the right to suggest to the majority leader or other Senators on the other side what the procedure should be. I can appreciate that the Senator from California would like to have present the Senator from Virginia and many other Senators who are interested in the measure which is before the Senate. I think the alternative, however, between taking a recess and the Senator proceeding with his discussion in their absence, is to make the point of no quorum, and I feel constrained to leave the choice to the majority side.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall be happy to make the choice if the distinguished minority leader will tell me what choice I should make. That is throwing the ball right back at him.

Mr. WHITE. If I indicated what choice the Senator should make, it would not be his choice.

Mr. DOWNEY. In that the distinguished minority leader is very much mistaken. I have been watching him for many years, and I have seen his wisdom and his universally good judgment, until almost always his judgment and his choice are my judgment and my choice, and I assure him that would apply to this case.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from California is most gracious, and in what he has said of me he simply impeaches his own judgment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before I myself then suggest a recess, unless one of our leaders comes on the floor, I might tell what is perhaps at this stage of the

proceedings an appropriate story, and if there is one word used in the story which seems perhaps out of place on the Senate floor, I wish to say, first, that the Senate rules allow it, and second, I am only quoting a very distinguished man when I use this word.

Mr. Herndon, in his Life of Abraham Lincoln, says that at one time when Lincoln was campaigning for Congress he was at a small town, and went to the meeting hall. There were only two persons in the hall, one being Mr. Herndon, Lincoln's partner, the other a stranger. Mr. Lincoln looked, with his melancholy eyes, out over the dismal and vacant hall, then went down and shook hands with Mr. Herndon. He said, "Herndon, I know why you are here." Then, turning to the other gentleman he said, "But why in h—are you here?" I know why the Senators present are here, namely, they are here to be attentive listeners, and I appreciate their presence.

Mr. President, I see our distinguished acting majority leader now in the Senate Chamber, so I shall not have to tell any more stories.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understand the Senator does not desire to proceed further at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like very much to proceed, but I am making statements in reference to some of the Senators, and controversies I have with them, and I am very reluctant to proceed in their absence. I understand they are called to committee meetings.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the Senator from Virginia who is very much interested in the bill, and two other members of the Committee on Civil Service, the committee which reported the bill, the other two Senators being also very much interested in the bill, have to be at a very important meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. I have been so informed. Before our leader suggests a recess or an adjournment, I might advance proceedings in this way. I should like to call up and have read the amendment I have on the desk providing for the increase of congressional pay to \$15,000. I might say that, coupled with that proposal, are two other proposals, but I desire only to submit to the Senate at this time—not to have voted on now, but merely to have read—the proposal so far as it concerns the increase of congressional salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the bill a new section, as follows:

Sec. 6. (a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$15,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President shall be at the rate of \$20,000 per annum each.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to present at this time subdivision (a) of section 6, which has just been read.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator asking that we dispose of one of these amendments?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am merely calling the amendment up for reading. I shall seek a vote on it as soon as possible when the Senate is again in session and I can have the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, is the amendment the Senator is proposing the one which covers section 6 (a), (b), and (c)?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am merely proposing subdivision (a) of section 6. I shall later, perhaps, call up the other proposals.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it the Senator's intention to call it up for a vote first of all the amendments he intends to offer?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We will vote on subsection (a) of section 6 first, but the Senator does not propose that we vote on it today?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. The distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] told me he would like to address the Senate for a few moments on the bill, so I shall continue until he arrives on the floor, which will be in a very few minutes.

Mr. President, I should like at this time to call to the attention of Senators a Gallup poll on the subject of pay raises. I know there are certain Senators, because they have told me, who are somewhat worried and distressed about voting in the Senate at this time on a controversial wage issue because of its effects or repercussions upon the wage controversy in the Nation generally. I cannot agree with the justice or logic of that view. I think that as Senators of the United States our duty is very clear—to decide what kind of a raise we think Federal employees ought to have, and to give it to them, even though it would not please certain labor leaders or certain industrial leaders. But I suppose to a certain extent every Member of Congress is justified in being affected by public opinion; indeed, it may be we should be here to reflect the will of the majority of our people. So in that connection I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the result of three or four Gallup polls which have been taken in the last few months, showing the opinion of the American people on the desirability of wage increases.

First, I want to say that Gallup polled the American people on the question whether it was their belief that workers should be given a 30-percent increase in their wages to balance the loss of overtime, and, as I recall, the result was 55 percent against and 45 percent in favor, with the overwhelming majority of businessmen, industrialists, and farmers opposed to the raise, and a very large proportion of the factory workers and union-labor workers favoring it.

Since that time Gallup has twice polled the American people on the desirability of raising wages by 15 percent, and on this subject there is an overwhelming popular approval, not only when counting all classes combined but when segregating the classes. Every class is overwhelmingly in favor of giving

American workers a 15-percent pay increase to balance the amount of money lost by the lack of continued overtime.

On the poll with respect to the question of a 15-percent wage increase the national vote was 64 percent in favor and 27 percent opposed. Professional and businessmen: 60 percent for and 33 percent against. White-collar workers: 66 percent for and 27 percent against. Farmers: 49 percent for and 33 percent against.

All manual workers, 71 percent for, and 19 percent against. Union members only, 83 percent for, 14 percent against.

Since the date of that poll Gallup has again polled the American people on a 15-percent and a 30-percent increase. The last vote on the question of the 15-percent increase was as follows: Favoring the 15-percent increase, 69 percent, opposed, 22 percent.

I desire to point out to my colleagues that a large majority of every group in the United States, based on their common experience and judgment and common sense, favored a 15-percent increase.

I further wish to point out to my colleagues that admittedly the factory and industrial groups have at the very least a 10-percent favorable margin over the Federal workers, and any group knowing the exact facts who favored 15 percent for industrial workers generally, by the same logic would have to favor a 25-percent increase for Federal workers.

In this connection I wish to say that several corporations have already given wage increases ranging from 15 percent to as high as 30 percent, and it is generally understood that practically every industry is willing to make at least some adjustment to the worker because of his loss of overtime pay.

Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] desires to have me yield, I am glad to do so.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, first of all I wish to explain to the Senate that I have watched the progress of this bill very closely. It was not always possible for me to attend the hearings, but I attended a number of them, and I was also present whenever any vital committee discussions were held respecting this proposed legislation.

The present chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee has held that responsibility since Senator Bulow left the Senate. He has diligently pursued his task. He has treated the members of the committee with the utmost courtesy. He has held frequent hearings and has given the employees, their representatives, and others interested in the legislation many opportunities to present their views.

I desire to open my remarks on this bill, which I favor, by commending the chairman of our committee for his fairness, for his grasp of the subject of the subject, and for his uniform courtesy to everyone interested in the affairs of the civil service. At this particular juncture of our economic progress I think we are fortunate in having as the leader in this legislation the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. His knowledge of the economic situation, his grasp of the economics involved in this bill, his

desire to make a contribution beyond the scope of the employees affected, is, in my judgment, very commendable.

Mr. President, the Senator states the case in support of this bill very effectively and very succinctly in a communication which I received from him a short time ago. He explains in that communication that Federal employees are now averaging in real purchasing power from 10 to 20 percent less than they received in the year 1941. He explains that this is true because their basic increase has averaged less than 16 percent, while the cost of living has increased from 30 to 36 percent. He explains additionally that since VJ-day almost all overtime in the departments and agencies of the Government has been eliminated, thereby reducing Federal wage costs approximately 25 percent. While this has resulted in a great saving to the Government, he goes on to explain it has left many Federal employees in desperate financial straits.

Mr. President, I know that to be true. I know that there are many Federal employees, particularly those in the lower brackets, who are seeking additional opportunities to augment their meager wages, who are engaging in work outside of that which they perform for the Government in order to make sufficient money to enable them to carry on.

The chairman then goes on to say that beyond the 25-percent saving accruing to the Government from the elimination of overtime, hundreds of thousands of employees have been discharged and are continuing to be discharged, thus further reducing the Federal expenditures.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] if it is the intention to have consideration of the pending bill go over from about 2:30 today until the first of next week? The reason I ask is that there is a very important meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee which begins at 2:30. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and I are on that committee, and it happens that we are three of the members of the Civil Service Committee who are vitally interested in the pending legislation. I will say in all sincerity that it is my opinion that the meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee, which begins at 2:30, is one which it is necessary for us to attend.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that I knew that neither he nor the Senator from Virginia could be present after 2:30 this afternoon, and since we have certain differences of opinion I was reluctant to proceed in the absence of the Senators. But the Senator from New York now has the floor and he would like to proceed at this time. May I ask

the Senator from Iowa if he would have any objection to the Senator from New York continuing his argument, and we will at least dispose of that much of our presentation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, neither would I have any right to object to the Senator from New York proceeding, nor would I have any disposition to try to circumscribe his presentation of the case. But I should like to ask whether it is the intention of the Senator from California to attempt to bring anything to final action today, that is by way of amendment or otherwise?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President. The Senator may be assured that I shall not call any matter to a vote, and I shall not make any further remarks unless called upon for information by some Senator. There will be no action taken this afternoon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, unfortunately I shall have to return to Indiana the early part of next week for a check up because of my recent automobile accident, and it is possible I may not be present to vote on the bill providing for an increase in Government employees' salaries. I wish to take this opportunity to say that I am in hearty accord with the bill, and if I could be present I would vote for it. I hope to obtain a pair with a Senator who is against the bill. I think it is a timely measure, I think Government employees are underpaid, and in my opinion this is a fine step in the right direction.

Mr. MEAD. As everyone understands, the bill provides an increase of 20 percent in the pay of the employees affected, except those in the legislative and judicial departments of the Government, where the increase averages 10 percent. The chairman of the committee explained very logically the reason for the difference between the 20-percent and the 10-percent increases.

Mr. President, I wish to generalize a little so far as my argument for the bill is concerned. The distinguished chairman of the committee has given us all the facts and details which in my judgment are necessary for us in arriving at a decision.

The situation in the city of Washington, particularly as it affects the employees in the lower brackets, is not only serious, but in some cases tragic. If anyone were to attempt to budget the meager salaries received by employees of the Federal Government, particularly those in the lower brackets, so as to meet the ordinary run of expenses which one has to meet in Washington, there is only one conclusion that any thought on that subject could bring to mind, and that is that the increase recommended by the Civil Service Committee of the Senate is modest and moderate, and not at all, in my judgment, subject to criticism. Employees of the Government in the lower brackets have a most difficult time providing shelter, food, and proper clothing, and meeting the ordinary necessary expenses of life. In my judgment

it is a bad example for the Government of the United States, the richest Government in all the world, a Government which can now with good grace extend liberal loans' running into billions of dollars, in order to rehabilitate other nations, and in many instances meet their pay rolls, to treat its own employees as they are being treated under present circumstances.

Mr. President, while some wages may under certain circumstances be too high, I never heard anyone justify such a complaint applying to wages in the Government service. While the theory of high wages can be advanced at this critical juncture of our country's history with good grace and economic soundness, this bill does not even approach the wage scale which might be called high wages. No large corporation in the United States has a wage scale which, in comparison with the wage scale set forth in this bill, can be used as an argument against the bill. The salaries being paid by the large corporations of the United States, while in many instances not large enough, are in nearly all cases in excess of the scale prescribed in the very modest proposal before the Senate.

I believe this is a time when we can with economic justification recommend this proposal, and recommend generally higher wages throughout the United States. Many thousands of employees in the lower brackets are leaving the Government service for better opportunities. They are employees who are trained and skilled in their work. If we can prevent costly turn-overs, which contribute very largely to the inefficiency of Government, we can save more money than the sum set forth in the statement given to the Senate by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Not only are employees in the lower brackets in desperate need; not only are employees in the lower brackets leaving their positions, but employees in the higher brackets as well are leaving. They, too, find it difficult to make both ends meet. Many leaders in the executive departments of the Government have informed my colleagues and me that the difficulty which besets them, the reason why they are unable to meet the standard of efficiency required of them, is that they cannot keep the necessary personnel. Every day when we pick up the newspapers we find that men are leaving the Government service and going into private enterprise, receiving \$25,000, \$50,000, \$75,000, and even \$100,000 a year. Men who have established themselves in the Government because of their ability as executives have made as much of a sacrifice as they can make. In need of financial help, they have left the Government and gone to work for private enterprise.

It is a serious state of affairs when the Government of the United States finds itself in that situation at a time when an efficient government is a vital necessity. Our Government must meet the most complex problems in all its history; and upon the solution of those problems will depend the prosperity of the organizations and institutions which are taking

men and women away from the Government. We are losing men who are skilled, trained, and experienced, because of the fact that they cannot live under existing conditions as laid down for them under the Federal wage schedule.

So, Mr. President, this bill which has been considered by the Senate Committee on Civil Service comes before the Senate at an appropriate time. I regret exceedingly that we must delay action on this Friday afternoon, with the Christmas vacation looming in the near future. I regret that we shall have to put it off until Monday. When Monday comes there will still be meetings of committees which take Members of the Senate from us today. It seems to me that we ought to proceed with the consideration of the bill. We ought to discuss it on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. It is of vital importance. If we are to take a recess until Monday, I hope that will be the last delay until a decision is reached by the Senate and the bill is passed.

Mr. President, wage legislation is a very wholesome and constructive subject for the Senate to discuss. There is more in this subject than appears upon the surface. The determination which we now make, both so far as the Government is concerned and so far as private enterprise is concerned, will either hurry the day when we shall enjoy widespread prosperity which will be prolonged and enduring, or will hasten the time when the history following the last war will be repeated. We shall either augment the buying power of the Nation, which has seriously suffered as a result of curtailments following war production, or we shall drift into a very serious economic struggle which may precipitate another depression.

So, Mr. President, with a full realization of the seriousness of this problem, its effect upon the employees of the Government, its effect upon the efficiency of the Government, and its effect upon the economy of the country, I hope that we may begin on Monday to take up the bill section by section, until such time as we arrive at a determination, and I trust that the determination reached will be one favorable to the bill.

I wish to commend the able chairman of the Civil Service Committee for bringing the bill before the Senate, and for the fine explanation he has made of it. I hope he will continue his militant advocacy of the bill until it is passed, and that it will be passed at an early date.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolu-

tion, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; and

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I had intended to say more about the pending bill, but I shall reserve any further statement for a later opportunity. I wish to speak briefly about the housing situation, unless some other Senator wishes to discuss the pending bill.

Housing is linked with the issue of Government salaries, because unless adequate housing is provided in the District of Columbia additional financial burdens will be imposed upon the employees affected by the pending measure.

The housing situation is very serious. It is growing more serious from day to day. The tragedy of it all is that those of us who have been here during the past 4 or 5 years have had opportunities to secure pleasant, clean, sanitary housing accommodations. But apparently there are no more houses to be had. The existing housing accommodations are filled, and they have been filled for the past year or two.

Mr. President, who is it that is now coming home to look for a place to live? It is the boy who answered the call to arms, the boy who left his home, vacated the premises, and went away to do battle for his country. He is the man who now is here looking for the realization of the dream of his fox-hole days—a job and a home. There is a possibility of his getting a job; but, Mr. President, I do not know how long it will take him to find a home. From experiences which come to mind, it seems to me he will find it a most difficult problem and one which will require a prolonged period of time.

I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday. The heading of the article really tells the story. It is this: "Housing toughest problem veteran faces; expert describes situation as 'explosive.'"

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE HOUSING FOR SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES—JOINT RESOLUTION REPORTED

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at this time I am delighted to report Senate Joint Resolution 122, to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of

providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and I submit a report (No. 839) thereon.

The joint resolution authorizes an additional appropriation of \$160,000,000 for the purpose of moving houses now in the United States from places where they are not needed to places where they are now needed for the use of ex-servicemen. I think the Senate realizes that 3,000,000 of our men have been discharged from the service since VJ-day. The Army and the Navy expect to discharge 10,000,000 more by the end of 1946. A great many of those who were in the service either were married just before they entered the service or were married while they were in the service or will be married immediately after they leave the service. That situation causes in the United States a tremendous housing problem the like of which we have never faced before, due to the fact that during the war we were able to build only a few houses for the civilian population. So this measure is reported favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for permitting me to interrupt his remarks at this time.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it was a pleasure to yield to my distinguished and able colleague, and I congratulate him and the Committee on Education and Labor for the expeditious manner in which they have considered and reported the joint resolution. I introduced it some time ago; and, as has been so well explained, it will permit the Federal Housing Authority to move family housing units from places where they were vitally necessary during the war to places where they are vitally necessary now in the postwar period. Passage of the joint resolution will help a great deal in relieving the housing shortage.

I also trust that the Congress will be very quick to pass the permanent housing measure which has been introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] in conjunction with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. That bill, known as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which now is receiving consideration, will supplement the temporary housing program, in that it will provide a permanent housing program which the country needs very badly. However, Mr. President, the joint resolution will provide an interim program, and it will permit the moving of family housing units from places where they were originally constructed to places where the present need is obvious.

Mr. President, at the time I yielded to the Senator from South Carolina I was reading from an article appearing in the Washington Post of yesterday. The article is by Sam Stavisky, the Post's vet-

erans editor. The article reads in part as follows:

HOUSING TOUGHEST PROBLEM VETERAN FACES; EXPERT DESCRIBES SITUATION AS "EXPLOSIVE"—125,000 MEN DUE BACK SOON, MANY SEEKING QUARTERS

(By Sam Stavisky)

When it comes to housing the veteran coming "home" to Washington is strictly in the dog house.

With demobilization speeding up daily, with 125,000 GI's due back to the District, the situation is fast becoming critical.

Mr. President, "critical" is not a strong enough word.

I now read further from the article:

One housing expert makes no bones about the worsening situation. He frankly describes it as "explosive."

Unquestionably, shelter is the toughest problem facing the returning veteran here. Not even the matter of making a livelihood is as imminent to the GI who's coming back to be reunited with his family.

NO TIME TO LOOK FOR JOB

Pfc Frank Beuchert, Jr., was discharged at Fort Meade last Sunday. He was overseas 2 years, and now desperately wants to be back with his wife and two children "so we can be a real family again."

But as it stands, Frank and one of the children must live with an aunt at 764 Rock Creek Church Road NW., while his wife, Mary Jane, and the other child must live with his family at 712 Somerset Place NW. He doesn't even have the time to look for a job.

"We'll just have to eat our savings," Frank says. "I just couldn't concentrate on a job until we find a place to live together."

Scores of District of Columbia families are separated over wider areas.

"I've returned here to my job, and I'm staying in one room while my wife and son are living with relations 265 miles away," writes A. E. Fulford, 638 Park Road NW.

"Being separated for three long years was hard enough, but when you can't live with your family as a civilian, certainly something ought to be done about it."

Mr. President, that is a tragic situation.

The article continues, as follows:

WHAT'S BEING DONE

Just what is being done about it here?

The War Housing Center is currently placing 500 to 600 veterans and their families in apartments or houses monthly, or about one quarter of the 2,000 veteran applications made last month.

Altogether, there's a backlog of 3,000 applications from veterans in search of homes.

Mr. President, if we were to summon the Congress to remain in session day and night without any recess whatsoever, we should hardly be beginning to make the sacrifice which these boys have made over and over again—these boys who are looking for homes, but who will not find homes until the program to provide temporary homes and the program to provide permanent homes are fully and completely enacted. So I hope that before the Christmas recess is taken, the Senate, at least, will enact both the measures for the temporary housing program and the permanent housing program.

Mr. President, the housing situation for veterans is no longer merely a problem. It has reached the stage of an acute national emergency. Emergency action on the part of the Federal Government is required.

The veterans' housing need is the product of no one's imagination. Make no mistake about it, the Nation's housing shortage exists not only in our major cities, but hundreds of smaller communities are in dire need.

The situation is so desperate that the emergency can no longer be passed off as a community responsibility. Thousands of men from battle fronts half way around the world are tramping the streets in search of any place in which to rejoin their families and resume a normal life.

We all know that our servicemen have wanted two things above all else upon their return, namely, a job and home. But a job without a place to live is not much to come back to.

Foreseeing the danger of present conditions, Congress last June amended the Lanham Act by adding title V to make provision for some degree of relief for these veterans until such time as the resumption of residential building can provide the real answer to the Nation's housing shortage by adding thousands of new dwellings to the permanent housing supply.

Generally, States and municipalities have thus far failed to take steps to meet the situation.

Title V of the Lanham Act, among other things, provided for:

First. Veterans and their families to be given preference in any vacant federally owned war housing.

Second. The removal of temporary war housing which becomes vacant as the result of out-migration from war centers to congested areas for the use of veterans.

Third. Construction of new temporary housing for veterans and their families where the need clearly existed.

The National Housing Agency has carried out this policy to the limit of its powers. It has established regulations giving veterans and their families occupancy preference in all federally owned war housing, and has frozen the disposal of any movable war housing units except to house veterans and families of men still in service.

It has made available temporary housing, including trailers, to communities, colleges, and universities for the use of student veterans returning to school under the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights. It has urged both community and State officials to give wide publicity to the plight of the veteran to the end that any part of the private housing supply becoming available through turnover be reserved for veterans.

Communities have been urged to, and have been aided in, establishing or expanding local referral housing services for veterans. Mayors have been asked to appoint emergency committees on housing.

Under title V of the Lanham Act, Congress made available any funds available under title I thereof. Title I authorized the appropriation of \$1,500,000,000 to carry out the purposes of that title; \$1,464,313,000 has been appropriated to carry out the purposes of title I. All of the funds appropriated for those purposes have been expended except for

\$74,355,000 of the appropriation, which was rescinded. At the present time there are no funds available for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I or title V of the act, and the only remaining authorization is an authorization for the appropriation of \$35,627,000 to carry out the provisions of those titles. Accordingly, I submitted a joint resolution to increase the existing authorization from \$35,627,000 to \$195,627,000, in order that the National Housing Agency may carry out the provisions of title V of the Lanham Act in the present emergency.

Mr. President, the authorization has been approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, and the report of that committee has been made to the Senate by the able junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON]. If the measure is adopted by the Congress it will then be possible for us to include in the pending deficiency bill, either in the committee or when it comes before the Senate for consideration, the additional money which will be required.

No new temporary construction is contemplated with this money. It will be devoted to supplying ultimately 100,000 temporary dwelling units to communities and educational institutions for the relief of veterans.

Some 75,000 of these family units, which will be taken apart or panelized and moved from their present sites to the areas of need, will come from the temporary housing erected for war workers.

Mr. President, these buildings were constructed under the direction of the Federal Housing Authority for use as family dwellings. They were fully equipped for the purposes for which they were constructed. For the most part they were clean, sanitary, pleasant, wholesome and attractive, even though they were not so large or so spacious as they should have been. However, they were built for the use of family units. They proved to be very effective during the war. I would not wish to see our veterans or anyone else living permanently in small homes of this type, but I would prefer to see them living in this type of family dwelling than to be called upon to live in barracks buildings where many of them have already lived for a long period of time, or in what might be called temporary shelters. I believe Mr. President, that these buildings will augment our present supply, and will provide better home surroundings than will the barracks type or domiciliary type which might otherwise be supplied.

It is anticipated that the remaining 25,000 family units will be provided through conversion of dormitories and barracks into family housing accommodations. That will be done under the direction of the Federal Housing Administration. It has the experience and the know-how in connection with using material and equipment, such as light, heating, and plumbing now located in the barracks and dormitories which will be razed for the purpose of constructing small family units. Those family units will resemble the temporary units which were used by the war workers.

Heretofore, the cost of removing temporary housing and re-erecting on new sites has had to be borne by communities or colleges. But in most instances communities and colleges either do not have the funds or cannot legally expend money for such a purpose.

I also propose amending the Lanham Act so as to make it possible to utilize temporary and other structures and facilities which are surplus to the needs of Federal agencies.

At the present time it is not possible to utilize fully the existing structures because of the provisions of the law which requires that a payment be made when structures are to be transferred from other Federal agencies to the National Housing Agency to be moved off the site and converted to housing at another place. The purpose of this amendment is to meet this problem by authorizing Federal agencies to transfer surplus properties to the National Housing Administrator for conversion of those properties to meet housing needs of servicemen, and to provide that such arrangements may be made without reimbursement for the cost or value of the structures to be transferred.

Mr. President, a great many camp and cantonment facilities are now under the control of the Army and the Navy. Our Senate committee, in investigating the war effort, has been diligent in attempting to bring about very quick and speedy distribution of those surpluses which may be found in camps and cantonments, and which are no longer necessary to the war effort. We believe that if those camp and cantonment facilities are quickly declared surplus, and if the building material, such as roofing, sash and doors, as well as all necessary lighting, heating, and plumbing equipment, is declared surplus and placed on the market, a very necessary need will be supplied. With other available materials, private enterprise will be enabled once again quickly to go into the business of building homes for our people.

Heretofore the Federal Government has been unable to give financial assistance to communities and institutions in moving temporary housing. Under the authorization now sought, the Government will be able to pay the cost of moving and re-erection of the housing, and the municipalities and institutions will provide the sites and connect the utilities.

While the relief which this legislation will provide can take care of some of the most acute need, it will by no means completely solve the problem. It has been estimated by the National Housing Agency that 1,200,000 American families were living "doubled up" on September 30, 1945. Preliminary estimates show that another 2,000,000 families must double up by December 31, 1946, unless there is a far greater volume of new construction than now seems possible.

These figures include returning veterans. Specifically the NHA has estimated that 1,600,000 married veterans discharged by December 31, 1946, whose

families now live with friends or relatives or in nonhousekeeping quarters, will not have established homes to which to return. It was further estimated that 1,300,000 single veterans will get married by December 31, 1946. That makes a total of 2,900,000 married veterans without established homes.

Mr. President, that is a very serious situation, a very serious problem, one which we cannot postpone very much longer.

Rough estimates indicate that some 800,000 of these veterans will share living space with others voluntarily, or not be in the market for homes, and that possibly a million veteran families can be taken care of in existing vacancies in private and public housing through the release of quarters by war workers and the normal dissolution of families. Those are very liberal figures, I should say. It has been estimated, too, that perhaps as many as 475,000 units of new housing may be completed by December 31, 1946.

With all these favorable figures there will still be 1,110,000 veterans' families to find accommodations in the presently occupied housing supply. They simply cannot do it. The room does not exist. This is not a very encouraging outlook, but is a challenge which we cannot ignore.

So much for the present emergency. I urge quick action for obvious reasons. We owe a debt to the veterans who fought our battles. They were taken from their homes, called upon to live in tents and barracks, and they are entitled to pleasant, healthful homes, and we should see to it that they are provided for them.

There are also hundreds of thousands of other citizens of this country in need of decent homes. There are families living in substandard housing and in slums. Certainly the time has come when we should deal with that problem from a long-range point of view.

Fortunately there is before the Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal, to attack, for the first time, all phases of the problem, and to provide for that unified approach which is necessary for its successful solution. The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is an all-out attack, one which will point to a proper solution of the problem. It is the General Housing Act of 1945, on which hearings are presently being held before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, I wish that bill could be passed today. I wish we could start the construction contemplated tomorrow. I wish it was the housing contemplated in that bill that we were preparing for our veterans by virtue of the joint resolution which has just been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. But it will take time not only for the passage of the bill through the Congress, it will take time to assemble the necessary critical materials, prepare the plans, and make other necessary provisions.

Mr. President, I hope the bill will be enacted speedily, and I know that thereafter it will be administered rapidly.

We are taking a step in the right direction by the enactment of the permanent housing bill. Under the provisions of that bill private enterprise will be given assistance to do as much of the postwar housing job as possible, a job estimated at more than a million homes a year for the next two decades. Private enterprise will be encouraged to build for the great mass or middle market, made up of families of moderate incomes.

Cities would be aided in clearing their blighted areas and assembling land for redevelopment at an economic cost. For the lowest income group, the low-rent, public-housing program is expanded. The bill should be passed before we recess for the holidays.

We need all these provisions in order to move forward on the long-term housing job ahead. Surely for a Nation which made such a record as ours in war the job is not too big. All we need is to tackle it in the same spirit in which we went to war, and we will move forward toward the goal of a decent home for every American family.

Mr. President, there is increasing activity along this line, both in the Congress and in the country at large. In my own State, the State and municipal housing authorities are taking renewed interest in the subject. Recently the State housing authority visited Washington, and, with the assistance of Members of the congressional delegation and the departments, including the Federal Housing Authority, made arrangement for the utilization of barracks buildings and similar shelters as an emergency method of taking care of the returning veterans.

I regret that a program of that kind is essential. I had hoped that barracks facilities, the lumber, the roofing, all the lighting, heating, and plumbing fixtures would in large quantities be placed upon the market so that the Federal Housing Authority or private enterprise could, by adding other materials, begin quickly to build temporary family housing units for the veterans. Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is indicated that an emergency is at hand when State and local housing authorities are seeking for materials of this particular type with which to build houses of the kind I have mentioned.

I would favor the immediate inventory of all the building materials and supplies in Army and Navy depots, the immediate surplusage of all the facilities in camps and cantonments no longer required by the Army, and placing them all on the market, so that in one great drive private enterprise and public authorities could build decent, clean, wholesome, sanitary homes for the returning veterans. We could augment that by the program which is embodied in my resolution, by removing temporary housing projects, built for war workers, from areas where they are to be found, to areas of great need, in many instances adjacent to our communities, particularly our cities. Of course, the activity is not altogether confined to the cities. There are many small communities which need housing very badly.

Mr. President, we should move rapidly in the direction of utilizing all the surplus material that is now held by the military and of relocating temporary family units, and we should promptly enact the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. Then, with all the energy at our command, we could begin to approach the time when there would be opportunity for every family in America to live in some kind of a house, and from there on we could improve the situation until—and I hope it will not take many years—it could be said to the world that citizenship in the United States carries with it the right to live in a decent, wholesome, healthy, sanitary home.

Mr. President, I hope that in the emergency we all realize is upon us, and upon us in a most dramatic way, by reason of the fact that we are unable to find lodgement for the men who have returned from the fox holes, the pup tents, the barracks, and the battlegrounds—we will with renewed vigor and firm determination make it one of the great objectives of our congressional program to provide as quickly as possible suitable homes, a sufficiency of homes, and a sufficiency of good homes, for the people of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who is chairman of the committee which bears his name, the Mead committee, formerly the Truman committee, has stressed the importance of and the emergency situation relating to housing. I wish to say that I do not think there is a State in the Union with a more acute problem than the State of California in this regard. Not only has California a terrific shortage of homes but also a very large number of servicemen coming back without a place in which to live. The building materials held by the War and Navy Departments, which the junior Senator from New York mentioned, I think furnish one of the most immediate sources of building supplies, and I wish to join with him in stressing the urgency of the situation upon the War and Navy Departments.

Some time ago I communicated with both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and asked for information specifically giving facts as to the amount of building material available in the Army and Navy depots and the amount that could be released. I also requested that they furnish the committee information as to the amount of building material which is on shipboard in the Pacific, because I have been informed that there was a considerable amount of building material at Okinawa and in the harbors of Japan.

Mr. President, I think as a matter of national urgency the War and Navy Departments, without being pressed by Members of the Senate or by the Mead committee, or by other committees of the Congress, should of their own volition recognize the importance of the situation and declare that material, or a large part of it, surplus.

As a specific example, I found that the Navy had at Port Hueneme in California

and at Tacoma, about 97,000,000 feet of lumber, but when they proceeded with their explanations as to where that material would have to be used they finally got down to a point where less than 5 percent of that large amount was to be made available to the civilian economy.

Mr. President, it is true that under the procedures we have set up for the disposal of surplus materials, if a particular branch of the Government cannot use the material itself, it notifies other branches of the Government, and in this particular case, after the Navy put aside the amount of lumber they felt they needed, they notified the Army, and the Army declared they needed a certain amount of additional lumber, and the point was finally reached where about 20,000,000 feet were left. Then it was said that new requests were coming in from both the War and Navy Departments which would result in using up even that amount which might otherwise be available to the civilian economy.

Mr. President, I think the crux of the situation is this: During the wartime period, very rightfully and very properly, the civilian economy had to give way in priorities to the armed services, but now that the war is over I think that those who are doing the planning in the War and Navy Departments must realize that there is an urgent situation in the reconversion process, and they themselves must readjust their sights and must determine that the civilian economy should now have some priorities.

I have no doubt whatever that the Army and Navy can make reasonable explanations as to why the supplies which are available in the various Army and Navy depots should be used by the services themselves. But I think they should reexamine the whole problem, and certainly the Congress of the United States should reexamine it and should determine that certain of these materials should be put aside and the civilian requirements given a priority.

That same situation exists at Lathrop where there is a large amount of supplies in the way of pipe, conduits, soil pipe, caterpillar tractors, and so on, which are urgently needed. In the woods of Oregon and Washington these caterpillar tractors are needed by the lumber industry, which desires to help relieve the housing situation.

I wish to join the junior Senator from New York in saying to the War and Navy Departments that this is not a matter which should be put off for 1 week or 1 month or 6 months. It is a matter which they should take up immediately.

THE PRESIDENT'S LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the President's Labor-Management Committee adjourned November 30. Although it is too early to appraise the results of its deliberations, I am inclined to feel that much good has been accomplished, particularly in identifying the areas of agreement and disagreement. It is greatly to be hoped that the future meetings which the conferees provided for

will further reduce and clarify the remaining points of difference.

There was one point of agreement which was especially gratifying to me. It relates to the National Labor Relations Board. I am sure it will be of interest to other Senators. As reported by the New York Times on December 1, in separate reports, committees representing the labor and management delegations reported to the conference. Labor reported as follows:

Labor is of the opinion that industrial relations will be best promoted and the functions of the National Labor Relations Board will be best performed if that agency remains an independent body.

Labor believes that industrial strife can be lessened by prompt disposition of representation cases.

To that end labor urges adequate financial provision for the performance of these duties of the National Labor Relations Board.

Management reported as follows:

To the end that the National Labor Relations Board may be enabled best to perform its functions in the prompt and impartial determination of representation questions, the Board should remain as an independent agency and should be provided with adequate appropriations.

There was disagreement on other aspects of the subject under consideration, but on these two points there was obvious unanimity. Both reports say the same thing about the National Labor Relations Board, although they use slightly different language. It is perfectly clear that the authorized spokesmen for both labor and management have agreed that the National Labor Relations Board should remain an independent agency and should be provided with adequate funds to discharge the heavy responsibilities imposed upon it by Congress.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CURRENT REVENUE ACT OF 1945"

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 105, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED, containing an analysis of the current Revenue Act of 1945, entitled "Questions and Answers on the Revenue Act of 1945," be printed as a House document; and that 42,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 30,000 copies shall be for the House document room, 10,000 copies for the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is a concurrent resolution coming over from the House, providing for the printing of additional copies of a House document. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution. The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate may stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DELAY IN RETURNING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on my return to the office today I found a Christmas greeting which had come from Hawaii. There appeared upon it the following in print:

There's a certain charm to old things
Never found in something new,
Which is why this Christmas greeting
Brings the old, old wish to you!
Merry Christmas.

Written in ink on the back of the greeting there appear the following words which have caused me to rise at this time.

Are you having a merry Christmas this year? Senator, ours is quite miserable, thanks for your lack of action on the matter closest to our hearts. A very large number of us, plus our families, are keenly disappointed in you gentlemen of Capitol Hill. You may not like the consequences. Our slogan here is: "No boats—no votes." Get the troops home.

Respectfully,

FROM A GI IN THE PACIFIC.

I again invite attention briefly to the words "Thanks for your lack of action. A very large number of us are keenly disappointed in you gentlemen of Capitol Hill."

Mr. President, the thought which came to my mind was this: Why do the GI's in the service blame the legislative branch of the Government for the failure to get them home? Who is propagandizing them, or who is failing to tell them the truth? Only the other day I was talking with Admiral Land, who informed me and others that he was transferring a large number of troop ships from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Again I inquire, who is to blame?

We read in the newspapers what seems to be authoritative statements to the effect that ships come to our ports from the Far East with only a few soldiers aboard. Why are not the soldiers in the Far East told the truth? Everyone knows that the world is full of incipient fires. The fires in the Far East and in the Near East, as well as in Germany, are apparent to everyone. However, it is not the function of the legislative branch to operate ships. Neither is it the function of the Legislature of this great country, since the war is still on—peace has not yet been declared—to operate ships and bring back to their homes the men who were sent to fight in distant lands. The responsibility for that is certainly on the Executive, through the Army and through the Navy, and not on the legislative branch.

A while ago we were supposed to have a great departmental set-up which would give information to foreign nations. That department, the OWI, was transferred to the State Department. What are they doing about telling the men in the service why there is so much delay in bringing them home? It seems to me that in order to maintain the morale of the home folks, as well as the men who are away, they should be told

the truth. If it be true that the boys cannot be shipped home, they should be told why. On the other hand, if there is ineptitude on the part of the Navy and on the part of the Maritime Commission, and if boats are coming to our shores empty when they should be filled with boys who are entitled to be discharged, we should know why that is the case.

Mr. President, this is not the first occasion on which I have received communications of the kind to which I have referred. There is now upon us the season of the year known as the season of good cheer, when we are supposed to be happy, and when we are supposed to sense something in the air which makes life worth living. When a GI boy places the blame upon us for not having been given an opportunity to return home, I ask this question: Are we going to return to that period of a few years ago when it was seemingly the function of the executive branch of the Government to get people of this country to believe that the legislative branch was hardly worth while? The men in our armed services have gone through hell. They should return to their homes with minds on an even keel, with poised intellects, and ready to meet the problems which will confront them on the home front. If they have had implanted in their minds, because of the neglect of some department or because of deliberate propaganda, that their Government and the legislative branch of their Government are not looking after their interests, it is certain that they will return in no mental condition to take up the duties which they will face upon their return.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say to the GI who wrote the Christmas greeting which I have read, that so far as I know the Congress of the United States has done its job. It is now up to the executive branch of the Government, or to the military, first to bring the boys back in ships which are abroad, if in the opinion of the Commander in Chief the boys should be brought home; and second, if the boys should not be brought home they should be told why. If ships are available and the boys should be brought home and are not brought home, the military or the Maritime Commission should tell us why they are not performing their duty.

I repeat that Admiral Land told me that everything possible was being done, and that ships were being transferred from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I believe they are being so transferred.

Mr. President, we have been told that the truth will make us free. If the simple truth were being told, a lot of boys would be free from distrust of their Government caused by a fear of not being treated fairly.

So, Mr. President, that is the answer which I would give to this boy if I had his name and his address.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

William E. Lee, of Idaho, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1952 (reappointment); and

William J. Patterson, of North Dakota, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1952 (reappointment)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Olson, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho, which had previously been passed over.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the nomination of Frank Olson has gone over two or three times already, and I should like to have the nomination voted upon today. For that reason I suggest the absence of a quorum, as I should like to make a statement respecting the nomination of Mr. Olson.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Austin	Guffey	Myers
Ball	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hart	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoe	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Dennell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Willis
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Gossett	Murdoch	Young
Green	Murray	

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomi-

nation of Frank Olson to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am loath to take up the time of the Senate and inconvenience Senators in this manner at this late hour of the day. However, the nomination of Frank Olson has been passed over several times, and I should like to have it acted upon.

Let me give a brief history of the case in order that Senators may have an understanding of how the issue arose.

When I first recommended Frank Olson for the position of register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho, the Civil Service investigators looked into his record and found that in 1933 he had served a jail sentence of 90 days following a conviction under the Volstead Act—in plain English, for bootlegging.

I immediately wrote to Idaho, to the United States marshal, and had him investigate the matter. I told him to make a report to me regarding what he found. I have known Frank Olson since about 1937. From what I could learn he is a very splendid type of man and has a good standing in his community; so, of course, I was very much surprised when this development occurred. Accordingly, I had the marshal make the investigation. After making it, he wrote to me as follows:

Whatever the seriousness of Frank's ancient mishap may be, it should certainly be erased by the conduct of his life since that time and is more than overcome by the high regard in which he is held by everyone to whom I talked. He is certainly a good citizen and has held a number of responsible positions of trust in the past 10 years. He has been a school trustee, master of the local grange, watermaster, has charge of a Government gage at Bridge, and his wife is postmistress. None of these positions are very exalted but they certainly reflect a condition of trust by the people of that section. He is one of the best liked people I have ever been in contact with, and I can honestly say that I found no one who did not have a good word to say for him. As to the offense he was held for, from what I can learn, he merely elevated himself in the eyes of his neighbors when he refused to turn information in to the prohibition agents when to have done so would have meant his freedom.

Sincerely,

EVERETT M. EVANS.

Mr. President, I asked the marshal to make inquiry in the community, and I told him that if the people in that section of the State had anything to say for or against Frank Olson, to let me know. In consequence, I have received a number of letters. I hold in my hand a letter which I received from the editor of the local newspaper. Incidentally, he is a Republican; and, although I know him, certainly he is not one of my political supporters. I should like to say that Mr. Olson has written a column for this newspaper for a number of years—something on the order of Will Rogers' articles. The letter from the editor reads as follows:

THE OAKLEY HERALD,

Oakley, Idaho, September 30, 1945.

HON. GLEN TAYLOR,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: This is to thank you for naming Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho,

to be in charge of the United States general land office at Blackfoot. I have known Mr. Olson for about 10 years and regard him as one of the truly interesting and useful men of our State.

The appointment is popular with the readers of my paper. Some of these people have known Mr. Olson all his life. Others don't know him personally but they have read his articles in my paper. Mr. Olson is a talented writer and an authentic humorist. With honesty, intelligence, and talent, Mr. Olson should do good work in the new position.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES BROWN.

I now read a letter from the chief of police at Burley, Idaho, which is the county seat of the county in which Mr. Olson lives:

POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Burley, Idaho, October 3, 1945.

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: I address this letter to you to express my hearty approval of the nomination by you of Mr. Frank Olson for the position of register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho. I have been personally acquainted with Mr. Olson for more than 20 years—

Mr. President, it will be recalled that the bootlegging episode occurred in 1933, which is only 12 years ago.

I read further from the letter:

And I know of no more sincere and enthusiastic supporter of the Democratic Party and of yourself than Mr. Olson has shown himself to be.

I believe that I am qualified to express an opinion regarding Mr. Olson's suitability for this position insofar as his character and ability are concerned, and it is my opinion that his qualities are such as will bring credit to the party and yourself.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. W. WILLIAMS.

I now read a letter from a doctor who lives in that section of the State and who has treated the Olson family for many years. The writer of the letter is a well-known and civic-minded person. His letter reads as follows:

BURLEY, IDAHO, October 1, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am happy to have known and to have had professional dealings with Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho. This acquaintance extends over a period of twoscore years, since I knew and treated both his father and mother before Frank assumed the responsibilities of married life and went out for himself.

There is more to the letter, but much of it is irrelevant to the subject presently under discussion. At the conclusion of the letter, the doctor states the following:

Mr. Olson can do his district, his county, his State more good as land commissioner at Blackfoot, Idaho, than any other man you may hand pick from Idaho or our neighboring States. I know because he is desert and irrigation conscious, and has learned it the hard way.

Let us put it this way when you honor him, you honor yourself. In a democracy there is always give and take and Frank gives first.

Sincerely yours,

DR. G. E. CRANER.

I now read a letter from a prominent attorney in Burley, the county seat:

BURLEY, IDAHO, October 3, 1945.
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho, has requested that I write to you regarding the matter of his appointment to the office of register of the general land office at Blackfoot. I have been acquainted with Mr. Olson for approximately 8 years through his activities in connection with the Democratic County Central Committee, Cassia County, Idaho, and I know him to be a conscientious and enthusiastic supporter of the party and of yourself, and I know of no one who is more deserving of this appointment than Mr. Olson.

I believe that Mr. Olson's character and intelligence is such that he will perform the duties of the office of register with credit to himself and the Democratic Party.

With best personal regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

KALES E. LOWE.

I now read a letter from a prominent contractor in that section of the State, Mr. Dan J. Cavanagh, of Twin Falls, Idaho:

TWIN FALLS, IDAHO, September 29, 1945.
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho, is being considered for the appointment as Register of the Blackfoot Land Office, Blackfoot, Idaho.

This letter will act as an unqualified endorsement of Mr. Olson for that position. I have known him for a number of years and have followed his contributions to local newspapers and magazines, in which field he has gained considerable mention nationally.

Mr. Olson comes from old pioneer stock who settled in the Raft River Valley in Idaho before the railroads arrived. He is a solid, substantial citizen, and while I believe this would be the first important public office he would hold, he has always taken a lively interest in all civic and public affairs and has been a leader in his community in bettering the welfare of the people in his surrounding territory.

Having been brought up in the early settlement of the Raft River country, he has a wide knowledge of reclamation, irrigation, and range problems which should serve him in good stead as a register in the district land office. He is a sober, industrious man of unquestioned integrity and honesty, and I feel no hesitancy in urging his appointment to this office.

With kind personal regards,
Cordially yours,

DAN J. CAVANAGH.

The letter which I now read is from Hon. Henry W. Tucker, probate judge of Cassia County:

BURLEY, IDAHO, October 1, 1945.
To Whom It May Concern:
This is to certify that I am well acquainted with Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Cassia County, Idaho; and that I have known him for the past 10 years, and that during that period he has been a fine, outstanding citizen of his community and this county. He is a loyal and patriotic American who has worked hard in our various war activities of this county and State.

I heartily commend him for the position to which he has been nominated, namely, the district land office at Blackfoot, Idaho. Respectfully submitted.

HENRY W. TUCKER,
Probate Judge and also
United States Commissioner.

I now read a letter from a banker at Albion, Idaho:

ALBION, IDAHO, October 1, 1945.
To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that I have known Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho, for the past 20 years. I have never known of anything happening in that time that would be a reflection of any kind upon his character. He is honest, industrious, and will make an earnest effort to do his best in any type of work he may undertake.

C. E. SIMONSEN,
President.

The last letter which I shall read is from Ernest G. Hansen, State auditor of Idaho. His letter reads as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, August 4, 1945.
To Whom It May Concern:

Briefly, this letter is to recommend Mr. Frank Olson as to his character and qualifications as follows:

I have known Mr. Olson for the past 13 years as an upright citizen of Cassia County, and have found him to be loyal, sincere, and honest. During the time I have known him he has made a livelihood for his family from an income of various minor positions, and he has always been willing to take his part in civic functions.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST G. HANSEN,
State Auditor.

Mr. President, having read those letters, I wish to say that Frank Olson has raised a large family of 10 or 11 children on a dry-land farm. Recently, when I attended the funeral of Senator Thomas, in Idaho, I saw Mr. Olson, and his hands were deeply cracked from the hard work he had been doing on his farm. I sympathize with him. I myself am one of 13 children, and I know that while my father was a fine and capable man he never was able to get ahead very far financially because of the large family he had to support. After we were grown and left home, he did very well financially, and I am sure that but for the fact that he had such a hard time financially during the earlier years he might have been here in the Senate long before I came here. I feel the same way about Frank Olson. I am sure he is an honest and capable man. I am convinced that he never committed the offense for which he was sent to jail, but rather that he took the blame for someone else.

I wish to say that it was a misunderstanding which resulted in having this matter come up in the first place. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] understood that I was to make this talk on the floor of the Senate. I offered to make it in the committee, but I did not understand that I was expected to do so. The Senator from Iowa understood that it had been agreed that I would make the talk and explain the circumstances. So when the nomination came up in the Senate, the Senator from Iowa rose to his feet and asked me if I had any statement to make. I really did not understand what he meant at that point, and I so stated. He then made the statement that Mr. Olson had been convicted and served a jail sentence. So now I am making my statement.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that Frank Olson is a wounded veteran of the First World War. He has had

two sons in the service in this war, and a daughter who is taking nursing training. I have absolute confidence in his integrity and ability.

This appointment was made long before the junior Senator from Idaho became a member of the Senate. He has taken the position that inasmuch as an issue has been made, he wishes to have the opportunity of voting against the nomination. However, I wish it to be known beyond any doubt that the nomination is not of his sponsorship, but that it is of mine, and I take full responsibility for it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Frank Olson to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. President, I shall like to be recorded as voting "no" on the confirmation.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maple T. Harl to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, and under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, December 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received December 7 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Bernhard H. Eleri, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Rear Adm. William H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Rear Adm. Richard L. Conolly, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Rear Adm. George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 7 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Frank Olson, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Maple T. Harl, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

POSTMASTERS
CALIFORNIA

Theodore W. Markham, Caspar.
Helen Cooper, Diablo.
Rena L. Post, Knightsen.
Peter Almos, Moffett Field.
Ferrell H. Lauraine, Oceanside.
Effie M. Inks, Port Costa.
Irene S. Gooch, Temecula.

FLORIDA

Roy Radcliffe Morris, Panama City.
Gertrude G. Whitfield, Salerno.

LOUISIANA

Barney N. Eubanks, Dry Prong.
C. Mildred Smith, Houma.

MARYLAND

Margaret E. Mulford, Galena.
Elizabeth R. Woodland, Marion Station.

MONTANA

Charles A. Berkner, Highwood.

NEBRASKA

Charles E. Opitz, Bertrand.
Frances N. Fauqueler, Chapman.

NEW MEXICO

Lambert R. Dannenfels, James.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gladys L. Hall, Deering.

TEXAS

Lucile R. Ryon, Seadrift.
Orine H. Palmer, Tornillo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all comfort, the surety of human redemption, from whom nothing is concealed, keep us free from the shuddering depths of unbelief. In this seething world, help us ever to stay our faith on Thy saving graces. It is the Christ-shen above and beneath men which makes them brilliantly courageous and sacrificially Godlike. When in the travail of sorrow and hardship, whatever the crisis, the perplexity or apparent defeat, let us lift up our faces with the abiding strength of faith supporting us. May we forsake our low-vaulted past and, together with the Lord God, work in building a more stately mansion of the soul of our Republic. Incline our hearts to put ourselves within the sweep of Thy directive truth and wisdom; to think and keep on thinking of the high and noble destiny of America, and with devout spirits and plodding steps, strive to open the way for greater progress. In Thy Holy name we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1064) entitled "An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Office of Defense Transportation.
7. War Shipping Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two poems by Mr. Carlisle.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, December 17, immediately after reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address entitled "A Precedent for Peace."

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of his constituents supporting Mr. LANE's bill for the establishment of a diplomatic school.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE
ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a copy of a bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are greatly concerned about the continuation of the draft. Shortly after VJ-day, the President said that if we drafted 50,000 each month it would be sufficient to meet our military needs. Since the voluntary enlistment bill was passed by this House, I want to report that in the month of September there were 38,000 enlistments and in the month of October there were 79,451. From the 1st of November to the 15th of November, there were 83,547 enlistments. It is obvious from this report, Mr. Speaker, that there are enough men coming into the service today on a volunteer basis to meet the needs of the military. I believe we ought to give some thought at this time to the repeal of the Selective Service Act relating to inductions. There is no further need to induct any men. And a suspension of that law will not interfere with the discharge of men now in the service. I have offered the bill H. R. 4894 to effect this purpose.

H. R. 4894

A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and to suspend all inductions thereunder

Be it enacted, etc., That upon final passage of this act those provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, relating to the inductions of individuals into the military service of the United States are hereby repealed and no person shall be inducted for further training and service thereunder as provided in said act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include excerpts from a number of letters.

LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement of my own in reference to loans to foreign countries. It is a little over 300 words, but not much.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on Who's To Make the Watches?

BRING THE PACIFIC VETERANS HOME

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from an outfit located in Cebu, in the southern Philippines, from which I would like to read an extract:

Public opinion and pressure can force a general speed-up of the demobilization from the Pacific and end the immense differenti-

ation between the different areas of the Pacific theaters. Many areas have shipped home men with 60 points while in the southern Philippines we have men with 70, 80, 90, and even 100 points still sweating out transportation.

Just because we happen to be the ones who are the greatest distance from home is no reason we should be passed by. We want a general speeding up of demobilization from the Pacific and on a more equitable basis. Then and only then will we have something to be thankful for this Thanksgiving season.

Here is word from another point in the far Pacific. Imagine the feelings of these men with 60 to 100 points, when 55 now makes a soldier eligible for discharge. These transportation bottlenecks must be broken. These men must be returned at once. They have earned a triple A priority on boats.

The young man who sent me this requested me to "speak of this to others." I would have done so in any event. My purpose for weeks has been to focus attention on the plight of these men. This is their message to the Congress and the people. The Army and Navy must take action to carry out this all-important task. Congress has provided the President and the Army and Navy with the authority and the money. Let us have some action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the years and in every campaign in which I have personally been engaged, the officials of the CIO have misrepresented, condemned, and opposed me. The last few days I have been receiving wires and letters asking me to oppose legislation recommended by the President, and which is now being considered by the Labor Committee of the House. I refer to H. R. 4908. Believe it or not, I have advised all of those CIO officials who made that request that I am going along with them in opposing that legislation.

This afternoon, in the 15 minutes allotted me, I will give you the reasons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some items from servicemen.

WANTON WASTE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with some of the Army and Navy bases in the Pacific as a result of my experience in the Navy during this war. One of the places with which I am familiar is a city called Noumea, New Caledonia. I have received a letter from a very responsible source in Noumea, and a part of it reads as follows—this has to do with the disposal of American property:

Every day dozens of vehicles, boats of all sorts, and millions of dollars of material are thrown into the sea or burned.

Now, this is not the only complaint that has been made regarding other bases in the Pacific. I think at this time, when the world is looking for materials and equipment of all kinds, it is nothing less than criminal to throw this stuff into the sea.

I am introducing a resolution to investigate the wanton disposal of this American property at these overseas bases, and I hope it will receive the consideration of the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER—PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to.

Monday is District day. I have been informed that four bills will be submitted, S. 1212, S. 1278, S. 1152, and H. R. 3995.

Then on Monday there will be the Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 2536, a bill relating to agreements between carriers.

On Tuesday, there is the Arends bill, H. R. 3937, and the Hobbs bill, H. R. 32. It is quite probable it will be difficult to dispose of them both in one day, but I am putting them both down. The Arends bill will be called first.

Mr. MICHENER. Is that the May bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Arends-May bill.

Mr. MICHENER. It is the May bill with an Arends amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is probably correct. Therefore, we call it the Arends bill.

On Wednesday a resolution out of the Committee on Accounts to continue the Small Business Committee will be brought up.

The full-employment bill I am putting down for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, with 1 day's general debate. It may be that the members of that committee may want to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday in view of the fact that this resolution out of the Committee on Accounts will be called up and is assigned for that day.

The Hobbs bill. If the Hobbs bill cannot be considered on Tuesday, I am hopeful that arrangements will be made, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] on yesterday, to program it after the full-employment bill is out of the way, if it is his desire to program it later on.

Conference reports, of course, will always be in order and it is impossible to state when they will be brought up, but naturally there are some important ones pending on reorganization and the \$550,000,000 UNRRA appropriation. There may be some others. Conference reports, of course, when brought in, will be acted upon as soon as pending business will permit.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman enumerate the bills to be called up on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. They are all bills on the District Calendar and deal with District business. I can enumerate the bills by title if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. MICHENER. No; it is sufficient to know that they deal with District of Columbia business.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; they are District bills.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman earlier this morning said that the May-Arends bill would come up next week. This morning, if I understood correctly, it was announced in the Committee on Labor that the leadership on both sides had agreed that the bills which have been reported out by the Military Affairs Committee would not come up until after H. R. 4908 had been disposed of.

Mr. McCORMACK. What leadership?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Republican and Democratic leadership of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can state to the gentleman is that, despite any agreement that may have been made in the Military Affairs Committee—and I have been somewhat conversant with that—the rule has been out for several days and I have no control over programing it if any member of the Rules Committee announces his intention to call it up. Such notice having been given, I naturally am going to program it. That notice was served yesterday by a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But if no member of the Military Affairs Committee calls the bill up, can it come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not within the control of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as I understand the rules of the House, for they provide that when the Committee on Rules reports out a rule and it has not been programed within the next succeeding seven legislative days, any member of the Rules Committee can call the bill up at any time thereafter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] this morning made the statement before the Committee on Labor that the bill could not be called up if the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee did not call it up.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my understanding. My understanding is

that any member of the Rules Committee after seven legislative days succeeding the reporting of the rule can call the rule up. The gentleman from Georgia served notice yesterday of his intention to do so; and in view of that I am programming the bill. I said yesterday I was not going to program it for next week so far as I voluntarily was concerned, but when a member of the Rules Committee, exercising his rights serves notice of his intention to call it up, I am going to program it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is with the understanding that the bill, H. R. 4717, to establish a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration is to be taken up this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. Another thing, I am not going to object to adjourning over until Monday. I have tried to give the Members of this House an opportunity to express themselves in favor of getting these boys home who served for 18 months or more or who have dependents at home to look after, or who desire to return to school. I am not going to object to adjourning over until Monday because I want the Members to go home and see the fathers, mothers, and wives of these boys and get some first-hand information on how the American people feel about this proposition.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been no agreement in the Military Affairs Committee about calling up the bill the gentleman has been discussing.

The only thing that has happened in the committee is that the chairman did suggest that the matter be not called up by the committee or any effort made to call it up until it was determined whether or not the Labor Committee is going to report the so-called President's bill.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, if the rule passes providing consideration for the bill, the responsibility then devolves on the committee reporting the bill. It is discretionary with the committee reporting the legislative bill to call up the bill at any time after it has the rule, but the rule does not compel that it be called up forthwith.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will agree that after seven legislative days from the time the rule is reported any member of the Rules Committee can call up the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is absolutely right, but there are two different things involved and the gentleman knows that there are. One is the rule. The calling up of the legislative bill is a privileged matter, but it is up to the legislative committee to exercise its privilege under the rule.

Mr. BARDEN. Then it would not follow that any member of the Rules Committee could bring up anything except the rule after seven legislative days?

Mr. MICHENER. The Rules Committee loses jurisdiction as soon as the House passed on the rule.

Mr. BARDEN. It could not call up the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Without jurisdiction, no.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts understand that to be correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that after seven legislative days, when a bill is reported from the Rules Committee, under the rules of the House any member of the Rules Committee can call up the rule. My understanding of the situation is the same as expressed by the gentleman from Michigan. Having been served with notice that a member of the Rules Committee intends to call up the rule, although I was not going to program it, naturally I am programming it.

Mr. BARDEN. Would the gentleman propound a parliamentary inquiry to the original source of knowledge on that subject and get it settled?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman himself can propound the parliamentary inquiry. If the gentleman wants to, he may propound the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARDEN. It would not embarrass me at all but because one side of the House says one thing and the other side another I thought it would be wise.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think one side of the House says anything different on the subject than the other.

Mr. MICHENER. We are all in agreement.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding is, and I think it is the understanding of all of the members of the Military Affairs Committee following a meeting the other day, that the Military Affairs Committee through its chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, will not press for action on our bill next week, but would be prepared to go on with it pending action of the Labor Committee. I believe the chairman was authorized to contact members of the Rules Committee to that effect. The gentleman from Texas, I am sure, will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am assuming my responsibility as it confronts me at the present time. On Tuesday next, if the rule comes up, then the responsibility rests on somebody else's shoulders and that somebody else has got to assume their responsibility at that time. I am not undertaking now to look into their minds.

Mr. THOMASON. Neither the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] or I are authorized to speak for the Military Affairs Committee, but I think it is safe to predict that a majority of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs will insist on their bill being called up if this other bill is not called up in a reasonable time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that. All I say is that the rule can be called up by any member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that the rule states "that it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee

of the Whole." That motion must be made by some other Member besides a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cross that stream when he gets to it. The Chair will have charge of it at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. I was merely answering the question propounded by the gentleman from North Carolina. The Chair can recognize any Member of the House after the rule is adopted.

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

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the cessation of hostilities we have heard a clamor on all sides for the immediate release of those men in the armed forces whose magnificent efforts brought this war to a successful conclusion. Those of us who are sincerely interested in seeing that justice is done in the releasing of these men have been apprehensive lest this clamor result in injustices. I want to call your attention to an article that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post:

Plans to ship 100,000 veterans by air this month from Pacific coast ports of debarkation to their homes in the East have been abandoned, it was learned last night.

One reason is that the Air Corps, yielding to pressure from families of Air Corps personnel, has discharged men so rapidly that insufficient crews are left to undertake the huge ferrying job proposed.

By releasing trained personnel, 100,000 veterans will be held in service longer than they would have if the Air Corps had not yielded to pressure.

Let us permit those people charged with the responsibility of demobilizing our armed forces do it in accordance with the well-thought-out plans they have prepared. Further yielding to pressure will inevitably result in the slowing up of the program.

NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 119 to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this legislation?

Mr. BELL. The situation is this: Under the Philippine constitution the Philippine Congress cannot meet after the 30th day of this month. They have been engaged in a war and consequently

the elections of 1943 and 1945 could not be held. The purpose of this resolution is to give to the Philippine Government the power to hold elections not later than next April. It is very urgent legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I see the ranking minority member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is present, and I yield to him.

Mr. WELCH. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Senate Joint Resolution No. 119 which is identical with House Resolution No. 278, is now on the Speaker's desk. The House resolution was carefully considered by the Committee on Insular Affairs and reported unanimously. We support the request of our distinguished chairman in asking for immediate consideration of the Senate resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the situation, it is this: A Senate bill has been passed. A similar House bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Insular Affairs. The House resolution is on the Speaker's desk, and it is the desire to substitute the Senate resolution for the House resolution and pass it immediately.

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas the interruption of constitutional processes of government in the Philippine Islands due to enemy occupation has prevented the holding of elections in 1943 and 1945 as provided by the Constitution of the Philippines; and

Whereas the term of office of the President of the Philippines has been continued by the joint resolution of November 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 590), until such time as a successor has been elected and qualified; and

Whereas the Philippine Congress under the terms of the constitution of the Philippines cannot convene after December 30, 1945, because the terms of office of members of the House of Representatives and of two-thirds of the members of the Philippine Senate will have expired on that date; and

Whereas the liberation of the Philippines and the restoration of constitutional processes of democracy in the Commonwealth now permit the holding of an election in the immediate future; and

Whereas the members of the electoral commission responsible for the conduct of the elections have already been appointed by the Commonwealth Government in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines makes no provision for the emergency in which elections though of vital necessity cannot be held at the regularly scheduled time; and

Whereas it is the desire of the United States to fulfill her pledge to prepare the Philippines for independence and to make possible that grant of independence in accordance with existing law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines not later than April 30, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date for such elections, and the date fixed shall not be subsequent to

April 30, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date, then April 30, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

SEC. 2. The President and Vice President then elected, the senators then elected (who shall be all but those then in office whose terms continue until December 30, 1947), and the members of the house of representatives shall take office, and the elected Philippine Congress shall convene in regular session not later than May 28, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date or dates for the assumption of office and for the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session, and the date or dates fixed shall not be subsequent to May 28, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date or dates, then May 28, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date for assumption of office and the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session.

SEC. 3. The terms of office of the President, Vice President, and representatives then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945. The terms of office of eight of the senators elected at such elections shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945; and the terms of eight senators then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1943. Division of the senators elected at such elections into these two classes shall be made in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. The term of any senator then elected to fill a vacancy in a term expiring on December 30, 1947, shall expire on that date.

SEC. 4. The manner of holding such elections shall be as provided by the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 278) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, last night at the Mayflower Hotel in honor of Col. J. Monroe Johnson commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from the Third District of the great State of Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] on urging the selection of Tuskahoma as the capital of the United Nations Organization. Tuskahoma is not in my district, but no place more beautiful and more ideal than Tuskahoma could be selected for an international capital.

The word "Tuskahoma" itself has a very significant meaning. It is an old Choctaw word. It means "Red warrior." During the days before our statehood the Choctaw national colors were red and white. The color "red" signified bravery and courage. A free translation of the word "Tuskahoma" would be "Brave warrior."

Mr. Speaker, when the various members of the United Nations Organization come to the international capital they should be full of bravery and courage.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues from Oklahoma—the gentleman from the Kimachi [Mr. STEWART] and the gentleman from the valley of the Arkansas [Mr. STIGLER]—in further urging the consideration of the Tuskahoma area for the new Allied Nations capital. As my friend from the Third District has said, the future world capital should be a city in itself and not an appendage to an established metropolis. This Council of the Nations of the World is a new idea and should therefore be housed in a completely new city arising on virgin soil, with no disagreeable past to tarnish it.

Oklahoma is practically the geographical center of the United States. Delegates from the East or West would have to cross the whole continent if some coast-line city should be chosen—therefore the location of Tuskahoma is geographically perfect. There is no State in the Union that has more of all the natural resources than does Oklahoma. The close proximity of the largest known supply of natural gas in the world, the Guymon-Hugaton gas field, would supply the fuel and power for the city to be builded. The buildings would remain clean and the air pure, and we would not have the spectacle of soot-smoked buildings and impure air which we now see in so many cities of the North and East that are bidding for this location.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENDING INDUSTRIAL STRIFE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. BOREN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MILITARY RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, during this war I have consistently refrained from making any suggestions or criticisms concerning the internal management of the military organizations. In recent weeks certain matters have been brought to my attention which I think should be given some consideration by the higher-ups. We all know that during wartime it is necessary to have strict rules and regulations in the armed forces and in many instances it is necessary to impose severe penalties for the infraction of such rules and regulations. However, although the war is over, those same severe penalties are being administered to the boys and men who violate such regulations, just as if we were still in a state of war. I do not think it appeals to the sense of justice of anyone that such a program or policy should be continued. I would very much regret to see it become necessary for the Congress to be forced to give this matter consideration. I see no reason why a fair application of a little common sense would not cause the Army and Navy to abandon the practice complained of.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, mention has been made that we should not make any suggestions as to the demobilization in part of the men in the service. While we were at war I accepted everything that the Army and Navy said and did 100 percent. But we are not at war now and do not need the great number of men in the services, in either the Army or the Navy, that we have. Until the Army and Navy adopt as a part of their policy the necessity of discharging boys from the service who need to come back home and go to school, as well as discharge men with wives at home, and one or more children waiting for them to come home, I do not propose to stop.

REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I not witnessed it I would not believe what has occurred here this morning could possibly happen. I have heard this period referred to as one of current events. I have listened to every word spoken by probably 30 Members since the House convened 40 minutes ago without hearing a single reference to the tragic event of which today marks the anniversary. I have heard many references to the results of it. To the desire to bring our boys home, to the retarding influence political pressure naturally wields thereon, to a proposed location for the headquarters of the United Nations Organization, which has very appropriately developed as a result thereof. I have heard discussions of various labor laws, and what not. Yet no one has referred to the fact that 4 years ago today there occurred the most infamous, the most dastardly crime of history when those sneaking, treacherous, yellow little Japs all but destroyed our fleet in Pearl Harbor while their emissaries were here pretending to talk peace.

I consider it peculiarly appropriate that on this fourth anniversary of this criminal attack we receive the news of the conviction of one of those who followed up that dastardly deed by permitting the infliction of those unspeakably horrible atrocities on our American soldiers and citizens in the Philippines. Let Yamashita's body as it dangles from the noose be an unforgettable lesson to all war inclined leaders of the future. Let us hope and pray that it will deter them from the mad courses they might otherwise pursue by saying: "Be sure your sins will find you out." Do not overlook the new principle of international law which not only permits but requires the punishment of commanders for not preventing or stopping unspeakable atrocities by their subordinates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from the Washington News Digest, and in the other an editorial from the Veteran's Employment magazine.

Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article recently appearing in the Saratogan.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several editorials on the subject of compulsory sickness insurance cost.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the Washington Post.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects, and to include certain excerpts.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania took the floor and apparently criticized some of us who are doing all within our power to try to get these boys home. I know there are many officers in the Army and in the Navy who are splendid gentlemen and very sincere in their efforts to get the boys home, and in many cases they have cooperated to the fullest extent. But there is another group that is hard-boiled, and the moment a boy indicates any desire to go home he is called upon the carpet. He is told, "Who is your Congressman? What is he? What are you here for?"

I have a case like that where a young man has a wife and two children. The wife is desperately ill. When he called attention to a letter I had written, the officer said, "Who is he anyway?"

I am getting sick and tired of that arrogant attitude. Our boys have won a great victory and they are entitled to consideration. They know the facts and they are giving us the facts. It is up to this Congress to take some action to bring the servicemen home. I suggest signing petition No. 8 in the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CONFUSION IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the single greatest and most patriotic service Gen. Patrick Hurley has rendered to his country during his long and distinguished career as a public servant is his resignation as Ambassador to China to bring into the open the confused and confusing situation in our State Department, which has long been known to exist, but which no less drastic an act could have brought to a show-down.

How could we have won the war if some of the colonels and captains, after receiving orders from their commanding officer to move east, promptly moved west as soon as his back was turned?

Let us not imagine we can win the peace unless our diplomatic forces are as unified and as loyal as our military forces have been, and unless they pursue single-mindedly our diplomatic objectives, as determined by the President and Secretary of State, in the same efficient and vigorous and skillful way in which Eisenhower and MacArthur and Nimitz

and their men have pursued our military and naval objectives.

Let us insist on getting the most efficient State Department and diplomatic service possible all the way down the line.

IS CHRISTIANITY HER ONLY CRIME?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ESTABLISHING A DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 427, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately 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. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall 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. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 4717, known as the bill for the establishment of a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

I am pleased that I can support a rule for a bill introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I hope he will continue to bring in legislation in the future that I can support.

The intent of the bill is in the right direction but, unfortunately, it contains some provisions such as section 6 (a) and (b), which read as follows:

Sec. 6. (a) Appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, without regard to civil-service requirements.

(b) Such appointments as described in subsection (a) of this section shall be for a probationary period of 3 years and the record of each person serving under such appointment in the Medical, Dental, and Nursing Services shall be reviewed from time to time by a board, appointed in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, and if said board shall find him not fully qualified and satisfactory he shall be separated from the service.

These provisions appear to be unfair and the same can be said of paragraph (d) of section 10 which reads as follows:

(d) A disciplinary board, when in its judgment charges are sustained, shall recommend to the Administrator suitable disciplinary action, within limitations prescribed by the Administrator, which shall include reprimand, suspension without pay, reduction in grade, and discharge from the Department of Medicine and Surgery of such person. The Administrator shall either approve the recommendation of the board, approve such recommendation with modification or exception, approve such recommendation and suspend further action at the time, or disapprove such recommendation. He shall cause to be executed such action as he approves. The decision of the Administrator shall be final.

I especially disapprove of section 16, reading as follows:

Sec. 16. (a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by the administrator exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of the activities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery or interagency rules governing its relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted on the same day to the Committee on Finance of the Senate of the United States and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Finance of the Senate or by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the chairman of such committees. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance.

The section gives the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation veto power of any rules and regulations which may be prescribed by the Veterans' Administration. This is something that has never been heretofore attempted in legislation.

Another objectionable feature of the bill is that it eliminates civil-service requirements governing the appointment of employees, and I hope that when the bill is considered by the House this and the provisions which I have mentioned will be eliminated or at least amended.

Not only do I favor the objectives of the bill, but I favor also other legislation in the interest of our boys still outside the limits of our country. I am interested in bringing them back as speedily as possible. Further, I am interested in any aid that may be given these veterans. I am also interested in obtaining proper housing for them. Unfortunately, many of the servicemen who have already returned find it difficult—yes, impossible—to obtain living accommo-

dations. For this reason, I believe; that in the interest of these men who have so well served our Nation, we should not utilize for other purposes labor and material that could and should be used for the construction of homes for them. I am also interested in having them obtain employment at a living wage. Notwithstanding the fact that for months industry has tried to make the country believe we will have from eight to ten million unemployed, the facts are there is just as much demand for labor now as there was during the war.

I hope that this demand will continue. Of course, we have had some strikes, but they were due to the fact that those who have acquired and made millions upon millions of dollars during the war, the war profiteers, are now trying to take advantage of these returning men. It appears and it is charged, and I believe there is foundation for these charges, that the employers had a tacit understanding when they claimed and advertised that there would be millions of unemployed in order to obtain their services at the very lowest possible figure, at a wage with which these men cannot provide for their families. Therefore, I hope that organized labor will continue to aid them to secure employment at wages that they are entitled to receive and that they can properly live on.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel that in the interest of these returning soldiers, the OPA will not remove the ceilings on foodstuffs or on other needed material. I am informed that within the last few days after the OPA removed the ceiling on citrus fruits the price has gone up from 300 to 600 percent, from two to six dollars a case on oranges, and so forth. These returning veterans are entitled to their oranges and grapefruit, or whatever they need, without being obliged to pay exorbitant prices or without being mulcted by paying prices two and three times higher than for which they previously sold. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would not object if part of the increase were to go to the grower, but as the situation now exists, this is not true. The increase goes mainly to the manipulator, to the contractor, to the packers, to the shippers who made contracts 2 or 3 months ago at the then low-prevailing prices. It is charged that the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. and other food-chain stores have purchased and contracted for in advance of the available and growing stocks of fruit and farm products and, therefore, are now gouging the consumers. If these charges are true, I shall demand that the OPA and the Department of Justice take immediate steps to remedy the situation and to provide measures to prevent future price manipulations of foodstuffs. Consequently the grower does not derive any additional benefit and, as I said, the returning servicemen and their families are mulcted and are obliged to pay these exorbitant prices. In the interest of our returning servicemen and in the interest

of our country, I hope the OPA will continue in its effort to hold down the prices not only of foodstuffs but of any and all materials needed for the construction of homes for these boys.

I have called attention to the fact that it is dangerous to permit prices to soar, because if this is permitted, it is impossible to forecast how high the prices of food and other articles will go. I remember after the First World War the activities of certain manipulators with respect to sugar and other commodities that they had hoarded and corralled, and I am fearful that the unscrupulous sellers and manipulators will attempt to repeat their gouging of the consuming public. Therefore we should encourage the OPA to hold down the prices and not be influenced by various industries or manipulators, and that it will protect the consumers, the returning servicemen, and those who have already returned to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, I am against inflation, and I believe the only way we can hold it down and prevent endangering the future of our Nation is for the OPA to continue to function as it has without any interruption or without any coercion on the part of the profiteers.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks, reserving the balance of the time, and I now yield to my colleague the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly appropriate that we should be meeting here on this December 7 in the year 1945 to set up an adequate medical service for the men and the women who during these years have been wounded and who have returned to us broken and ill. To my mind no one could have been put in charge of this long overdue reorganization of our veterans' medical service so completely able as Maj. Gen. Paul Hawley, who has been overseas, carrying the responsibility for the care of these same men in the European theater. He is a man of broad vision, of wide experience, and of great humanity.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am very happy to hear the gentlewoman speak of Gen. Paul Hawley. Gen. Paul Hawley began the practice of medicine in Union County, Ind., which is located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. His father was an eminent physician, and Dr. Hawley has certainly made tremendous progress in the Medical Corps of the United States Army. I do not know of a finer selection that could have been made to head the Medical Section of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is indeed true that Dr. Hawley brings with him an inheritance of understanding of the needs

of the human being. In my contacts with him overseas I found in every instance that what he cared about was the boy that was wounded, and all the other things had to wait and take their places. He now has opportunity to serve the broken man, the wounded, the ill, the exhausted women, and he brings to this service a very rare ability.

The bill as it comes to us is not a perfect bill as I read it. There are a number of things in it which might well have been improved, but it is my sense of the situation existing both in the Veterans' Bureau and here in this House, that we will do well to accept it very much as it is. Then, as General Hawley said to me the other day when I asked him about it, it will be up to him and his staff to do such a fine piece of work that they will prove themselves worthy to suggest changes, which we in our turn should be very ready and glad to make when and if they are required for the best interests of the service. It is my very great hope that there will be an overwhelming vote for the passage of this bill.

Just one more word about the nurses of the country. I understand they are coming back and being demobilized, and that 17 percent of those demobilized 3 weeks ago have asked for service with the Veterans' Administration, saying "The boys still need us." It is because of the change in the whole character of the veterans' medical service. Good doctors who have been demobilized also are asking for service in that department.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the bill on this side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate on this day the military and naval tragedy of Pearl Harbor. The infamy of Japan while her emissaries were still fawning favor with America, on the morning of December 7, 1941, struck from life American soldiers and sailors and inflicted destruction upon our Navy with a suddenness and dastardly viciousness that stunned the world. Words cannot express our contempt for the perpetrators of that sneak attack upon our Nation—an attack which unified America under the inspired leadership of our then Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as no other single fact in history was ever able to solidify the American people. Prayers in remembrance of the fallen heroes of Pearl Harbor and of all the frightful and gloriously victorious battles of the Pacific are mingled today with our prayers of thanksgiving that their sacrifice stayed the hand of war and barred the visitation of death and destruction from our land.

The silencing of the roar of the cannon and bomb upon the signing of an armistice should herald as we hope and pray the dawn of peace. And yet from far off lands come the reverberations of bloody struggles between nations and

components of nations which proclaim with no uncertainty that peace has not thrown her mantle over the world. There remains great and arduous work to be done. The world for seven long years suffered from martial malignancy. During those years the life of an individual was held in callous contempt by those in places of high power who hated America and democracy. Unlike Pilate, these enemies of man sold their patrimony, not for silver, but for personal aggrandizement and in the sale agreed that cancerous philosophies would rule the world. Mass executions of helpless men, women, and children, annihilation of cities and towns, inconceivable degeneracy in the torture of prisoners of war, denial of God and religion, all evidence the extent of the degradation of part of mankind conceived and nurtured in the name of war. Chronic disabling disease is not incurable. But as the onslaught is not immediate, neither is the cure. So it is with the world today. Peace as the word implies and for which the man in the street years with heartache and hope, comes to men of good will. The gifts of life which bring the greatest happiness are not ours by fortuitous chance. They are earned by force of character. And America, with all her strength and power and glory must work unstintingly for peace—not only for America but for the world.

We can now look in retrospect upon Pearl Harbor. Men, women, and children throughout the extent of our country know the lessons of Pearl Harbor.

Pearl Harbor, among the many other lessons it taught, proved that in our war for freedom, those who there died to make life possible, proclaimed a single message to the living "We have laid the cornerstone of universal peace. You build the structure." The four freedoms, proclaimed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, have raised the hopes and stirred the hearts of men. But we must earn these freedoms—through intelligent planning. We must be worthy of these freedoms through common goodness. Otherwise they will become hollow phrases, barren of meaning through the destructive forces of greedy, selfish interests inspired by ignorance and malice. Wisdom and good will must be exercised and practiced for the greater good of the greatest number throughout our land upon which the sun never sets. The principles of Washington, of Jefferson, and Lincoln and Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt are in reality those fundamental American governmental truths for which we have fought since the founding of our country. We are all freemen. We will not permit of mass control or regimentation. America grew because her citizens were politically free and she was economically independent. A democratic state may be difficult to maintain because of such freedom, but democracy is the society which is natural to man because he is endowed with freedom of will. The state did not create man, nor give him his natural right of freedom. The state is never bound to safeguard and respect the natural rights

of man, who was man before he was a citizen. The success of the state in attaining the common weal through the protection of the natural rights of man is in proportion to the intelligence and goodness of its leaders. We must build the superstructure of world peace—permanent and immovable. The heroes of Pearl Harbor have thrown us the challenge—and we should not fail.

As I stand here, there goes through my mind a statement made by the present Premier of Japan only a few days ago, when he made a recommendation to the limited legislative body of Japan to investigate the causes of Japanese defeat so that there will be no recurrence of such a defeat of Japan in any future war. While those are not the exact words, that is the substance of what he said. In other words, the Premier of Japan called for an investigation to find out the causes for the defeat of Japan in this war so that they can use that information for the future. Certainly, under no conditions can we permit that to happen. I say fortunately we have in control of our forces in the administration of Japan for the United States a man who has made a great name for himself, a man I have never met personally but for whom I have the greatest respect as a citizen and a soldier, General MacArthur. General MacArthur is doing a great job in Japan. We should back him up and support him in the difficult task he has before him. I know that in the administration of the civil government of Japan, as long as he is there, any efforts by the Japanese leaders to investigate their conduct of the war with a view to correcting it for future wars that Japan may engage in will not be permitted.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt hated war. But in his message to Congress on January 6, 1941, he warned that America was not immune from involvement in war. He stated:

As long as the aggressor nations maintain the offensive, they, not we, will choose the time and place and the method of attack. That is why the future of all American Republics is today in serious danger.

President Roosevelt outlined our national policy in 1941. We were committed to "all-inclusive national defense—to full support of all those resolute peoples everywhere who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our territory—to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers." He tells the Nation bluntly in that message that the immediate need of the Nation was "a swift and driving increase in our armament production," adding "I am not satisfied with the progress thus far made." That as early as January 6, 1941.

In accordance with his desire for speed and more speed in the maintenance and development of an adequate system of national defense commensurate with the dire peril which confronted the Nation, President Roosevelt advised that the Congress of the United States should undertake, with the least possible delay, the construction of not less than 200 steel

cargo vessels suitable for the use in the existing emergency, but of such type and design that would permit a most rapid construction. On March 15, 1941, at the White House correspondent's annual dinner in Washington, the President stated, referring to rumors rampant in the early days of World War I, that the people of America were disunited and cared more for peace at any price than for the preservation of ideals and freedom:

Let not dictators of Europe and Asia doubt our unanimity now. Before the present war on September 1, 1939, I was more worried about the future than any people—most people. The record shows I was not worried enough. * * * The British people and Grecian allies need ships. From America they will get ships. They need planes. From America they will get planes. They need food. From America they will get food. They need tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds. From America they will get tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds. * * * Our country is going to be what our people have proclaimed it must be—the arsenal of democracy.

On April 10, 1941, President Roosevelt requested of Congress statutory authority to take over any or all of the large number of foreign merchant vessels lying idle in our ports, stating that it was essential both to our defense plans and our domestic economy that we not permit the continuation of the immobilization in our hemisphere of shipping facilities. In March of 1941 Congress passed the lend-lease bill, which provided material aid for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States. On May 27, 1941, speaking of this bill, the President stated:

Every dollar of material we send helps to keep the dictators away from our own hemisphere. Every day that they are held off gives us time to build more guns and tanks and planes and ships. We have made no pretense about our own self-interest in this aid. Great Britain understands it and so does Nazi Germany, and now after a year Great Britain fights gallantly on a far-flung battle line. We have doubled and redoubled our vast production, increasing month by month our material supply of tools of war for ourselves and Great Britain and China, and eventually for all the democracies.

During this speech the President prophesied:

Nobody can foretell just when the acts of the dictators will ripen into an attack on this hemisphere, but we know enough by now to realize that it would be suicide to wait until they are in our front yard.

He stated as our national policy that we would actively resist, wherever necessary and with all our resources, every attempt by Hitler to extend Nazi domination to the Western Hemisphere or to threaten any and every attempt to gain control of the high seas. From the point of strict naval and military necessity, he promised every possible assistance to Britain and to all who, with Britain, were resisting Hitlerism to the end that the United States of America might enjoy human freedom. On that day, May 27, 1941, President Roosevelt, with profound consciousness of his responsibilities to his country, issued a proclamation de-

claring the assistance of an unlimited national emergency requiring "the strengthening of our defense to the extreme limit of our national power and authority." On June 9, 1941, in referring to the stoppage of production at the Los Angeles plant of an aviation company essential to national defense, the President stated:

Our country is in danger and the men and women who are now making airplanes play an indispensable part in its defense.

On June 20, 1941, the President advised the Congress, in speaking of the sinking of the American ship *Robin Moore* in the South Atlantic by a German submarine, that the act of lawlessness appeared to be a first step in the assertion of the supreme purpose of the German Reich to seize control of the high seas. The President proclaimed that we as a Nation would not yield to any such domination. On July 21, 1941, the President requested an extension of the Selective Training and Service Act. Under date of September 11, 1941, speaking from the White House concerning the torpedoing of the destroyer *Greer* by a German submarine, the President advised the American people that from that date if any German or Italian vessel of war entered water, protection of which was necessary for American defense, they did so at their own peril. Under date of September 18, 1941, the President requested of Congress a supplemental appropriation of \$6,000,000,000 approximately in addition to the \$7,000,000,000 originally appropriated under the Lend-Lease Act. Under date of October 9, 1941, President Roosevelt recommended the repeal of Section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 in order to allow the Army of merchant vessels, stating:

I cannot impress too strongly upon the Congress the seriousness of the military situation that confronts all of the nations that are combating Hitler. We would be blind to the realities if we did not recognize that Hitler is now determined to expend all the resources and all the mechanical forces and manpower at his command to crush both Russia and Britain. * * * "I say to you solemnly that if Hitler's present military plans are brought to a successful fulfillment, we Americans shall be forced to fight in defense of our homes and our freedom in a war as costly and devastating as that which rages on the Russian front."

On December 6, 1941, the day prior to the anniversary, we are here assembled to commemorate, President Roosevelt dispatched a message to the Emperor of Japan which stated in part, as follows:

Developments are occurring in the Pacific area which threaten to deprive each of our Nations and all humanity of the beneficial influence of the long peace between our two countries. Those developments contain tragic possibilities. * * * I am certain that it will be clear to Your Majesty as it is to me that in seeking these great objectives both Japan and the United States should agree to eliminate any form of military threat. This seems essential to the attainment of the high objectives. * * * During the past few weeks it has become clear to the world that Japan's military, naval, and air forces have been sent to south Indochina in such large numbers as to create a reasonable doubt on the part of other nations

that this continuing concentration in Indochina is not defensive in character. * * * The people of the Philippines, of the other islands of the East Indies, of Malay, Thailand, are asking themselves whether these forces of Japan are preparing or intending to make an attack in one or more of these many areas. I am sure that Your Majesty will understand that the fear of all these peoples is legitimate fear as it involves their peace and their national existence. * * * I address myself to Your Majesty at this moment in the fervent hope that Your Majesty may, as I am doing, give thought in this definite emergency to dispelling dark clouds. I am confident that both of us for the sake of the peoples, not only of our own great countries but for the sake of humanity in neighboring territories have a sacred duty to restore territorial amity and prevent further death and destruction in the world.

On December 8, 1941, the President addressed the Congress of the United States:

Yesterday, December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan. The United States was at peace with that nation and at the solicitation of Japan was still in conversation with its Government and its Emperor, looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, 1 hour after Japanese squadrons had commenced bombing * * * the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and a colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message * * * [which] contained no threat or hint of war or determined attack. * * * I ask that Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, 1941, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.

These are but brief excerpts from epic statements of Franklin D. Roosevelt during the year 1941. He foresaw and advised Congress and the American people on repeated occasions of the threat to our national institutions from the tyrant-dominated Axis Powers and the danger of our involvement in war through sudden unprovoked attack upon America.

Trifely spoken, a football team of the offensive does not advise its defending opponent of the place or type of its play. Japan did not broadcast in advance the locale of its sneak attack. President Roosevelt, however, had repeatedly altered the American people of the possibility of an attack on either shore of this Nation. His magnificent exercise of executive power had done all that could humanly be expected of any one man occupying the position as Chief Executive of this Nation and as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The foresight of President Roosevelt throughout the long-troubled frightening days which preceded Pearl Harbor saved America from—not defeat, for America and her allies would never have succumbed to Axis domination—but from longer years of death and destruction which would have followed the visitation of war upon our country. As General Marshall states in his biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army to the Secretary of State—July 1, 1943—June 30, 1945:

This Nation is just emerging from one of its gravest crises. This generation of Americans can still remember the black days of 1942. In those hours Germany and Japan came so close to complete domination of this world that we do not yet realize how thin this thread of allied survival had been stretched. It is certain that the refusal of the British and Russian peoples to accept what appeared to be inevitable defeat was the great factor in the salvage of civilization.

President Roosevelt, more than any man, knew of the peril confronting America and the necessity of aid, and more aid, for Russia and England, and knowing, he acted for America.

Commemoration of the fourth anniversary of the attack upon Pearl Harbor recalls the history of our relationship with the Empire of Japan over the decade preceding the sudden and dastardly bombing of our naval forces on December 7, 1941. In 1931, when Japan seized Manchuria we as a Nation expressed disapproval. In 1937 we expressed our strong disapproval to the fresh outbreak of Japanese aggression in China in a manner that brooked no misunderstanding in Tokyo. We utilized trade embargoes. Thomas Jefferson once stated that an America would never stand idly by if an aggressor nation attempted to control Europe. He would have said the same thing of Asia in 1941 when Japan intended by rapid surprise the conquest and domination of the whole Far East.

On December 7, 1941, America awoke to the cruel fact that tyrant nations to the East and West were dangerously threatening the seas which guard our shores. Aroused to that power and force which only the American fighting spirit of fair play could accomplish, we, with our allies have won ultimate victory. But the words of President Roosevelt, spoken as late as October 12, 1942, still resound as a challenge to the world "It is useless to win battles if the cause for which we fought these battles is lost." Let us not forget that America fought for a just and lasting peace. We are moving ahead toward that goal. The American people are determined that there shall be world peace. Our allies are equally determined. No great objective was ever accomplished in a day. Building requires patience and courage and hope—these qualities of mind and heart are American qualities. Peace is impossible without faith and charity. America is charitable—America, unscathed by the scythe of war which desolated cities and razed towns and even countries, with sympathetic understanding appreciates the horror and destruction of threatened starvation which now faces the millions of homeless in the war-ravaged nations of the world. America will not forget these victims in her commemoration of Pearl Harbor. America has faith—faith in God—faith in her sister nations—faith in America and American citizens. With that faith, under divine guidance, America will never lose the cause for which World War II was fought—any more than she will ever forget the significance of Pearl Harbor

or the glory of the victory made possible by the selfless heroism and sacrifice of the members of her armed forces.

So, Mr. Speaker, on this fourth anniversary let us remember the lessons we learned from the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. Let us remember those who have passed to the Great Beyond, who have made the supreme sacrifice that our country might win this war and might live. Let us go forward with determination to do everything within our power, based upon the national interest of our country, and cooperate with the other nations of the world, if they have the same spirit, in the bringing about of an international organization that will accomplish the hopes of the average person everywhere, hopes difficult to attain, hopes that we trust and pray will be attained—universal peace for mankind for countless generations to come.

America will never forget Pearl Harbor.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole, and include certain excerpts from publications, and also certain statistics.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pending legislation.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANKIN. 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. 4717) to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

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. 4717, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] will be recognized for 1 hour.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, first I desire to pay my respects to one of the best friends the servicemen of America ever had, Gen. Frank T. Hines, who served for more than 20 years as head of the Veterans' Administration.

He came in at a time when his predecessor had been driven from power for corruption in office. He took over at a time when the Veterans' Administration was demoralized. He brought order out of chaos, and served through one of the most stormy periods the Veterans' Administration has ever been through. He is now serving as our Ambassador to the Republic of Panama.

I just want to let the record show that I, for one, am grateful for his great services to the veterans of this country.

I also want to pay my tribute to his distinguished successor, Gen. Omar R. Bradley. In my opinion, President Truman could not have found a more able successor to assume the great responsibilities that now rest upon his shoulders.

He is a great soldier, a great American, and in my opinion he is making a great administrator.

I agree with what has been said about General Hawley, one of the outstanding physicians of America, a man who is doing everything in his power to give us

what we need, a real medical department in the Veterans' Administration.

For 14 years I have been chairman of this Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. During all that time it has fallen to my lot to lead the fight for the disabled veterans and their widows and orphans. I am carrying out that responsibility today.

We recently conducted an investigation based on certain charges. A careful investigation showed that they had quoted men who were hopelessly insane, that they had made absolutely false statements in their writings and before the committee. But we went through all the hearings and we called, not only General Hines, but also General Bradley before the committee, and at their request we have reported this bill, H. R. 4717, to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

We found in our investigations that the Veterans' Administration had been imposed upon, especially when it came

to selecting doctors. They were forced to take doctors from civil service, many of whom, in my opinion, got on the roll by questionable means. They have been compelled to take doctors that the War Department did not want. They have been compelled to take doctors who had got in uniform, some of whom did not want to go to the battle front. As a result, with the connivance of these publicity hounds, some of them have stirred up this trouble in the Veterans' Administration.

After thorough investigation we found there was not a similar institution in a single State that measured up to the average veterans' hospital in that State, or in any other State. We secured a list of these doctors showing when they were selected for each hospital, their date of birth, place of birth, and the date of their employment.

I am going to ask you to look over this list of names which I read to you.

Listen to this:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cole, Maj. Sidney S.	Chicago, Ill.	June 15, 1910	July 6, 1938
Foster, Lt. Col. Elden H. H.	Harrisonville, Mo.	Sept. 24, 1881	May 15, 1922
Guller, Maj. Emanuel J.	Kiev, Russia	Mar. 9, 1911	Sept. 6, 1941
Merrill, Maj. Sidney A.	Montgomery, Ala.	Feb. 17, 1888	Feb. 2, 1931
Sax, Capt. Max T.	Russia	Dec. 25, 1903	Mar. 16, 1942
Trostler, Capt. Lewis S.	New York City, N. Y.	Oct. 7, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Ferrell, Lee T.	Hazlehurst, Miss.	Oct. 23, 1879	Dec. 15, 1920
Mobley, Arthur	Riley, Ark.	Mar. 26, 1889	(¹)
Civilian dental officer: Kinzer, John D.			
	Bedford, Va.	May 10, 1895	Jan. 24, 1936
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Groves, Daniel C.			
	Brockwayville, Pa.	Jan. 9, 1878	Dec. 15, 1920
Commissioned medical officer: Mason, First Lt. William S.			
	Washita County, Okla.	Aug. 17, 1896	Dec. 15, 1942

ALEXANDRIA, LA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adelman, Capt. Samuel L.	Philadelphia, Pa.	May 8, 1911	Nov. 19, 1940
Altschuler, Capt. Max G.	Omaha, Nebr.	Apr. 3, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Chelnek, Capt. Irving	Chicago, Ill.	Feb. 25, 1916	Dec. 1, 1941
Cohn, Capt. Harold S.	Russia	Dec. 30, 1888	May 1, 1940
Epstein, Capt. Isaac	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 15, 1908	Sept. 16, 1942
Etter, Lt. Col. Roscoe	Warren County, Tenn.	Jan. 18, 1888	Jan. 6, 1931
Ketron, Maj. Hubert W.	Pineville, Ky.	Mar. 7, 1899	Aug. 27, 1929
Kleinman, Capt. Samuel B.	Russia	Jan. 3, 1914	Feb. 1, 1940
Last, Maj. Jeremiah	New York City	Aug. 22, 1908	June 3, 1938
Mathiasen, Capt. Henning W.	Omaha, Nebr.	July 17, 1908	May 1, 1941
McClelland, Maj. Norman M.	Gilmer, Tex.	Jan. 28, 1888	Nov. 6, 1931
Odegard, Capt. John K.	Kalispell, Mont.	Oct. 19, 1908	Aug. 1, 1941
Pravda, Capt. Eli	New York City	Dec. 12, 1913	Mar. 2, 1942
Schwarz, Capt. Benjamin E.	Obestertze, Hungary	Apr. 23, 1903	Feb. 23, 1938
Sellers, Capt. Harry W.	Ottumwa, Iowa	July 13, 1884	Apr. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Burdison, William R.	Moscow, Tenn.	July 10, 1905	July 3, 1937
Carroll, George F.	Atlanta, Ga.	June 17, 1884	July 20, 1934
Grubb, Donald J.	Liberty, Ill.	May 2, 1895	July 27, 1929
Moore, Tarleton	McKinney, Tex.	Dec. 22, 1884	Sept. 20, 1919
Moore, William P.	Smithville, Ark.	Sept. 12, 1889	Feb. 6, 1931
Pedford, Reece M.	Wheeling, W. Va.	Feb. 7, 1882	Nov. 1, 1944
Pitts, Wilton G.	Hazlehurst, Miss.	Nov. 20, 1891	Feb. 10, 1931
Susskind, Arthur	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 12, 1910	Aug. 1, 1944
Commissioned dental officer: Baker, Maj. DeWitt T.			
	Cookeville, Tenn.	Mar. 10, 1884	Oct. 12, 1927
Civilian dental officer: Cassidy, William J.			
	Worcester, Mass.	June 20, 1895	(²)

¹ Oct. 20, 1924, to May 11, 1930; Oct. 17, 1932, to Jan. 7, 1937; Sept. 10, 1942.

² May 29, 1922, to Feb. 29, 1924; Aug. 8, 1942.

AMARILLO, TEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Corson, Maj. Wesley C.	Springfield, Ill.	June 11, 1901	July 17, 1939
Handin, Capt. Irving L.	Russia	Oct. 4, 1908	Oct. 4, 1938
Haugen, Maj. Invald J.	Gilby, N. Dak.	Apr. 9, 1897	Oct. 17, 1935
Herrdon, Lt. Col. Oma E.	Powelson, Ga.	June 4, 1880	Sept. 8, 1918
Jacobson, Capt. Merlin E.	Albion, Nebr.	Apr. 3, 1902	Mar. 16, 1942
Walkes, Maj. Ernest E.	Avon, S. Dak.	July 23, 1895	Mar. 14, 1932
Wegener, Lt. Col. Karl F. E.	Germany	Jan. 9, 1884	Jan. 15, 1923
Civilian dental officers:			
Whitehead, William D.	Durango, Colo.	June 6, 1896	Nov. 21, 1930

AMERICAN LAKE, WASH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cullins, Col. John G.	Junction City, Ark.	Dec. 11, 1893	Dec. 1, 1920
Diamond, Capt. Leon S.	Chicago, Ill.	Aug. 6, 1915	May 1, 1941
Futterman, First Lt. Samuel	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 15, 1909	July 16, 1942
Jackson, Capt. Carl R.	Carbondale, Ill.	July 7, 1901	1935
Kisheneff, Maj. Joseph	Kisheneff, Russia	Feb. 6, 1900	Oct. 18, 1937
Morgan, Maj. John D'Arcy	Portland, Oreg.	Mar. 22, 1904	Apr. 9, 1935
Simon, Capt. Werner	Bremen, Germany	June 5, 1914	Sept. 16, 1941
Civilian medical officer: Neil, Thomas F.			
	Limestone, Pa.	Nov. 8, 1877	May 25, 1922
Commissioned dental officer: Edele, Capt. Fred L.			
	St. Louis, Mo.	Oct. 2, 1889	Feb. 9, 1921

ASPINWALL, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abramovitz, Capt. Leonard J.	Baltimore, Md.	Jan. 29, 1911	Dec. 1, 1941
Barone, Maj. Andrew M.	Fredonia, N. Y.	Jan. 29, 1908	Jan. 17, 1938
Carroll, Col. Kelso A.	Dudley, Ga.	Feb. 14, 1894	May 11, 1932
Cohen, Maj. Archibald C.	Clarks Harbor, Nova Scotia, Canada	Feb. 13, 1909	July 8, 1940
Fellows Lt. Col. William W.			
	Salisbury, Mo.	Dec. 9, 1896	June 18, 1931
Fronduiti, Capt. Lucian J.	Jessup, Pa.	Dec. 13, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Gier, Capt. Joseph A.	Lancaster, Ohio	Mar. 16, 1914	June 1, 1942
Glushien, Maj. Arthur S.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 15, 1911	Jan. 12, 1939
Goodman, Capt. David H.	Wilmington, Del.	Nov. 25, 1908	Nov. 2, 1942
Huber, Maj. Charles B.	Lancaster, Pa.	Aug. 17, 1900	Mar. 1, 1937
Machover, Capt. Saul	New York, N. Y.	Nov. 11, 1909	May 1, 1941
McClung, Lt. Col. Marshall L.	Charleston, W. Va.	July 21, 1895	Aug. 15, 1920
Pullen, First Lt. Lee	United States	July 13, 1913	June 5, 1943
Rumball, Maj. John M.	Rochester, N. Y.	Apr. 20, 1909	July 8, 1940
Schwartz, Maj. Robert	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 28, 1910	Oct. 4, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Bloom, Charles Francis	Viola, Iowa	Feb. 5, 1881	Feb. 3, 1931
Buka, Alfred J.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	May 1, 1882	Apr. 24, 1944
Burkhart, Helen W.	do.	Aug. 10, 1913	Sept. 18, 1944

ASPINWALL, PA.—Continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—CON.			
Civilian medical officers—Con.			
Ebersohn, Frederick	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 10, 1892	(⁹)
Ecker, Charles S.	Oakmont, Pa.	Jan. 5, 1881	Jan. 10, 1944
Hammond, James L.	Lebanon, Ind.	Apr. 28, 1878	Feb. 15, 1922
Ketterer, Clarence H.	Bntler, Pa.	Jan. 13, 1887	Mar. 25, 1921
Kirk, Donald J.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Dec. 18, 1889	Apr. 17, 1944
O'Donnell, Merrill C.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Aug. 16, 1915	Jan. 17, 1944
Rauch, Stewart E.	Bethlehem, Pa.	June 30, 1894	Apr. 24, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Ewing, First Lt. Frederick M.	Salisbury, Pa.	July 15, 1897	Sept. 10, 1942
Lee, Maj. Walter S.		Jan. 2, 1896	Oct. 6, 1920
Rushmer, Capt. Linden A.	Oakland, Calif.	Oct. 27, 1905	May 23, 1941
Well, First Lt. Ely	New York City, N. Y.	Sept. 26, 1908	Aug. 1, 1944

ATLANTA, GA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abrams, Capt. Hayman Seelig	Poland	Apr. 12, 1903	June 9, 1937
DiLorenzo, Capt. Gaspare	Sicily, Italy	Apr. 24, 1904	Oct. 16, 1941
Frischberg, Capt. Samuel B.	Kovel, Russia	Feb. 24, 1896	Apr. 1, 1942
Krantz, Maj. Simon	New Haven, Conn.	Dec. 23, 1905	Nov. 11, 1935
Mestre, Maj. Ricardo	Mayaguez, P. R.	May 20, 1889	July 14, 1919
Rosen, Capt. Leonard B.	Fitchburg, Mass.	Dec. 24, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Steiner, Capt. William E.	Shawneetown, Ill.	May 22, 1914	Feb. 2, 1940
Thurston, Lt. Col. John A.	Thomaston, Ga.	June 12, 1892	Aug. 20, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Beall, Charles R.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 16, 1897	Aug. 1, 1939
Bryant, Roy H.	Calhoun, Ga.	Nov. 24, 1889	Oct. 11, 1920
Daniel, Robert L.	Union Point, Ga.	Feb. 10, 1894	Dec. 28, 1923
Daniels, William	Chicago, Ill.	Dec. 7, 1884	Dec. 17, 1931
Foster, Simon S.	No record available	Jan. 22, 1887	Dec. 6, 1927
Hall, John H.	Wooddale, N. C.	May 21, 1885	Sept. 11, 1922
McAllister, James	Mount Vernon, Ga.	Oct. 3, 1892	Sept. 1, 1938
Neilans, Charles	South Bend, Ind.	June 18, 1894	July 1, 1920
Thompson, William C.	Anderson County, S. C.	Dec. 16, 1883	Oct. 16, 1944
Williamson, Milton	No record available	Mar. 3, 1893	May 15, 1944
Commissioned dental officer:	Warrenton, Va.	July 14, 1889	Feb. 26, 1936
Civilian dental officers:			
Pettinger, Neil S.	No record available	Aug. 16, 1907	May 15, 1944
Wells, Robert F.	Stone Mountain, Ga.	June 22, 1891	July 29, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Arthur, James F.	St. Matthews, S. C.	Aug. 19, 1889	June 9, 1922
Holden, Farish C.	Johntown, Ga.	Feb. 14, 1900	Jan. 22, 1945
Lahman, Rose A.	Toronto, Canada	Oct. 2, 1907	Feb. 7, 1944
Longino, Dick R.	Douglas County, Ga.	July 20, 1888	Jan. 30, 1929
Treusch, Herbert L.	Atlanta, Ga.	Apr. 3, 1900	Apr. 3, 1944
Williams, David	Ashville, Ala.	May 19, 1886	Apr. 1, 1944

AREA OFFICE NO. 4, ATLANTA, GA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Aimand, Claude	Lithonia, Ga.	Jan. 3, 1891	July 1, 1921
Carter, Donald E.	Nashville, Ga.	Jan. 11, 1895	Feb. 1, 1944
Miller, Walter	No record available	Sept. 15, 1877	Jan. 9, 1945
Tryon, Lewis Roger	Hamburg, Pa.	Mar. 22, 1872	Apr. 1, 1944
Turest, David	Lithuania, Province of Kaunas.	Dec. 25, 1902	June 23, 1941

AUGUSTA, GA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Burdashaw, Maj. William J.	Atlanta, Ga.	July 9, 1900	Apr. 1, 1932
Feinberg, Capt. Philip	Sioux City, Iowa	Apr. 14, 1915	(⁹)
Gancher, Capt. Ralph	Waterbury, Conn.	Dec. 28, 1915	Mar. 16, 1942
McElroy, Capt. Robert B.	Rogers, Tex.	Jan. 9, 1912	July 8, 1940
Miracolo, First Lt. Charles C.	Italy	Jan. 1, 1907	Nov. 2, 1942
Scheinman, Capt. Leonard	New York, N. Y.	Mar. 28, 1909	Mar. 16, 1943
Tighe, Maj. Leo R.	Cohoes, N. Y.	Aug. 13, 1890	Oct. 1, 1928
Vicary, Maj. William H.	Lockport, N. Y.	Sept. 6, 1909	October 1937
Walton, Lt. Col. Charles R.	Benton, Ark.	Feb. 7, 1894	Mar. 8, 1922
Civilian medical officers:			
Clayton, Malcolm D.	Roy, Ga.	Aug. 31, 1888	May 14, 1921
Hutchison, Sam L.	Belden, Miss.	Nov. 18, 1902	June 11, 1936
Witten, Henry O.	Coffee, Mo.	Feb. 13, 1886	(⁹)
Civilian dental officer: Skinner, Edward J.	New Orleans, La.	Sept. 25, 1891	Oct. 17, 1922

⁹ Oct. 17, 1938, to Aug. 15, 1940; Aug. 24, 1942.⁹ In 1941.⁹ Oct. 1, 1920, to Jan. 10, 1926, Sept. 1, 1928.

BALTIMORE, MD., BALTIMORE AREA, OFFICE NO. 3

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Richards, Dickinson	Alton, Iowa	May 17, 1893	Dec. 23, 1944
Forney, Guy V.	Peru, Ind.	June 20, 1889	Dec. 20, 1927

BALTIMORE REGIONAL OFFICE, BALTIMORE, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baird, Maj. Paul E.	Winchester, Ohio	June 6, 1903	Sept. 2, 1938
Di Iorio, Capt. Edward L.	Newark, N. J.	Nov. 17, 1911	Dec. 1, 1941
Fox, Maj. Nathan S.	Berezdov, Russia	Apr. 22, 1896	July 6, 1937
Glickman, Maj. Leo G.	No record available	Oct. 22, 1899	Sept. 26, 1926
Ilsen, Capt. Paul J.	Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y.	Oct. 25, 1914	May 1, 1941
Ludwig, Capt. Irving L.	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 25, 1905	Nov. 16, 1931
Commissioned dental officer: Vickery, Capt. Arthur L.	Rock Stream, N. Y.	Aug. 6, 1894	Oct. 21, 1926
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Carroll, Charles J.			
	Dennisville, N. J.	Dec. 16, 1872	Dec. 29, 1943

BATAVIA, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Badaines, Maj. Nathaniel H.	Poland	Apr. 20, 1902	Mar. 23, 1939
Bogen, Maj. Eugene F.	Finland	Nov. 4, 1886	May 23, 1934
Bonner, Maj. William F.	Bastrop, La.	Dec. 25, 1884	May 1, 1937
Cajigas, Capt. Mariano	Puerto Rico	Sept. 8, 1905	Aug. 9, 1935
Catiniella, Capt. Anthony S.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 15, 1908	July 16, 1942
Eisert, Capt. Otto	do	July 6, 1912	Sept. 16, 1942
Jolly, Lt. Lewis E.	No record available	Mar. 3, 1912	Apr. 16, 1940
Kirsh, Maj. Israel E.	Russia	Mar. 17, 1906	Feb. 11, 1938
Korol, Maj. Epharim	do	Aug. 15, 1894	Aug. 15, 1920
Locke, Lt. Col. Frederick C.	Vevay, Ind.	Jan. 24, 1884	July 25, 1920
Roadruck, Capt. Roscoe D.	Albion, Nebr.	Nov. 7, 1905	July 5, 1938
Sorenson, Lt. Col. Raymond	Erwin, S. Dak.	Jan. 15, 1904	Sept. 4, 1934
Civilian medical officer: Newlove, Frank E.	Winnipeg, Mass.	Oct. 24, 1880	Apr. 1, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Day, Capt. Milligan E.	Georgia	Feb. 7, 1889	May 24, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blanchette, Lt. Louis A.	Montreal, Canada	Aug. 15, 1888	June 19, 1944
Trott, Capt. Harold William	Canada	Aug. 7, 1899	Jan. 25, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Malonson, James H.	Gloucester, Mass.	Dec. 20, 1876	(⁹)
McDowell, John S.	Plattsburg, N. Y.	June 1, 1894	Feb. 21, 1944
Waglom, Wesley W.	New York, N. Y.	June 18, 1881	Feb. 25, 1944

BATH, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alexander, Maj. Ralph E.	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 22, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Alvermann, Capt. Emil	Germany	June 2, 1908	July 9, 1937
Bolin, Maj. Neatha V.	Cleveland, Kans.	Aug. 31, 1905	Jan. 16, 1939
Feldberg, Capt. Irving	New York, N. Y.	July 21, 1904	Feb. 3, 1941
Giacomini, Capt. Antonio J.	Wallingford, Conn.	June 9, 1906	May 1, 1941
Kates, Maj. Samuel R.	Cleveland, Ohio	Aug. 15, 1908	Feb. 17, 1937
Knoll, Capt. William	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 29, 1904	Dec. 2, 1940
Koretz, Capt. Harold	Detroit, Mich.	Jan. 18, 1910	Jan. 10, 1938
Lipton, Capt. Benjamin	Corona, Long Island, N. Y.	Dec. 20, 1907	Feb. 3, 1941
Salberg, Capt. Seymour R.	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 25, 1910	Mar. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Steindler, Leo	Baltimore, Md.	Oct. 17, 1886	Nov. 1, 1921
Woodward, Roy	Steuven County, N. Y.	May 12, 1889	Oct. 20, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Hoos, Capt. Herman H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 26, 1907	Nov. 2, 1939
Civilian dental officers:			
Endler, Joseph O.	West Hoboken, N. Y.	Apr. 7, 1892	Oct. 1, 1923
Hodges, Lowell B.	Oak Forrest, Tex.	June 4, 1896	Mar. 24, 1925

⁹ Jan. 3, 1921, to June 1921, July 12, 1921, to Jan. 15, 1940, May 1, 1941.

BAY PINES, FLA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baranowski, Capt. Joseph A.	No record available	Mar. 3, 1908	May 1, 1941
Barnett, Capt. Ernest R.	do	Nov. 11, 1912	Jan. 8, 1945
Bevis, Lt. Col. William M.	Boscom, Fla.	Oct. 16, 1882	Oct. 8, 1928
Deane, Capt. Harry R.	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 21, 1909	Mar. 1, 1938
Gorday, Capt. Abraham J.	do	Apr. 30, 1914	Aug. 29, 1938
Hanks, Maj. George W.	Panguitch, Utah	Mar. 14, 1892	Dec. 23, 1930
Jones, Lt. Col. Will O'D.	Milledgeville	Mar. 5, 1888	Feb. 20, 1932
Karmiol, Capt. Jerome	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 3, 1910	Feb. 3, 1941
Keller, Maj. Julian J.	Birmingham, Ala.	Sept. 21, 1903	Jan. 9, 1935
Klapman, Capt. Martin J.	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 5, 1913	May 1, 1941
Manginelli, Capt. Vitus W.	New York, N. Y.	May 18, 1905	July 8, 1940
Range, Maj. Irving	Ulster, N. Y.	July 24, 1896	Mar. 12, 1937
Rock, Maj. John W.	Paducah, Ky.	June 9, 1889	Feb. 16, 1922
Sieger, Maj. Simon	Ostrow Lomza, Poland	Dec. 25, 1901	Sept. 1, 1937
Simon, Capt. Sydney M.	Bronx, N. Y.	July 23, 1908	Sept. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Barnett, Ernest R.	No record available	Nov. 11, 1912	Jan. 8, 1945
Hughes, Charles W.	Wisconsin	Mar. 9, 1877	June 6, 1923
Nelson, James Van D.	Logansport, Ind.	May 1, 1878	Aug. 15, 1921
Nelson, Roger W.	Quincy, Mass.	Nov. 2, 1897	May 26, 1939
Thaler, Henry S.	Austria	Aug. 20, 1904	June 23, 1941
Thompson, William J.	Onecenta, N. Y.	Aug. 3, 1882	Aug. 4, 1944
Wendriener, Herbert V.	Breslau, Germany	Nov. 14, 1879	July 4, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Hatcher, Maj. William H.	Allen, Ky.	Mar. 15, 1893	May 1, 1920
Judge, Capt. Newell T.	Carbondale, Pa.	Nov. 15, 1897	Aug. 8, 1923
Lonnegan, First Lt. Joseph A.	New Orleans, La.	Mar. 27, 1909	Feb. 6, 1941
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Fleming, Mary R.	Monterey, Va.	Apr. 17, 1877	Feb. 15, 1944
Smith, Ray W.	Newport, Ga.	June 9, 1889	Feb. 2, 1924

BEDFORD, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Burrier, Lt. Col. Walter P.	Biddeford, Maine	Apr. 12, 1882	Nov. 19, 1921
Edelstein, Capt. Abraham	Austria-Hungary	Oct. 24, 1916	June 1, 1942
Meislin, Capt. Jacob	Kremenchug, Russia	July 4, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Mercurio, Capt. Frank	New York City	June 26, 1912	Do.
O'Brien, Maj. John F.	Fall River, Mass.	Aug. 12, 1886	Apr. 4, 1928
Weber, Capt. Joseph E.	Milwaukee, Wis.	June 17, 1910	May 6, 1938
Zellin, Maj. Morris	Boston, Mass.	Aug. 12, 1897	May 21, 1924
Civilian medical officers:			
Adams, Winthrop	Cambridge, Mass.	May 18, 1887	Sept. 26, 1919
Blumenthal, Irving J.	New York City	Dec. 14, 1910	May 1, 1941
Braverman, Aaron H.	Chelsea, Mass.	Mar. 18, 1897	Jan. 15, 1923
Richter, Waldemar G.	Fargo, N. Dak.	Jan. 14, 1892	(?)
Commissioned dental officers:			
Schuman, First Lt. Elihu J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 18, 1906	July 1, 1941
Civilian dental officers: Sinton, William			
	Colorado Springs, Colo.	May 5, 1883	July 1, 1921

BILOXI, MISS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Burns, Lt. Col. Ellis P.	Birmingham, Ala.	July 4, 1886	June 15, 1922
Heard, Maj. Wilbur L.	Camp Hill, Ala.	Jan. 12, 1889	Jan. 22, 1937
Hille, Maj. Richard W.	Norfolk, Nebr.	Oct. 2, 1898	Jan. 5, 1932
Iseman, Capt. Robert M.	Cleveland, Ohio	Feb. 10, 1912	Feb. 3, 1941
Manning, Maj. Wilkins R., Jr.	No record available	Apr. 30, 1910	Nov. 1, 1941
Pruett, Capt. William V.	Aberdeen, Miss.	Apr. 22, 1888	May 31, 1930
Civilian medical officers:			
Haslitt, Percy P.	Marshall, Ill.	May 7, 1880	Mar. 17, 1922
Henry, Hugh B.	Bluff City, Ark.	Mar. 16, 1880	Dec. 1, 1924
Larde, Charles D.	Salvadore, France	Jan. 16, 1898	Aug. 16, 1944
Commissioned dental officer:			
Roberts, Capt. Thomas N.	Somerset, Ky.	July 7, 1893	Apr. 10, 1921

This is one of the best managed and operated hospitals in the whole country.

BOISE, IDAHO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allis, Maj. Sherman L.	Kansas City, Mo.	May 15, 1911	Oct. 5, 1938
Davis, Maj. Ralph E.	Foster, Mo.	Oct. 17, 1891	Nov. 1, 1920
Harris, Maj. Henry C.	Wake County, N. C.	July 28, 1893	Apr. 8, 1931
Kimelman, Capt. Nathan	Warsaw, Poland	Feb. 18, 1912	May 1, 1941
Schuell, Maj. Gerald J.	Parnell, Iowa	Mar. 14, 1894	Mar. 6, 1934
Schulz, Lt. Col. Arthur W.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 30, 1892	July 16, 1928
Commissioned dental officer:			
Bouchet, Capt. Herman	Montreal, Canada	Feb. 21, 1898	Apr. 15, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer:			
Downs, Joseph M.	Chicago, Ill.	Feb. 7, 1890	Jan. 17, 1944

BOSTON, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer: Johnson, Capt. Goodwin A.			
	Keene, N. H.	Feb. 10, 1891	Aug. 30, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Berenson, Capt. Wyman.			
	Zaslov, Russia	Nov. 28, 1897	July 22, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Fasanello, John Baptist	Casano Al Jona, Italy	Mar. 7, 1900	Jan. 19, 1944
Kewer, Leo T.	Boston, Mass.	Apr. 13, 1888	Oct. 18, 1928
Quirk, Thomas C.	Watertown, Mass.	Jan. 6, 1889	Feb. 1, 1944

BRECKSVILLE, OHIO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Drecher, Capt. Richard G.	Cleveland, Ohio	May 3, 1914	July 16, 1942
Dredge, Maj. Thomas E.	Bellview, Minn.	Sept. 3, 1902	Nov. 10, 1930
Gilfoy, Maj. Francis E.	Adams, Mass.	Aug. 10, 1901	Mar. 6, 1935
Halberstein, 1st Lt. Abraham.	Warsaw, Poland	July 28, 1902	Sept. 16, 1942
Harris, Capt. Michael A.	Central Falls, R. I.	Sept. 21, 1911	Feb. 3, 1941
Rueggesser, Maj. Franklin M.	Baltic, Ohio	Nov. 27, 1899	Sept. 11, 1931
Schneider, Capt. Irving M.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 18, 1914	May 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Bearden, Fred	Solgohaehia, Ark.	Dec. 10, 1884	Nov. 5, 1920
Bradford, Wm. H.	Nankipoo, Tenn.	Feb. 11, 1901	July 1, 1928
Cass, James W.	Maumee, Ohio	Sept. 20, 1882	Mar. 1, 1922
Pomerantz, Max M.	New York, N. Y.	June 5, 1909	Mar. 18, 1944
Post, Edward	South Bend, Ind.	Oct. 10, 1898	Oct. 26, 1944
Trockey, Sidney	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 10, 1889	Nov. 19, 1931
Ujhely Valentine	Budapest, Hungary	July 9, 1896	May 1, 1931
Commissioned dental officer:			
Eisenberg, Capt. Max M.	New York City	May 3, 1911	Jan. 18, 1943
Civilian dental officer: Koch, Harvey.			
	Sumner, Iowa	Oct. 25, 1892	Sept. 1, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Ward, Harry H.			
	North Girard, Pa.	Feb. 5, 1878	Aug. 27, 1923

BRONX, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Balcer, Maj. Edwin A.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 10, 1911	Oct. 1, 1940
Barnett, Capt. Jack J.	New York City, N. Y.	Aug. 31, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Begenau, Capt. Vernon G.	Beekskill, N. Y.	July 1, 1914	Jan. 4, 1943
Bergmann, Capt. Charles S.	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 13, 1890	Aug. 17, 1921
Blum, Capt. Samuel D.	do	Sept. 1, 1907	Mar. 3, 1941
Brooks, Capt. Louis	Russia	Oct. 31, 1884	May 12, 1921
Carotenuto, Capt. Ralph J.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 15, 1907	Nov. 25, 1938
Caruso, Capt. Anthony T.	Newark, N. J.	Mar. 10, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Casasa, Capt. Philip R.	Sicily, Italy	June 6, 1909	July 1, 1942
Cook, Col. Robert C.	Bradley, S. Dak.	Mar. 28, 1887	Aug. 16, 1919
Davidhoff, Capt. Morris	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 15, 1900	Dec. 3, 1931
Deutschman, Capt. Reynold.	Cleveland, Ohio	Dec. 7, 1913	Sept. 16, 1942
Diamond, Capt. Norman	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 2, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
D'Oronzio, Capt. George B.	New York City	Feb. 27, 1901	Apr. 1, 1942
Eichenholtz, Maj. Sidney N.	Tarneu, Austria	Mar. 16, 1909	Feb. 17, 1937
Epstein, Capt. Jacob I.	New York City	May 28, 1903	Mar. 10, 1941
Flowers, Lt. Col. Hiland L.	do	June 13, 1894	Dec. 1, 1928
Frankel, Capt. Samuel	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 28, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Gellis, Capt. Sydney A.	New York City	Dec. 15, 1906	May 16, 1936
Gennis, Capt. Joseph	do	Feb. 1, 1912	Jan. 15, 1940
Glasser, Capt. Samuel M.	do	Oct. 28, 1908	Oct. 21, 1938
Gruenbaum, Capt. Max	Bucharest, Rumania	Nov. 7, 1886	May 14, 1921
Hardegree, Lt. Col. Harvey C.	Newman, Ga.	Feb. 4, 1891	Sept. 14, 1921
Joseph, Capt. Julius M.	Bronx, N. Y.	Oct. 6, 1910	July 13, 1944
Kapp, Maj. Louis A.	Koretz, Poland	June 25, 1888	May 9, 1936
Karlen, Capt. Saul H.	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 5, 1909	Feb. 3, 1941
Katz, Capt. Michael M.	do	Oct. 20, 1910	July 16, 1942
Katz, Capt. Sidney	do	May 27, 1917	July 16, 1942
Kemick, Capt. Irvin B.	Dubno, Poland	Nov. 14, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Kessler, Maj. Harry	New York City	Oct. 12, 1906	Oct. 21, 1935
Klein, Capt. Jacob	do	Apr. 26, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Labruier, Capt. Frederick J.	do	Sept. 6, 1884	Jan. 21, 1944
La Canna, Capt. Ralph L.	Mayfield, Pa.	Sept. 26, 1904	Mar. 16, 1942
Lattman, Capt. Morris	Russia	Aug. 16, 1896	July 16, 1936
Luloff, Capt. Harry	New York City	Jan. 11, 1911	Mar. 2, 1942
Marshall, Maj. Louis R.	Cleveland, Ohio	Dec. 11, 1899	Nov. 9, 1934
Matte, Maj. Michael L.	Gile, Wis.	Mar. 12, 1910	July 6, 1937
Maver, Capt. Hyman R.	New York City	July 29, 1911	Dec. 1, 1941
Miller, Capt. Joseph S.	No record available	Oct. 28, 1909	Mar. 16, 1938
Moreland, Lt. Col. Randall	Madison, Ind.	June 28, 1904	Oct. 20, 1932
Olson, Lt. Col. Ernest S.	Lemont, Ill.	Mar. 24, 1901	Nov. 16, 1931
Pfeffer, Capt. Jacob J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 2, 1880	Mar. 7, 1921
Pinks, Maj. David K.	Jersey City, N. J.	Aug. 25, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939

† Dec. 1, 1925, to Dec. 31, 1926; Mar. 6, 1927.

BRONX, N. Y.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—CON.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Podryski, Capt. Vladimir	Russia	Dec. 25, 1903	Apr. 1, 1942
Porter, First Lt. Louis	do	Nov. 15, 1911	Sept. 1943
Priviteri, Capt. Charles A.	Sicily, Italy	Jan. 1, 1910	Oct. 10, 1938
Povlin, Capt. Sheppard S.	New York City	July 1, 1900	Nov. 22, 1943
Robinson, Maj. Adrian M.	Walnut, Iowa	Nov. 20, 1904	Nov. 16, 1934
Roswit, Capt. Bernard	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 12, 1910	Feb. 23, 1937
Schneck, Capt. Jack I.	Bronx, N. Y.	Aug. 10, 1908	Jan. 15, 1940
Schneider, Capt. Julius	New York City	June 6, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Schwartz, Capt. William A.	Minsk, Russia	Mar. 12, 1901	Mar. 16, 1942
Sheinmel, Maj. Archie	Brest, Poland	Jan. 15, 1906	Aug. 23, 1940
Spivack, Capt. Louis L.	New York City	Aug. 17, 1904	July 1, 1921
Steingold, Capt. Meyer	Norfolk, Va.	Dec. 7, 1912	Jan. 15, 1940
Straus, Capt. Bernard	New York City	July 30, 1911	Jan. 4, 1944
Tepperberg, Capt. Irving	do	Oct. 6, 1908	Mar. 1, 1938
Toomey, Maj. Joseph H.	New Brunswick, Canada	Feb. 28, 1884	July 19, 1919
Young, Capt. William J.	Boston, Mass.	Sept. 9, 1881	June 3, 1930
Zane, Capt. Manuel D.	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Jan. 4, 1913	Feb. 2, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Abramson, Clarence	No record available	July 10, 1909	Aug. 23, 1944
Cohn, Franklin	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 10, 1883	June 13, 1931
Donovan, Timothy S.	Lawrence, Mass.	Dec. 27, 1876	Dec. 14, 1920
Emanuele, Louis J.	New York City	Feb. 25, 1908	Nov. 8, 1940
Berrara, James A.	Portocannone, Italy	Feb. 5, 1896	Oct. 22, 1941
Fuller, Allen G.	Greenville, Mich.	Nov. 17, 1880	June 8, 1920
Fuller, Robert G.	Shiloh, La.	Apr. 9, 1887	Mar. 16, 1929
Kreuger, Erich G.	Lemgo, Germany	Dec. 23, 1903	Apr. 24, 1945
Lancer, John J.	No record available	Jan. 30, 1886	1925
Lindenauer, Harold	New York City	Oct. 26, 1907	Dec. 2, 1944
Mattice, Eugene	Pueblo, Colo.	May 6, 1888	Oct. 15, 1919
Minden, Bendix S.	No record available	Sept. 11, 1886	Aug. 17, 1944
Mittleman, A. A.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 6, 1912	Feb. 3, 1941
Seannell, Edward	Concord, N. H.	Feb. 16, 1876	Sept. 17, 1932
Schwartz, Joseph A.	New York City	May 10, 1910	Dec. 29, 1943
Shimberg, Mandel	Troy, N. Y.	Oct. 16, 1894	Sept. 16, 1931
Silver, Jones	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 17, 1902	Apr. 24, 1944
Souther, Robert F.	Boston, Mass.	Feb. 15, 1876	Jan. 27, 1933
Steinberg, Miguel	Plonek, Russia	May 10, 1888	Aug. 4, 1944
Verner, William W.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nov. 7, 1875	Jan. 23, 1922
Young, James J. L.	New York City	Mar. 23, 1876	Aug. 15, 1920

CANANDAIGUA, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bobowiec, Capt. Basil B.	Adams, Mass.	June 21, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Cinder, 1st Lt. Julius	New York City	Jan. 11, 1913	Mar. 1, 1943
Constantine, Capt. Oleinick P.	Luchyn, Poland	Oct. 22, 1908	Sept. 25, 1943
Dell Cort, Capt. Amerigo P.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 18, 1907	July 8, 1940
Levy, Maj. Edwin M.	St. Mary Parish, La.	June 17, 1895	Mar. 7, 1930
Ranno, Capt. Frederick S.	New York City	June 5, 1910	May 1, 1941
Rubin, Maj. Emanuel	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 6, 1904	Jan. 16, 1935
Slocum, Capt. Yudell K.	Clifton Forge, Va.	June 5, 1904	Oct. 19, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Borden, Parker G.	Downesville, N. Y.	Jan. 16, 1879	(?)
Hansen, Hans	Denmark	Mar. 24, 1878	Jan. 15, 1923
Mueller, Donald F.	Dyersville, Iowa	Feb. 18, 1912	June 1, 1942
Wafer, Raymond F.	Hornell, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1880	Jan. 7, 1928

CASTLE POINT, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Ballou, Maj. DeForrest, Jr.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Mar. 21, 1885	June 15, 1925
Bates, Col. Carleton	New Jersey	Dec. 30, 1883	June 16, 1919
Beloff, Capt. Lewis	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 23, 1912	July 1, 1942
Emma, Capt. Edwin	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 14, 1912	Mar. 2, 1942
Goldstein, Capt. Leon	do	Sept. 23, 1914	Do.
Greer, Maj. Rex E.	Woodford, Okla.	Jan. 13, 1907	Sept. 16, 1938
Hartman, Capt. Joseph	Pap, Hungary	Mar. 11, 1906	Feb. 2, 1942
Huenagel, Lt. Col. Charles J.	Dale, Ind.	Feb. 17, 1888	Jan. 17, 1936
Lande, Maj. Frank	Brest-Litovsk, Russia	Apr. 2, 1888	Feb. 24, 1931
Lerner, Capt. George	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 4, 1906	Mar. 1, 1938
Schumann, 1st Lt. David P.	Jersey City, N. J.	Feb. 25, 1913	Jan. 17, 1944
Tedesco, Maj. Joseph F.	New York City, N. Y.	Sept. 23, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Travisano, Maj. Anthony	Palcrews, Italy	July 21, 1890	Mar. 1, 1928
Civilian medical officers:			
Androsky, George	Austria	Feb. 12, 1869	Nov. 13, 1944
Brosin, James	Ireland	Nov. 11, 1877	July 13, 1922
Keirans, James E.	Williamantio, Conn.	Aug. 8, 1888	Mar. 21, 1928
Michelson, Nicholas	Riga, Latvia	Dec. 3, 1897	July 3, 1944
Sloat, Harrison	Watertown, N. Y.	July 20, 1878	Feb. 12, 1922

¹ June 24, 1920; May 1, 1927; Sept. 4, 1927.

CHEYENNE, WYO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allegretti, Lt. Col. Anthony J.	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 1, 1907	Mar. 19, 1936
Clarke, Capt. Edward J.	Anselma, Nebr.	July 25, 1898	Nov. 2, 1931
Glucksman, Capt. Herbert Y.	Bronx, N. Y.	Aug. 16, 1914	Nov. 1, 1941
Griffin, Maj. Jack B.	El Reno, Okla.	May 15, 1912	Oct. 1, 1940
Steele, Maj. Ashby B.	Benton, Ark.	Nov. 8, 1901	Mar. 1, 1931
Stone, Capt. Calvin F.	Chicago, Ill.	Sept. 19, 1910	Nov. 16, 1942
Winsberg, Maj. James A.	do	May 2, 1910	Sept. 17, 1938
Civilian medical officers: Savage, Nephi H.	St. George, Utah	Feb. 19, 1892	July 1, 1944

CHICAGO, ILL., AREA NO. 6

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Bisdorf, Mathias	Cologne, Germany	June 3, 1881	Jan. 24, 1944
Goeder, Will	St. Paul, Minn.	Aug. 1, 1881	Mar. 16, 1945
Margolis, David	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 3, 1893	Sept. 22, 1919

CHILLICOTHE, OHIO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Ashmore, Capt. Buell L.	Hopkins County, Ky.	Dec. 4, 1889	Mar. 30, 1927
Esposito, Capt. Albert C.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nov. 9, 1912	Oct. 16, 1939
Futrelle, Lt. Col. Walter E.	Conway, N. C.	Nov. 10, 1886	May 11, 1931
Halle, Capt. Louis	New York City	July 28, 1908	Feb. 2, 1942
Hanus, Capt. Joseph J.	Bryan, Tex.	Dec. 31, 1898	July 1, 1942
Hyman, Capt. Barnett M.	No record available	June 12, 1908	Oct. 1, 1940
Kravetz, Capt. Irwin	Jersey City, N. J.	Dec. 19, 1913	Feb. 3, 1941
Kruglik, Capt. Meyer	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 3, 1914	Feb. 2, 1942
Madden, Maj. Arthur B.	New York City	Apr. 4, 1894	Feb. 28, 1938
Sharp, Maj. William T.	Kimberly, W. Va.	June 29, 1907	Sept. 23, 1937
Tanner, Capt. Henry	New York City	Feb. 15, 1904	Sept. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Garrett, Ephraim Spencer, Jr.	Mount Willing, Ala.	Nov. 3, 1897	June 1, 1943

COATESVILLE, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allen, Maj. Adam G.	Miamisburg, Ohio	Sept. 4, 1908	Nov. 1, 1939
Horst, Capt. Elmer L.	Annville, Pa.	Dec. 2, 1912	Do.
McCullough, Capt. John D.	Solomon, Kans.	Feb. 17, 1905	Oct. 16, 1941
Polan, Maj. Simon	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 24, 1912	Nov. 9, 1939
Woods, Lt. Col. Leo G.	Birmingham, Ala.	Oct. 8, 1889	July 1, 1927
Civilian medical officers:			
Bailey, William	Lyndon, Vt.	Jan. 29, 1893	Feb. 1, 1944
Fulmer, Joseph C.	Williamsport, Pa.	Aug. 22, 1884	Feb. 25, 1921
Katzman, George M.	Ravno, Poland	Jan. 1, 1900	Mar. 16, 1942
Kotzin, Isadore	Pennsylvania	Apr. 29, 1907	Nov. 1, 1941
Miller, Clarence R.	Pacific, Mo.	Jan. 17, 1880	July 19, 1919
Podall, Harry C.	New Haven, Conn.	May 22, 1883	(?)
Civilian dental officer: Neilon, John E.	Addison, N. Y.	Jan. 18, 1891	Oct. 3, 1921

COLUMBIA, S. C.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alton, Capt. John J.	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 25, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Barnett, Maj. Roy N.	Woodmere, N. Y.	June 6, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Burger, Capt. Mortimer D.	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 25, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Butt, Capt. William J.	do	May 15, 1887	Jan. 1, 1931
Eaddy, Maj. Albert M.	Timmonsville, S. C.	May 18, 1903	Do.
Hartnett, Maj. William C.	Toledo, Ohio	June 2, 1903	July 1, 1942
Miller, Capt. Harold	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 12, 1917	Mar. 16, 1942
Potosky, Capt. Henry	New York	July 7, 1909	Feb. 17, 1939
Rosenberg, Maj. Nathan	Kansas City, Mo.	June 30, 1894	Nov. 7, 1933
Zimmerman, Maj. Solomon L.	New York City, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1912	Dec. 1, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Birch, Louis	Warsaw, Poland	Dec. 29, 1906	Do.
Coffee, Henry Daniel	Ashland, Ga.	Dec. 20, 1886	May 4, 1925
Ruoff, John Sebastian	Natchez, Miss.	Aug. 15, 1889	Aug. 1, 1925
Smarr, Roy G.	Sharon, S. C.	Aug. 29, 1909	June 1, 1944
Woods, Jackson F.	Irene, S. C.	Apr. 25, 1896	Mar. 1, 1931
Commissioned dental officers:			
Richards, Maj. Paul E.	Eagletown, Ind.	Aug. 13, 1895	Oct. 19, 1931
Taylor, Capt. William F.	do	July 9, 1895	Dec. 17, 1930

¹ July 15, 1921, to June 11, 1925.

COLUMBIA, S. C.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Fishburne, Skottowe B.....	Williamsburg County, S. C.	Nov. 27, 1875	June 16, 1922
Foster, Ralph K.....	Lancaster, S. C.	May 11, 1884	Jan. 18, 1944
Hall, Price B.....	Belmont, N. C.	Apr. 14, 1880	Mar. 2, 1944

COLUMBUS, OHIO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Hendman, Samuel.			
	Iberia, Ohio.....	Dec. 23, 1879	Aug. 22, 1921

DALLAS, TEX.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Freed, Maj. Harold.....	Lithuania.....	Dec. 28, 1890	Apr. 3, 1924
Fromm, Capt. Charles S.....	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 7, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Lipschultz, Capt. Bernard M.	do.	Nov. 14, 1912	May 1, 1941
Magruder, Lt. Col. Charles	Monrovia, Md.	June 23, 1891	Jan. 17, 1925
Mock, Maj. Ernest L.....	Bluffton, Ind.	Oct. 9, 1896	Sept. 1, 1936
Powell, Maj. Homer.....	Brownwood, Tex.	Oct. 4, 1889	Sept. 18, 1922
Sazama, Capt. John J., Jr.	Chicago, Ill.	Aug. 20, 1911	Jan. 16, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Beckman, Monroe A.....	Oldenburg, Tex.	Aug. 8, 1888	Nov. 1, 1944
Karras, Ray.....	No record available.	Oct. 4, 1888	Dec. 1, 1919
Ratton, Edgar.....	Clay, Miss.	June 18, 1886	June 16, 1928
Rowe, Forsythe.....	Hillsboro, Tex.	Aug. 18, 1893	Sept. 13, 1922
Standifer, Charles H.....	Bastrop County, Tex.	Oct. 15, 1882	Aug. 16, 1926
Stephenson, William O.....	Corinth, Miss.	July 26, 1873	Feb. 3, 1944
Commissioned dental officer:			
Powell, Capt. Daron H.	Eulogy, Tex.	Aug. 26, 1895	Aug. 21, 1928
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Booth, Carleton.....	Macomb, Ill.	July 9, 1871	Feb. 11, 1944
Gooden, Thomas M.....	Stephenville, Tex.	Nov. 4, 1887	Jan. 2, 1945
Maxwell, Samuel A.....	Dubuque County, Iowa.	Jan. 27, 1872	Mar. 12, 1945
McBride, James T.....	Belleville, Ill.	Aug. 2, 1871	Nov. 4, 1943
Usury, Ralcligh S.....	Calhoun County, Ala.	Feb. 11, 1885	Apr. 1, 1944

DANVILLE, ILL.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cancellieri, Capt. Remo.....	New York, N. Y.	Nov. 12, 1907	Nov. 2, 1942
Elledge, Maj. Lloyd C.....	Cincinnati, Ohio.	Feb. 2, 1898	Sept. 1, 1925
Klemmer, Maj. Herbert.....	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 19, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Lipkin, Capt. Sam J.....	Milwaukee, Wis.	Dec. 28, 1908	Oct. 6, 1938
Prata, Capt. Michael.....	New York, N. Y.	Mar. 29, 1903	Jan. 4, 1943
Rothman, Capt. Harold.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 27, 1913	Dec. 1, 1941
Werba, Maj. Daniel R.....	Milwaukee, Wis.	Dec. 22, 1898	Mar. 16, 1927
Workman, Capt. Abraham D.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 30, 1911	Feb. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Rice, George D.....		Aug. 31, 1880	Apr. 7, 1924
Rowland, George.....	Delaware, Ohio.	Jan. 17, 1879	July 1, 1919
Thompson, John J.....	Ontario, Canada.	Oct. 26, 1879	May 26, 1924
Commissioned dental officers:			
Abraham, First Lt. Ray T.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Sept. 17, 1906	Mar. 13, 1942
Burke, Capt. John J.....	St. Louis, Mo.	Oct. 11, 1888	Nov. 20, 1920

DAYTON, OHIO

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abramson, Maj. William.....	No record available.	Aug. —, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Arduino, Capt. Lino J.....	Centerville, Iowa.	Dec. 18, 1914	Oct. 16, 1939
Barnett, Maj. Abner J.....	Carthage, Miss.	Oct. 21, 1892	May 8, 1931
Brogan, Maj. Austin J.....	Archibald, Pa.	Jan. 29, 1905	Jan. 20, 1938
Brown, Lt. Col. Robert N.	Johnson City, Tenn.	June 17, 1903	July 16, 1930
Burton, Lt. Col. Claud C.	Louisville, Ky.	Mar. 24, 1897	July 5, 1921
Camp, Capt. Walter H.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 31, 1913	Dec. 2, 1940
Caruso, Capt. Rocco J.....	Newark, N. J.	Nov. 27, 1897	Apr. 1, 1942
Chazin, Capt. Benjamin J.	Lubar, Russia.	July 8, 1901	Dec. 1, 1941
Colangelo, Capt. Cornelius C.	United States of America.	Nov. 9, 1915	May 1, 1941
Davis, Capt. James S.....	Boston, Mass.	June 22, 1913	Feb. 2, 1942
Dugdale, Capt. Frederick E.	Lowell, Mass.	May 28, 1906	Dec. 1, 1941
Einhorn, Capt. Harry.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 11, 1909	Oct. 1, 1940
De Rago, Capt. Clifford L.	New York City.	Nov. 28, 1908	Dec. 29, 1944
Eisenberg, Capt. Joseph A.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Aug. 27, 1908	Jan. 3, 1939
Garner, Capt. Amos D.....	Paragould, Ark.	Sept. 22, 1913	June 1, 1942
Holsinger, Capt. Robert E.	Washington, Ind.	Feb. 12, 1906	Mar. 2, 1942
Nolan, Maj. Don E.....	Beardsley, Minn.	Sept. 21, 1905	Oct. 5, 1938

DAYTON, OHIO—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Rhodes, Capt. Marvin P.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 15, 1911	May 1, 1941
Robertson, Maj. Robert C.	Republic, Mo.	Aug. 6, 1883	Sept. 16, 1925
Royal, Maj. Warren M.....	Georgia.	Jan. 7, 1885	Aug. 10, 1924
Schillinger, Lt. Col. Edward N.	Covington, Ohio.	Oct. 6, 1869	May 15, 1919
Speier, Capt. Aaron S.....	Crete, Nebr.	Jan. 20, 1898	Mar. 16, 1942
Stewart, Maj. Edgar A.....	Quincy, Ill.	May 6, 1881	Apr. 16, 1927
Thomas, Capt. Maurice C.	New York City, N. Y.	Apr. 7, 1902	Mar. 1, 1943
Zollett, Capt. Phillip B.....	Russia.	Apr. 10, 1903	May 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Brown, Arthur M.....	Cherokee, Iowa.	Dec. 31, 1881	May 10, 1920
Garltitz, Arnold.....	No record available.	Feb. 15, 1874	Apr. 15, 1928
Gillam, Anna J.....	Worcester, Mass.	July 4, 1883	Sept. 1, 1944
Hynes, Joseph C.....	St. Louis, Mo.	Dec. 4, 1878	Apr. 17, 1923
Lockwood, Kenneth L.....	Covington, Ky.	Jan. 30, 1896	Oct. 16, 1944
Perkins, Rufin.....	La Fourche Parish, La.	Jan. 5, 1880	Nov. 10, 1919
Reichard, Simon.....	Mauch Chunk, Pa.	June 8, 1878	June 1, 1921
Schiffer, Harry.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 5, 1908	Jan. 4, 1943
Sullivan, Claude.....	Zebulon, Ga.	Jan. 6, 1895	Aug. 1, 1923
Commissioned dental officers:			
Dailey, Lt. Frank L., USNR.	Larchmont, N. Y.	May 21, 1887	May 4, 1937
Linek, Capt. George A.....	Leavenworth, Kans.	Nov. 24, 1899	Aug. 1, 1930
Pytrfin, Maj. Sherman A.	Connorsville, Ind.	June 25, 1896	Jan. 20, 1924
Civilian dental officer: Fain, Henry G.			
	Atlanta, Ga.	Apr. 14, 1884	June 12, 1929
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
George, Raymond.....	Woodford, Ill.	July 4, 1883	Jan. 16, 1930
Kitsmiller, Clyde A.....	New Albany, Ohio.	Mar. 5, 1872	Oct. 1, 1943
Neidhamer, Claude.....	Indianapolis, Ind.	June 18, 1891	July 1, 1931

DEARBORN, MICH.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Caputo, Maj. Joseph M.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.	June 20, 1906	Sept. 7, 1937
Fitzporter, Maj. Alonzo L.	St. Louis, Mo.	July 23, 1884	May 1, 1931
Fox, Maj. Morris E.....	Malin, Russia.	Dec. 22, 1908	Apr. 17, 1939
Frassette, Capt. John.....	Pollutri, Italy.	Nov. 15, 1907	Feb. 1, 1940
Hunter, Capt. Lawrence M.	New York City, N. Y.	June 7, 1905	June 1, 1942
Kamin, Capt. Louis.....	Slutz, Russia.	Mar. 16, 1896	Apr. 2, 1938
Levin, Capt. Myron J.....	Los Angeles, Calif.	Mar. 6, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Marcus, Maj. Ernest.....	Detroit, Mich.	July 8, 1909	Jan. 17, 1938
Nuzzolo, Capt. Charles A.	Paterson, N. J.	July 12, 1908	Nov. 2, 1942
Rothman, Maj. Herman R.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nov. 25, 1904	Feb. 1, 1934
Schlusser, Maj. Maurice J.	Austria.	July 15, 1907	Dec. 18, 1933
Varco, Capt. Benedict William.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Sept. 26, 1904	Oct. 1, 1940
Waters, Lt. Col. Pattison A.	Denver, Colo.	Nov. 23, 1892	May 1, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Barnes, Van D.....	Fayette, Ohio.	Mar. 4, 1892	Sept. 16, 1930
Ekkins, Fred J.....	Robards, Ky.	July 27, 1886	Apr. 1, 1935
Howell, James A.....	Grant City, Mo.	Mar. 29, 1892	Aug. 2, 1922
Makman, Saul H.....	Akron, Ohio.	Nov. 8, 1898	Feb. 1, 1924
Smith, Clifton H.....	Underhill, Vt.	July 6, 1889	Nov. 1, 1919
Commissioned dental officers:			
Baker, Capt. William J.....	Denver, Colo.	Mar. 20, 1894	Dec. 17, 1927
Jacobson, Capt. Clarence R.	Tracy, Minn.	Jan. 28, 1894	July 1, 1929
Pawl, 1st Lt. Earle E.....	Marrissa, Ill.	Oct. 11, 1887	Nov. 4, 1943
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Hopkins, Samuel R.....	Delavan, Ill.	Oct. 25, 1876	Oct. 8, 1928
Troxler, William E.....	Greensboro, N. C.	June 18, 1895	Nov. 7, 1921

DENVER, COLO.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Black, Maj. Walter A.....	Mount Pleasant, Tex.	Jan. 15, 1888	Jan. 15, 1923
Breitzer, Capt. Bernard.....	New York City.	July 26, 1908	Aug. 1, 1938
Fricke, Capt. Fred J.....	Aloe City, Nebr.	Nov. 23, 1906	Mar. 27, 1936
Rosenberg, 1st Lt. Saul.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Feb. 18, 1912	Nov. 10, 1943
Civilian medical officer: Partington, Cyrus.			
	Fall River, Mass.	Dec. 12, 1883	May 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer:			
Lomax, Capt. Clifford C.	Bristow, Ind.	Oct. 16, 1892	Apr. 8, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian Medical officer: Boe, Roy A.			
	Soldier, Iowa.	Nov. 25, 1900	Nov. 4, 1940

DES MOINES, IOWA

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bielinski, Capt. Stefan	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 17, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Bogan, Lt. Col. Robert J.	Utica, N. Y.	Sept. 16, 1898	Sept. 4, 1930
Carrow, Capt. Roland A.	Goodrich, Ill.	Feb. 18, 1900	Mar. 16, 1942
Everist, Maj. Guy V.	Marshalltown, Iowa	Aug. 30, 1908	June 22, 1937
Frien, Capt. James J.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 16, 1914	June 15, 1942
Hoffman, Maj. Clifford W.	Laurel, Ind.	Oct. 3, 1896	June 17, 1940
Miller, Maj. Dwight F.	Portland, Ore.	Mar. 12, 1888	Feb. 18, 1938
Peck, Maj. Hyman	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1908	Jan. 15, 1940
Samberg, Capt. Harry H.	do.	Sept. 30, 1904	Feb. 3, 1941
Wollenman, Maj. Max Joseph	Ferdinand, Ind.	May 30, 1901	Aug. 5, 1930
Civilian medical officers:			
Clark, Burton	Sheridan, Mo.	Mar. 19, 1877	Jan. 1, 1928
Drysdale, William T.	Punjab, India	July 27, 1882	Jan. 1, 1931
Larimore, Ogh T.	Clifton, Kans.	Feb. 27, 1894	Feb. 12, 1930
Nadig, Clyde M.	Elizabeth, Ill.	June 9, 1905	Oct. 1, 1940
Civilian dental officers:			
Akin, Hamilton I.	Chicago, Ill.	July 11, 1896	Nov. 15, 1943
Baldwin, John W.	Le Raysville, Tenn.	Nov. 21, 1888	July 23, 1928
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Corbin, Capt. Ray L.	Norway, Iowa	Oct. 17, 1897	Jan. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Brown, Harry W.	Waterloo, Iowa	Aug. 9, 1880	Mar. 16, 1944
Trotter, William	Eddyville, Iowa	Sept. 17, 1880	Oct. 9, 1944

DOWNEY, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Benson, Maj. George B.	Richland Center, Wis.	Sept. 14, 1902	July 8, 1940
Delong, Maj. Edward E.	Chicago, Ill.	Dec. 9, 1909	Feb. 9, 1939
Gallo, Capt. William C.	New York, N. Y.	July 16, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Golob, Capt. Meyer E.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 2, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Goode, Col. Delmar	Myrtle, Miss.	Feb. 17, 1889	June 21, 1923
Green, Maj. John W.	West, Miss.	Mar. 28, 1889	Jan. 19, 1931
Mason, Maj. Aaron S.	Russia	Mar. 3, 1911	Nov. 3, 1938
Rodriguez, Lt. Col. Antonio	Puerto Rico	Dec. 22, 1893	Apr. 17, 1919
Simonson, Capt. Melvin	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 21, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Wood, Maj. Lorin F., Jr.	East Hampton, Conn.	Mar. 3, 1885	June 1, 1925
Civilian medical officers:			
Erps, Benjamin	Hungary	Apr. 15, 1892	Dec. 15, 1930
Robie, Andrew	Manferd, N. Dak.	June 30, 1896	Mar. 1, 1945
Civilian dental officers:			
Crossey, William	Louisville, Ky.	May 24, 1880	July 20, 1926
Feldman, Benjamin L.	Chicago, Ill.	July 1, 1909	June 1, 1942

DWIGHT, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Crowell, Maj. Marvin	Scotland, Ark.	Sept. 27, 1896	Oct. 3, 1935
Harvey, Capt. Salmon C.	New York City, N. Y.	Nov. 14, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Kendall, Lt. Col. William E.	Mason City, Ill.	Mar. 17, 1884	Sept. 4, 1929
Knudson, Maj. Alvin B. C.	Waubay, S. Dak.	June 28, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Raich, Maj. John A.	Kansas City, Mo.	Mar. 16, 1901	Aug. 8, 1935
Schmerer, Capt. Frederick	New York City, N. Y.	Dec. 22, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officer:			
Taylor, Septimus Theodore	South Carolina, Ky.	June 1, 1879	Dec. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer:			
Durke, Capt. Eugene W.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Jan. 7, 1896	May 24, 1937

EXCELSIOR SPRINGS, MO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Altomare, Capt. Edward P.	New York City, N. Y.	Dec. 23, 1911	Mar. 10, 1942
Bell, Lt. Col. Forrest G.	Illinois	Feb. 28, 1892	May 26, 1936
Glasser, Capt. Joseph	Warsaw, Poland	July 1, 1910	May 1, 1941
Glasser, Maj. Seymour	New York, N. Y.	May 27, 1909	Jan. 20, 1939
Keller, Capt. Louis	do.	July 25, 1906	Nov. 1, 1939
Kozinn, Capt. Philip J.	Poland	Sept. 6, 1912	Nov. 2, 1942
Mantell, Maj. Francis J.	Laurel, Miss.	Mar. 2, 1903	July 19, 1930
Netzer, Maj. Solomon	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 22, 1900	Mar. 16, 1942
Echnif, Maj. Burnett	New Haven, Conn.	May 14, 1908	Dec. 2, 1940
Tapp, Lt. Col. Ernest M.	West Mansfield, Ohio	May 28, 1904	Dec. 3, 1931
Trippodi, Maj. Donald W.	Italy	Nov. 14, 1894	Sept. 16, 1940
Civilian dental officer:			
Adams, Leo J.	Bainesville, Ohio	Feb. 28, 1892	Jan. 15, 1923

FARGO, N. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Diamond, Capt. Jack L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 2, 1909	Sept. 1, 1938
Einterz, Capt. George F.	New York City, N. Y.	June 2, 1914	Feb. 3, 1941
Herman, Maj. Lester R.	Cende, S. Dak.	Mar. 18, 1891	Dec. 11, 1930

FARGO, N. DAK. continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—COR.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Manaugh, Maj. Hursel C.	Lexington, Ind.	Dec. 13, 1899	Jan. 4, 1932
Rosen, Capt. Michael	New York City, N. Y.	Jan. 12, 1905	Mar. 12, 1936
Smith, Lt. Col. Clifton H.	Underhill, Vt.	July 6, 1885	Nov. 1, 1919
Tyson, Maj. John J.	Ayden, N. C.	Oct. 12, 1891	Sept. 18, 1934
Commissioned dental officer:			
Hauser, Capt. Walter C.	Anaconda, Mont.	July 10, 1895	Sept. 24, 1931

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Kaufman, Capt. Benjamin M.	Manhattan, N. Y.	July 7, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Kleiman, Maj. Aaron H.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1908	Jan. 16, 1939
Levine, Capt. Daniel I.	New York City, N. Y.	Jan. 26, 1911	Mar. 16, 1942
Lening, Capt. Howell E.	Dardanelle, Ark.	Jan. 16, 1900	Sept. 16, 1929
Tompkins, Lt. Col. Raymond D.	Lewiston, Ill.	Jan. 3, 1884	June 13, 1921
Wolkin, Capt. Abraham	Newark, N. J.	Oct. 18, 1909	Oct. 1, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Delaney, Joseph P.	Green Bay, Wis.	May 24, 1887	Aug. 1, 1930
Gordon, Frank N.	Savannah, Ga.	Apr. 12, 1879	Jan. 1, 1920
Shafer, Frank N.	No record available	Dec. 3, 1876	Sept. 1, 1926
Civilian dental officer:			
Knox, Frank D.	Hannibal, Mo.	May 19, 1893	Jan. 15, 1921

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baird, Maj. John A.	Fusen, Korea	Oct. 12, 1894	Sept. 1, 1931
Ebel, Capt. Alfred	Austria	Apr. 5, 1907	July 8, 1940
Hoot, Maj. Melvin P.	Arkansas City, Kans.	May 7, 1909	Dec. 2, 1941
Scott, Maj. Thomas G.	Norwood, Ohio	Oct. 2, 1897	Mar. 13, 1936
Selkoff, Capt. Solomon J.	Kiev, Russia	Mar. 12, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Stein, Capt. Elias	New York City, N. Y.	Aug. 16, 1910	Dec. 5, 1940
Walker, Lt. Col. Starnes E.	Milan, Tenn.	Mar. 15, 1887	May 15, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Corbett, Lucy W.	Bishopville, S. C.	Feb. 12, 1890	Jan. 2, 1931
Everett, Jesse J.	Resaca, Ga.	Sept. 4, 1880	(^o)
Moore, Baxter S.	Chester, S. C.	Feb. 18, 1879	Oct. 1, 1928
Rachlin, Stanton A.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 29, 1907	July 7, 1936
Turner, John W.	Milwaukee, Wis.	June 21, 1880	Dec. 16, 1919
Weirick, Albert J.	Marselles, Ill.	Dec. 19, 1877	(^o)
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer:			
Lazzenby, Earl K.	Thompson, Ga.	Sept. 25, 1886	Oct. 10, 1929

FORT BAYARD, N. MEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Crays, Capt. William H.	Loogootee, Ind.	Nov. 14, 1906	Nov. 1, 1939
Keeler, Maj. Charles C.	Oskaloosa, Iowa	Sept. 2, 1882	Mar. 2, 1924
Klein, Capt. Harold	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 25, 1910	June 5, 1941
Lazar, Maj. Harry	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 5, 1908	Oct. 10, 1938
Marby, Capt. George W.	Terre Haute, Ind.	May 27, 1914	June 15, 1942
Nalty, Lt. Col. Walter C.	Paola, Kans.	Feb. 20, 1899	Aug. 13, 1929
Walker, Lt. Col. Albert G.	Thomaston, Maine	Feb. 4, 1883	Mar. 10, 1920
Zausner, Maj. Joseph	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 27, 1910	Sept. 16, 1941
Commissioned dental officers:			
Morene, Capt. Albert	Portland, Ore.	Nov. 11, 1897	Oct. 15, 1935

FORT CUSTER, MICH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baden, Capt. David D.	Cleveland, Ohio	Mar. 18, 1898	Apr. 1, 1944
Herman, Capt. Louis	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 15, 1907	May 1, 1941
Maniscalco, Capt. Anthony E.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Apr. 4, 1911	Sept. 16, 1942
Nunez, Capt. Edgar O.	Grenada, British West Indies	Dec. 17, 1903	June 1, 1942
Olsen, Maj. Albert L.	Richfield, Utah	Oct. 12, 1904	Apr. 1, 1938
Orr, Maj. Eli B.	Mount Erie, Ill.	May 1, 1898	Mar. 2, 1931
Schwartz, Maj. Frank W.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 21, 1887	Jan. 16, 1923
Toms, Lt. Col. Roland E.	Williamston, Mich.	Nov. 4, 1889	Apr. 1, 1921
Weintraub, Capt. Arthur	Odeesa, Russia	May 21, 1907	Dec. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officer:			
Hentz, Roger P.	Courtland, Miss.	Dec. 20, 1884	Dec. 15, 1921
Commissioned dental officer:			
Lundblad, 1st Lt. Clarence H.	St. Paul, Minn.	May 18, 1893	Sept. 16, 1943
Civilian dental officer:			
Stevens, Edward	Duluth, Minn.	Sept. 16, 1861	July 24, 1940

^o Sept. 27, 1922, to Dec. 30, 1922; Mar. 30, 1925.
^o Mar. 16, 1922, to Jan. 31, 1927; May 1, 1931.

FORT HARRISON, MONT.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Faust, Capt. Joseph M.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Dec. 19, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Fitzgibbons, Capt. Thomas G.	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Jan. 10, 1895	June 1, 1942
Gier, Capt. Jacob B.	Russia	Jan. 10, 1903	Oct. 21, 1935
Harmon, Maj. George A.	Rigby, route No. 1, Idaho	Aug. 3, 1897	Dec. 7, 1937
Hines, Maj. Ralph E.	Leavenworth, Kans.	Dec. 16, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Perkins, Maj. John N.	No record available	Feb. 13, 1892	Jan. 15, 1923
White, Maj. William E.	do	Mar. 9, 1888	Jan. 6, 1925
Civilian medical officer: Tremblay, Julian L.			
Commissioned dental officer: Jones, Capt. Guy H.	Stewart, Minn.	Nov. 3, 1886	June 20, 1931
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Fortin, William H.	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 13, 1880	Feb. 1, 1923

FORT HOWARD, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Balter, Lt. Col. Abraham M.	Vilna, Poland	Nov. 12, 1908	May 12, 1931
Brackin, Capt. John T., Jr.	Lansdowne, Pa.	Jan. 1, 1910	Nov. 16, 1942
Cullison, Maj. Robert M.	Montezuma, Iowa	Nov. 2, 1891	Nov. 16, 1937
Fleck, Lt. Col. Warren LeRoy.	Neola, Iowa	Feb. 28, 1889	Aug. 30, 1924
Hurwitz, Capt. Abraham B.	Baltimore, Md.	Apr. 4, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Ochs, Capt. Irving L.	Syracuse, N. Y.	Dec. 1, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Richards, Maj. Hyrum Y.	Ferry, Utah	Aug. 5, 1886	Sept. 28, 1931
Roberts, Capt. David A.	Morganfield, Ky.	Sept. 30, 1903	Mar. 17, 1936
Ryan, Maj. Francis J.	Hartford, Conn.	May 24, 1909	Mar. 18, 1939
Zuravin, Capt. Meyer H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 20, 1907	Mar. 1, 1943
Commissioned dental officers:			
Eastman, Capt. James B.	Winchester, Ind.	Nov. 24, 1890	July 29, 1920
Rosser, First Lt. Eli B.	Edwardsville, Pa.	May 22, 1894	May 24, 1944
Civilian medical officer: Mason, Frank E.			
	Easton, Md.	Feb. 18, 1893	Sept. 1, 1920

FORT LYON, COLO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Chat, Capt. Emanuel	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 13, 1909	July 16, 1942
Jackson, Maj. Benjamin F.	Ozark, Ala.	Dec. 29, 1899	Oct. 6, 1930
Mace, Maj. Norman C.	Portland, Ore.	June 8, 1902	Apr. 18, 1931
Shrout, Col. Cecil B.	Bunton, Mo.	Oct. 31, 1891	May 1, 1920
Weinstock, Capt. Adolph	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 24, 1913	May 1, 1941
Wharton, Maj. Russell S.	Marysville, Ohio	Sept. 15, 1894	Sept. 4, 1931
Civilian medical officer: Kimball, Isham.			
Civilian dental officer: Grado-ville, Charles M.	Plattsmouth, Nebr.	Dec. 8, 1895	Dec. 1, 1931

FORT MEADE, S. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Fox, Capt. Thomas H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 12, 1907	Oct. 27, 1937
Kaney, Capt. Emil M.	Kiev, Russia	May 22, 1906	June 15, 1942
Lewis, Maj. Claud	Bible Grove, Ill.	Mar. 27, 1898	Feb. 17, 1931
McLin, Lt. Col. Thomas G.	Fairfield, Ill.	Apr. 17, 1882	Oct. 25, 1924
Peifer, Peter A.	Louisville, Ky.	Apr. 3, 1902	Mar. 6, 1945
Civilian medical officer: Olson, William E.			
Commissioned dental officer: Marsh, Capt. Robert E.	Bellingham, Wash.	Feb. 28, 1907	Mar. 1, 1941

FORT WASHINGTON, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Smart, Maj. James	Chesterfield, Va.	July 10, 1893	Jan. 21, 1926
Werner, Capt. Merrill J.	Golconda, Ill.	Mar. 26, 1904	Feb. 23, 1938
Civilian medical officer: Benson, Charles Prue.			
	Woolers Rest, S. C.	Apr. 1, 1879	Mar. 16, 1931

GULFPORT, MISS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Dunn, Capt. Maurice	Zitomir, Russia	Dec. 9, 1910	Oct. 16, 1939
Hodges, Maj. Robert	Austria	May 24, 1883	Dec. 17, 1934
Hughes, Maj. James A.	Jearoldtown, Tenn.	Sept. 16, 1901	June 18, 1935
Miller, Maj. Saul D.	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 28, 1906	May 1, 1941
Sheffer, Col. Gettis T.	Dorsey, Miss.	Jan. 1, 1883	Mar. 1, 1927
Winick, Maj. William	New Castle, Pa.	July 15, 1904	July 1, 1938
Wright, Lt. Col. Frederick L.	Stanford, Ontario	Dec. 7, 1883	Nov. 1, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Davidian, Hagop	Afion-Karahissar, Asia Minor	Aug. 5, 1877	(1)
Suraci, Francis X.	Washington, D. C.	Sept. 18, 1902	(2)
Commissioned dental officer: Grau, Capt. Adolph E.			
	No record available	Jan. 20, 1884	Aug. 14, 1922

HINES, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alexander, Capt. Howard G.	Snyder, Tex.	Mar. 4, 1907	Sept. 30, 1938
Andrew, Maj. Lloyd Brumund.	Table Rock, Nebr.	Sept. 7, 1896	Jan. 19, 1937
Baker, Lt. Col. Lyle A.	Greenfield, Iowa	Sept. 13, 1904	Dec. 12, 1931
Baumrucker, Capt. George O.	No record available	July 3, 1905	Dec. 20, 1943
Burstein, Capt. Harry	New York City, N. Y.	July 11, 1909	Mar. 2, 1942
Bush, Capt. Mitchell W.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 8, 1909	Sept. 16, 1942
Caffee, Col. William M.	Marion, Ala.	Feb. 23, 1890	Dec. 27, 1944
Colton, Col. Warren A.	Vernal, Utah	Mar. 29, 1883	Mar. 17, 1923
Fershing, Maj. Jennings	New York City, N. Y.	Dec. 5, 1914	June 15, 1942
Frankel, Maj. Joseph J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Aug. 4, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Freeman, Maj. Bromley S.	New York City, N. Y.	May 23, 1912	Jan. 16, 1939
Givner, Capt. David	Baltimore, Md.	June 1, 1903	Mar. 17, 1941
Greenberg, Capt. Arthur	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Apr. 22, 1913	Sept. 16, 1942
Grossman, Capt. Maurice O.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 17, 1910	Apr. 1, 1942
Iger, First Lt. Mortimer	Bronx, N. Y.		Nov. 15, 1943
Keser, Maj. Benjamin H.		Jan. 7, 1904	Nov. 29, 1939
Kline, Capt. Philip S.	Guadalajara, Mexico	Aug. 19, 1910	Aug. 2, 1941
Kooperman, Capt. Myer	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 2, 1911	Feb. 3, 1941
Kulvin, Maj. Max M.	do	Aug. 15, 1891	Feb. 11, 1931
Lane, Maj. John T.	San Antonio, Tex.	Dec. 11, 1911	Jan. 18, 1939
Lipson, Maj. Henry I.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 29, 1908	Oct. 3, 1938
McClanahan, Lt. Col. Charles W.		Sept. 9, 1891	May 16, 1924
McCue, Capt. Daniel J.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Aug. 26, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
McNamara, Lt. Col. William L.	Vienna, S. Dak.	Nov. 28, 1898	Sept. 23, 1930
Mednick, Capt. Edward D.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 17, 1944	June 15, 1942
Mitchell, Capt. Holland C.	New York City, N. Y.	Oct. 7, 1906	Feb. 19, 1941
Musgrave, Capt. David E.	Seattle, Wash.	July 25, 1908	Aug. 1, 1941
Phillips, Maj. Roy	Cincinnati, Ohio	Feb. 2, 1891	Jan. 30, 1931
Quamme, Capt. Roy K.	Bottineau, N. Dak.	June 21, 1905	Jan. 1, 1941
Quenzer, Capt. Fred August.	Chicago, Ill.	May 29, 1912	Aug. 3, 1939
Sackdorf, Capt. Harry	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 21, 1906	Mar. 16, 1942
Schrek, Maj. Robert	do	Dec. 28, 1907	Nov. 4, 1937
Silver, Capt. Saul L.	do	Oct. 2, 1909	Jan. 15, 1940
Slobodin, Maj. Harry	do	Feb. 7, 1909	May 17, 1937
Stephenson, Capt. Hack U., Jr.	Toano, Va.	Dec. 19, 1909	July 26, 1937
Stevens, Capt. Ernest J.	Santa Rosa, Calif.	Dec. 14, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
Thomas, Maj. Ralph A.	Treer, Kans.	Aug. 8, 1903	Jan. 24, 1938
Timberlake, Lt. Col. Harold P.	Demos, Ohio	Jan. 6, 1891	Mar. 1, 1920
Traub, Lt. Col. Norbert C.	Marathon, Wis.	Apr. 20, 1898	Sept. 1, 1928
Civilian medical officers:			
Alaben, Gerald R.	Argyle, Ill.	July 9, 1889	(1)
Cefai, Anthony F.	Malta (Europe)	Oct. 26, 1907	June 1, 1943
Costich, Kenneth J.	Rochester, N. Y.	Feb. 29, 1912	Sept. 26, 1938
Feldott, Harry R.	Batavia, Ill.	Feb. 1, 1895	July 14, 1919
Fitzsimmons, Joseph I.	Clinton, Iowa	Dec. 10, 1898	Sept. 23, 1930
Flynn, John F.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 17, 1895	June 9, 1928
Frow, James R.	Lewiston, Pa.	June 2, 1883	Aug. 14, 1928
Funkhouser, Ralph M.	Indiana	Aug. 14, 1884	June 11, 1921
Gbhurezyk, Frank H.	Joliet, Ill.	Jan. 19, 1894	Sept. 8, 1920
Graham, Albert P.	Early, Iowa	Jan. 2, 1905	Jan. 10, 1938
Haefner, Albert W.	Knoxville, Iowa	Nov. 7, 1881	Aug. 16, 1944
Hemminger, John R.	Somerset, Pa.	Oct. 7, 1875	Aug. 16, 1944
Kipnis, Harry	Russia (naturalized)	Dec. 17, 1905	May 4, 1931
Williams, Albert	Madelay, England	Mar. 15, 1881	Oct. 1, 1927
Krasner, Leonard	Newark, N. J.	June 15, 1908	Aug. 1, 1940
Lenowitz, Herman	Russia	Mar. 4, 1897	Dec. 8, 1939
Ludwig, Dorothy B.	Cernauti, Rumania	Nov. 16, 1909	Aug. 16, 1944
Maloy, Bernard S.	Rensselaer, Ind.	Jan. 3, 1874	Sept. 11, 1944

1 July 17, 1925, to Jan. 15, 1926; Aug. 11, 1926.
 2 Aug. 8, 1930, to Apr. 3, 1940; Nov. 1, 1943.
 3 1922 to 1923; Feb. 1, 1932.

BINES, ILL.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officers—Con.			
Ogden, Claude H.	Cedarville, N. J.	Oct. 21, 1890	Apr. 1, 1944
Randolph, Henry E.	Raun, Ill.	May 2, 1883	Jan. 2, 1923
Rowe, Lee B.	Broadhead, Wis.	Dec. 18, 1883	Sept. 18, 1944
Rushon, James S.	No record available	Aug. 2, 1879	Oct. 15, 1924
Russell, James	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 16, 1898	Mar. 16, 1942
Shamaskin, Arnold	Russia	Aug. 22, 1881	June 26, 1940
Sherlock, William P.	Des Moines, Iowa	Apr. 30, 1884	Jan. 7, 1920
Sodard, Anthony	Italy	Mar. 17, 1884	June 19, 1944
Ward, Benjamin F.	Inez, Ky.	June 29, 1891	June 20, 1919
Weinstein, Bernard	Norwalk, Conn.	Feb. 22, 1914	Feb. 2, 1942
Zolia, Norman	Russia	Oct. 5, 1888	Jan. 24, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Lister, Maj. Clarence S.	Manchester, Iowa	Oct. 8, 1881	Feb. 16, 1920
Logsdon, Maj. Cale M.	Jinks, Ky.	Nov. 2, 1896	Mar. 1, 1932
Swift, Maj. Lionel V.	Stanton, Tex.	Jan. 18, 1896	Dec. 15, 1922
Civilian dental officers:			
Cheely, Walter C.	Denver, Colo.	May 31, 1884	Nov. 4, 1919
Rohner, Joseph J.	No record available	Nov. 2, 1888	Feb. 2, 1931
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bedessem, Lt. Col. Philip M.	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 5, 1891	Apr. 23, 1920
Wilson, Capt. Nilas M.	Montgomery, Ind.	Dec. 10, 1888	Feb. 9, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Blau, James W.	Fountain Green, Ill.	Mar. 19, 1881	Apr. 6, 1944
Brown, Paul F.	Lake City, Minn.	Oct. 19, 1877	Dec. 1, 1919
Danielson, Wilford	Oseola, Nebr.	Dec. 20, 1891	(14)
Dowlat, Stanley A.	Chicago, Ill.	Aug. 2, 1901	Feb. 1, 1944
Doyle, Nicholas M.	Caledonia, Ontario	Feb. 2, 1880	Jan. 18, 1944
Goy, Michael Charles	Poland (naturalized)	Sept. 20, 1884	Jan. 24, 1944
Hurka, Robert	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	May 1, 1887	Nov. 22, 1920
Karg, Frank	Kalomys, Poland	Jan. 29, 1906	May 1, 1944
O'Neil, Dillan G.	Elgin, Ill.	June 11, 1886	Feb. 14, 1944
Pedott, Meyer S.	Russia	May 28, 1887	Jan. 17, 1944
Rategan, Edward H.	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 21, 1891	Apr. 1, 1944
Roberts, Sidney M.	do	Oct. 3, 1887	Do
Romano, John R.	Italy	July 10, 1888	Jan. 18, 1944
Stollenwerk, R. J.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Aug. 3, 1907	Nov. 1, 1943

HOT SPRINGS, S. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Campanella, Capt. Santo D.	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 26, 1908	Nov. 1, 1939
Cramer, Maj. Lloyd L.	Omaha, Nebr.	Jan. 13, 1886	Dec. 7, 1929
Jewett, Lt. Comdr. George Rae	Wabash, Ind.	Dec. 1, 1897	Apr. 24, 1935
Levin, Maj. Louis	Wilma, Russia	Oct. 29, 1903	Oct. 1, 1940
Miller, Capt. George A.	St. George, W. Va.	July 20, 1907	Jan. 15, 1940
Ogg, Lt. Col. Francis W.	Douglass, Kans.	May 30, 1884	Aug. 23, 1943
Schneider, Capt. Martin	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 15, 1913	Feb. 1, 1940
Welty, Capt. Dalton M.	Hagerstown, Md.	June 26, 1913	July 16, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Ral-			
bourn, Richard	Linnville, Ind.	Sept. 26, 1877	Mar. 30, 1920
Commissioned dental officer:			
Hanlon, Capt. John P.	Cherokee, Iowa	July 20, 1906	Nov. 12, 1938
Civilian dental officer: Rob-			
erts, Floyd J.	Rockford, Minn.	July 14, 1876	Mar. 1, 1929

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blotner, Maj. Carl	Salem, N. H.	Dec. 30, 1906	Oct. 6, 1938
Dodson, Capt. Ross	Glenville, W. Va.	Apr. 11, 1883	Nov. 12, 1921
Levine, Capt. Morris H.	Lowell, Mass.	Nov. 4, 1905	July 8, 1940
Mertz, Capt. Philip	Dupont, Pa.	Jan. 2, 1910	July 16, 1942
Pearlman, Capt. Carl Kenneth	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 18, 1908	May 1, 1941
Schnitt, Capt. Sidney	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 28, 1914	Oct. 1, 1940
Walsh, Capt. Eugene, L. B.	Hawkeye, Iowa	Sept. 21, 1906	Jan. 17, 1938
Wiesenfeld, Capt. Benjamin	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 14, 1910	Nov. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Copeland, Paul Richard	Ozark, Ill.	May 28, 1894	Oct. 10, 1920
Gellman, Irving I.	Odessa, Russia	Feb. 14, 1890	Jan. 5, 1925
Sasser, Thomas J.	Woodcliff, Ga.	Mar. 27, 1898	May 11, 1937
Willis, Carson	Bridgeport, W. Va.	Feb. 24, 1878	Nov. 5, 1921
Commissioned dental officer:			
Timken, First Lt. William H.	Rush Co., Kans.	Oct. 11, 1895	Aug. 19, 1942
Civilian dental officer: Whit-			
aker, Lee W.	Olive Branch, La.	Nov. 11, 1889	Nov. 27, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Moor-			
man, Earl	Hardinsburg, Ky.	Nov. 11, 1881	Nov. 12, 1925

¹⁴ 1921 to 1926; Sept. 20, 1943.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adams, Maj. Donald R.	Albion, Nebr.	Nov. 23, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Bown, Maj. Albert J.	Peoria, Ill.	Aug. 1, 1898	Sept. 4, 1929
Choate, Maj. Alton J.	No record	Jan. 15, 1883	Oct. 1, 1921
Finot, Maj. Philip H.	St. Louis, Mo.	July 17, 1882	July 1, 1919
Hare, Lt. Col. Earl Hazelton	Sheridan, Ind.	Aug. 26, 1890	June 5, 1922
Harmon, Capt. Jules	No record	Dec. 18, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Nowack, Capt. Henry J.	Chicago, Ill.	July 28, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Plotkin, Capt. Oscar M.	do	May 26, 1912	Sept. 20, 1938
Riley, Maj. William J.	do	Oct. 13, 1890	June 17, 1935
Sales, Capt. Louis M.	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 30, 1910	Nov. 2, 1939
Tremor, Lt. Col. Victor F.	Owensville, Ind.	Oct. 25, 1895	Feb. 29, 1930
Unger, Capt. Abraham	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 24, 1911	May 1, 1941
Warsaw, Capt. Arthur H.	Kansas City, Mo.	Sept. 29, 1906	Mar. 10, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Hel-			
wig, Edward C.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Nov. 15, 1884	Oct. 21, 1929
Commissioned dental officer:			
Toline, Capt. Clarence A.	No record available	Mar. 20, 1896	Jan. 26, 1932
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Warfel, Frederick	Hagerstown, Ind.	Dec. 6, 1879	Apr. 3, 1944
Little, Edward O.	Cicero, Ind.	Jan. 27, 1878	June 11, 1919
Ulrich, Arlie J.	Aurora, Ind.	July 28, 1890	May 11, 1921

JACKSON, MISS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Civilian medical officers:			
Speir, Ross C.	Furman, Ala.	Aug. 11, 1884	Dec. 7, 1919
Wallace, James M.	No record available	Apr. 10, 1878	Aug. 15, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Kahn, Alfred M.	Jackson, Miss.	Feb. 2, 1887	Dec. 1, 1921
Williams, Sidney C.	Kosciusko, Miss.	Apr. 24, 1885	June 5, 1920

JEFFERSON BARRACKS, MO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abramson, Capt. Daniel J.	Piedmont, W. Va.	Dec. 25, 1912	Sept. 16, 1941
Bondurant, Maj. Alpheus J.	Charleston, Mo.	Oct. 3, 1892	Sept. 16, 1921
Brennan, Capt. Louis V.	O'Neil, Nebr.	Sept. 30, 1908	Oct. 16, 1939
Briscoe, Capt. John R.	Pettis County, Mo.	Oct. 15, 1907	June 1, 1944
Edwards, Maj. Ernest V.	Plato, Mo.	May 11, 1889	Oct. 7, 1932
Epp, Maj. George J.	St. Louis, Mo.	Oct. 6, 1896	Mar. 17, 1939
Faxon, Maj. Donald E.	Elgin, Ill.	Jan. 13, 1896	June 17, 1929
Goodman, Maj. Jonathan N.	Keswick, Iowa	Oct. 3, 1898	Feb. 18, 1937
Isaacson, Capt. Phillip A.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 26, 1913	Dec. 1, 1944
Levin, Capt. Abraham J.	Liverpool, England	May 1, 1909	Mar. 3, 1938
Parker, Capt. William	Revere, Mass.	Jan. 23, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Relly, Capt. Terence M.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 30, 1911	Dec. 31, 1944
Sisk, Maj. Harvey E.	Duluth, Minn.	Oct. 17, 1909	Apr. 1, 1938
Wasserman, Capt. Sidney E.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Feb. 1, 1910	June 22, 1937
Commissioned dental officers:			
Bland, First Lt. James A.	St. Louis, Mo.	July 15, 1896	Mar. 1, 1941
Larson, Capt. Harry O.	Olivia, Minn.	Jan. 7, 1890	Dec. 19, 1921
Civilian dental officer: Gil-			
bert, Edward	Waupaca, Wis.	Sept. 16, 1895	Oct. 8, 1920

KANSAS CITY, MO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Kelly, Maj. Alto L.	Midland City, Ala.	June 26, 1891	Nov. 1, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Aubrey, George E.	Stithton, Ky.	May 9, 1889	Feb. 22, 1944
Eye, Boyd F.	Robinson, Kans.	Oct. 28, 1888	May 1, 1930

KECOUGHTAN, VA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bailey, Maj. James P.	Waxahachie, Tex.	Oct. 7, 1900	Aug. 15, 1934
Brown, Capt. Leo R.	Filipovo, Poland	May 28, 1907	Dec. 22, 1938
Davis, Capt. Lawrence C.	Richland Center, Wis.	Mar. 15, 1906	July 1, 1942
Frisch, Capt. Michael R.	London, England	Nov. 21, 1903	Feb. 2, 1942
King, Lt. Col. John E.	Sevier County, Tenn.	June 8, 1884	Feb. 5, 1929
King, Maj. Harold N.	Warren, Ohio	Oct. 11, 1899	Aug. 23, 1930
Kuehn, Maj. Conrad A.	Toledo, Ohio	Sept. 14, 1904	Apr. 23, 1941
Malmstead, Capt. Chester W.	Worcester, Mass.	Apr. 15, 1910	Aug. 1, 1941
Commissioned dental officer:			
Migliore, First Lt. Anthony D.	Italy	May 1, 1901	Oct. 16, 1941

KECOUGHTAN, VA.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Miller, Maj. Benjamin	Bodbudkia, Russia	Apr. 4, 1909	May 16, 1936
Roberts, Lt. Col. Ernest S.	Pascagoula, Miss.	Sept. 13, 1917	Mar. 13, 1936
Robinson, Capt. Robert F.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 26, 1913	Feb. 3, 1941
Switkes, Maj. Herman L.	Azernowitz, Austria	July 8, 1906	Aug. 8, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Butzke, Ernest J.	Beechwood, Wis.	Dec. 10, 1877	July 19, 1928
Dewey, Michael G.	Ashland, Pa.	June 2, 1889	Apr. 28, 1931
Commissioned dental officer:	Memphis, Tenn.	July 9, 1906	Oct. 2, 1941
Civilian dental officers:			
Gray, First Lt. Joe	Richmond, Va.	Oct. 20, 1891	Feb. 3, 1931
Dorset, Ramon F.	Shelby, N. C.	Oct. 23, 1879	Jan. 21, 1921
Durham, Benjamin J.			

KNOXVILLE, IOWA

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Doles, Maj. James W.	Havre, Mont.	June 21, 1909	Nov. 1, 1938
Glesne, Capt. Orvin G.	Elkader, Iowa	Jan. 11, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Greenhouse, Capt. Abraham C.	Poland	Jan. 7, 1888	Mar. 12, 1937
Simmons, Capt. Abbott P.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 9, 1908	Dec. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Barrett, Thomas	Ensworth, Pa.	Dec. 31, 1881	Aug. 14, 1929
Davis, George V. P.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 7, 1884	Mar. 12, 1923
Dawson, Dudley	Scotland, Ill.	Dec. 22, 1886	Feb. 21, 1944
Potkorf, Joseph L.	Nevada, Mo.	June 27, 1895	Feb. 28, 1924
Salisbury, Frederick S.	Broken Bow, Nebr.	Mar. 30, 1892	July 11, 1925
Woods, Arthur R.	Nashua, N. H.	Apr. 9, 1881	Feb. 18, 1925
Commissioned dental officers:			
Gill, Capt. Harvey E.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Oct. 30, 1893	Mar. 1, 1922
Plant, First Lt. Roland D.	Greenhill, Ind.	Sept. 26, 1907	Feb. 27, 1942

LAKE CITY, FLA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Byrd, Lt. Col. Emmett E.	No record available	Jan. 14, 1891	Apr. 16, 1920
Carrozza, Capt. Natale S.	Italy	Jan. 1, 1903	Sept. 16, 1942
Isaacson, Capt. Morris	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 15, 1908	May 1, 1941
Kirkham, Lt. Col. Judd H.	J u n e a u , D o d g e County, Wis.	May 18, 1919	Nov. 17, 1930
Lustig, Capt. Julian	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 18, 1909	June 13, 1939
Sasso, Capt. Robert M.	Mount Vernon, N. Y.	May 21, 1913	May 1, 1941
Weinstein, Capt. Abraham S.	New York City	July 23, 1908	May 17, 1937
Civilian medical officers:			
Arnold, Laurie J.	Sanford, N. C.	Aug. 7, 1877	Apr. 8, 1921
Featney, Frank A.	Providence, R. I.	Apr. 24, 1880	Nov. 11, 1920
Vermilye, John H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 3, 1888	June 20, 1921
Vondahn, Howard C.	Tiffin, Ohio	Apr. 19, 1883	Nov. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer:	Liberty, N. C.	Aug. 9, 1896	Nov. 21, 1923
Amick, Capt. James F.			

LEGION, TEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Barshay, Capt. Bernard	Minsk, Russia	Sept. 3, 1902	Mar. 16, 1942
Bruce, Lt. Col. Paul C.	Sheakleyville, Pa.	Dec. 20, 1890	Jan. 8, 1931
Cassidy, Maj. William A.	Bangor, Maine	Mar. 18, 1905	Aug. 1, 1938
Davis, Capt. Daniel	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 1, 1908	May 1, 1941
Ivey, Maj. Hubert T.	Lenoir, N. C.	Dec. 17, 1896	Mar. 24, 1930
Melton, Capt. Ernest I.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 4, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
Murray, Capt. Clifford J.	Denver, Colo.	Feb. 10, 1907	May 1, 1941
Pucie, Capt. Charles	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 26, 1911	Nov. 2, 1942
Weissman, Capt. Herman	Medjibosh, Russia	Mar. 22, 1899	Mar. 1, 1943
White, Maj. Louis L.	Yedinitz, Russia	Oct. 5, 1895	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Fryar, Thomas V.	Corsicana, Tex.	Nov. 7, 1877	Feb. 25, 1921
Kennedy, Theodore A.	San Mateo, Calif.	Apr. 20, 1898	Nov. 19, 1934
Moore, Carrol L.	Statesboro, Ga.	Aug. 25, 1894	Sept. 1, 1920
Reid, Harry P.	Friar Point, Miss.	July 31, 1880	Apr. 1, 1931
Commissioned dental officer:	Denver, Colo.	Feb. 19, 1896	Jan. 16, 1922
Gisin, Capt. George J.			

LEXINGTON, KY.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baker, Maj. Samuel R.	West Point, Ind.	July 15, 1905	Jan. 20, 1931
Cook, Maj. Arnold A.	Toledo, Ohio	Jan. 5, 1906	Nov. 1, 1939
Gall, Capt. Irving A.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 23, 1910	Do.
Marren, Lt. Col. John J.	Two Harbors, Minn.	Apr. 20, 1904	Apr. 1, 1938
Mayer, Capt. Frederick	Frankfurt-on-Main, Germany	Mar. 27, 1895	Dec. 3, 1930
Miller, Lt. Col. Oliver P.	Glenford, Ky.	Jan. 19, 1894	Nov. 10, 1921
Weltman, Capt. Joseph S.	Schenectady, N. Y.	Oct. 17, 1910	Oct. 1, 1940
Young, Maj. David P.	Springfield, Ohio	June 18, 1896	Oct. 30, 1937
Civilian dental officer:	Washington, D. C.	Feb. 13, 1893	June 5, 1920
William W.			

LEXINGTON, KY.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Astrom, Algot	Stode, Sweden	Nov. 22, 1881	Apr. 21, 1941
Nevitt, Phillip H.	Bradenburg, Ky.	Dec. 26, 1879	May 11, 1921

LINCOLN, NEBR.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Green, Maj. Ernest A.	Winterville, Mo.	Nov. 11, 1890	Mar. 1, 1931
Haley, Capt. Robert R., Jr.	Belton, Tex.	Nov. 5, 1896	Aug. 21, 1939
Krasner, Capt. George D.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 9, 1912	May 1, 1941
Lavender, Capt. John G.	Omaha, Nebr.	Apr. 8, 1918	Feb. 9, 1944
Levin, Maj. Stanley L.	Beaufort, S. C.	Aug. 8, 1910	Mar. 22, 1937
Marks, Capt. Morton G.	New York City, N. Y.	June 7, 1899	Feb. 23, 1937
Mullin, Maj. Richard F.	Omaha, Nebr.	Nov. 19, 1888	Oct. 30, 1931
Parillo, Capt. Orest J.	Naples, Italy	Apr. 21, 1910	May 1, 1941
Ritter, Capt. Jerome	New York, N. Y.	June 29, 1911	Oct. 1, 1940
Wilson, Maj. Nat J.	Vilki, Lithuania	Jan. 8, 9104	Jan. 23, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Eagleton, John	Decatur, Nebr.	June 19, 1900	Oct. 17, 1944
Scott, Harry A.	Edmeston, N. Y.	Apr. 29, 1890	Oct. 5, 1925
Commissioned dental officer:	Elliott County, Ky.	July 16, 1896	Mar. 14, 1932
Oppenheimer, Capt. Otto P.			
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:	Emington, Ill.	Jan. 29, 1889	Nov. 22, 1943
Everett, Lt. (USNR) Ernest A.			
Civilian medical officer:	Arlington, Nebr.	Jan. 12, 1879	Jan. 17, 1944
Bell, David W.			

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer:	Clayton, Mo.	July 26, 1884	July 15, 1921
Broadhead, Maj. William C.			
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Crow, Capt. Edward W.	Little Rock, Ark.	Aug. 13, 1905	Feb. 20, 1944
Shearer, Capt. William F.	Cour Hill, Ark.	Aug. 10, 1896	Feb. 3, 1941
Civilian medical officer:	Hope, Ark.	Mar. 21, 1897	May 1, 1930
Wilson, Paul W.			

LIVERMORE, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Dunner, Capt. Edward	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 4, 1910	Sept. 16, 1941
Murphy, Lt. Col. Charles P.	Phillips, Kans.	Dec. 8, 1887	Jan. 1, 1921
Putnam, Maj. Frank I.	Geneva, Nebr.	Apr. 25, 1883	Feb. 3, 1932
Rubinstein, Capt. Morris	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 20, 1895	Mar. 16, 1942
Stern, Maj. Morris E.	do	Jan. 4, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Beaudet, Elphege A.	St. Peter, Province of Quebec, Canada	June 9, 1890	Apr. 24, 1922
Harrod, Charles P.	Austin, Ind.	Nov. 16, 1885	Jan. 15, 1921
Martin, Albert	St. Anne, Ill.	Jan. 31, 1886	July 15, 1920
Stinson, Henry K.	Lowell, Mass.	Nov. 28, 1875	Feb. 12, 1923
Yankowicz, Michael	McAdoo, Pa.	Oct. 26, 1896	June 1, 1942
Commissioned dental officer:	Washington State	July 25, 1891	Jan. 16, 1921
Group, Capt. Oren F.			

SAWTELLE HOSPITAL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adashek, Capt. Eugene P.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Nov. 30, 1914	Sept. 16, 1941
Adelmann, Jerome	Russin, Ind.	Aug. 26, 1911	July 16, 1942
Bayer, Col. Charles F.	Harmony, Ind.	May 10, 1891	Jan. 21, 1920
Binder, Capt. Maxwell J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 16, 1913	May 1, 1941
Clark, First Lt. George E.	Bedford, Mich.	Sept. 19, 1908	July 1, 1943
Colbaugh, Lt. Col. Chas. W.	Radford, Va.	Apr. 5, 1895	Oct. 1, 1930
Daitch, Capt. Morris B.	Newark, N. J.	June 10, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Dobyns, Maj. Gypsyie J.	Woodland, Va.	May 17, 1903	Mar. 1, 1937
Fortner, Maj. Harry C.	Beaver Valley, Pa.	Nov. 8, 1890	Oct. 18, 1932
Galbreath, Capt. John C.	Morris Creek, W. Va.	Aug. 8, 1902	Aug. 1, 1941
Gore, Maj. William A.	Lynchburg, Tenn.	Aug. 8, 1898	Dec. 2, 1931
Goren, Capt. Morris L.	Sluts, Russia	May 25, 1908	July 5, 1938
Harris, Col. Richard L.	Wrietsville, Ga.	Oct. 25, 1896	Mar. 1, 1921
Holden, Maj. Isidore	Southampton, England	May 30, 1904	Oct. 5, 1938
Holvey, Capt. Ervin H.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Nov. 26, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Horowitz, First Lt. William	New York City, N. Y.	Apr. 16, 1913	July 16, 1942
Hubbard, Lt. Col. Milton E.	Willard, Utah	Oct. 18, 1892	July 1, 1928
Hurwich, Maj. Jerome J.	Chicago, Ill.	do	Feb. 19, 1937
Kupersmith, Capt. Harry S.	do	Jan. 5, 1913	Feb. 1, 1940

SAWTREE HOSPITAL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Lunsford, Capt. William B.	Roanoke, Va.	June 22, 1890	Feb. 21, 1931
Lyons, Maj. Clinton G.	Surgionsville, Iowa	Sept. 18, 1889	Oct. 12, 1927
Mandel, Capt. Harry	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 12, 1910	Sept. 16, 1941
McClellan, Lt. Col. Jay H.	Statesville, N. C.	Sept. 16, 1889	Nov. 7, 1924
Mollo, Maj. Louis D.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 10, 1901	Jan. 4, 1932
Morgan, Maj. Howard P.	Marshall, Tex.	May 24, 1894	Dec. 17, 1930
Mumma, Maj. Claude S.	Foreston, Ill.	Mar. 18, 1894	Mar. 16, 1922
Newman, Maj. Harry William	Ogden, Utah	Mar. 30, 1899	Dec. 6, 1930
Owens, Maj. Tracy C.	Bedford, Ind.	Mar. 10, 1902	July 18, 1938 ⁽¹⁾
Powell, Capt. Kenneth E.	Lee, Ill.	Nov. 24, 1906	July 18, 1938
Rabinowitz, Capt. David L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 17, 1909	Feb. 2, 1941
Rock, Maj. Joseph H.	No record available	Nov. 15, 1896	Sept. 17, 1926
Rosenberger, Capt. Maurice D.	Hancock, Ohio	Aug. 6, 1909	Oct. 1, 1940
Sabia, Capt. Daniel J.	New York City, N. Y.	Aug. 7, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Satterlee, Capt. Albert H.	Buffalo, N. Y.	July 1, 1905	Jan. 3, 1939
Smith, Lt. Col. Horace D.	Tennille, Ga.	Apr. 27, 1903	Jan. 4, 1932
Smith, Capt. Jack Lawrence	Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada	May 16, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Spiekerman, Maj. Harold D.	Topeka, Kans.	Feb. 17, 1904	Dec. 3, 1931
Suddeth, Capt. Leland F.	Paris, Ill.	Sept. 3, 1906	Mar. 2, 1942
Traxler, Maj. Paul S.	Chicago, Ill.	June 4, 1893	July 6, 1931
Van Vranken, Capt. Ralph	Passaic, N. J.	Sept. 18, 1895	Nov. 1, 1930
Velante, Capt. Anthony J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 21, 1910	Oct. 25, 1938
Wells, Capt. Benjamin J.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Feb. 12, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Woodward, Capt. Frank A.	Burlington, Iowa	Sept. 19, 1884	Jan. 23, 1928
Ziedman, Capt. Irving	Chicago, Ill.	Sept. 16, 1906	May 16, 1936
Civilian medical officers:			
Baro, Walter	No record available	Oct. 31, 1911	Sept. 1, 1944
Basham, Rue O.	Richardville, Ky.	Feb. 12, 1892	Sept. 25, 1931
Bowen, Ulysses	Metter, Ga.	Dec. 5, 1897	Dec. 22, 1930
Braze, Robert W.	Blackwood, N. J.	July 21, 1875	Oct. 4, 1924
Burnett, Edward J.	Terre Haute, Ind.	Jan. 4, 1879	May 1, 1925
Cobb, Davidd H.	Coaling, Ala.	Dec. 4, 1896	July 23, 1923
Dix, Isaac	Kirkwood, W. Va.	Oct. 3, 1881	June 10, 1921
Dubrow, James L.	Belopole, Ukraine	June 13, 1894	Sept. 21, 1931
Dulaney, Henry P.	No record available	June 30, 1877	Mar. 1, 1913
Gorrell, James	Churchville, Md.	Nov. 3, 1898	Aug. 1, 1941
Hantsch, Ferdinand K.	Friedek, Austrian Silesia	Jan. 26, 1892	July 16, 1928
Long, Frank L.	De Soto, Mo.	Nov. 18, 1882	Jan. 17, 1920
Nigh, John W.	No record available	Nov. 11, 1884	Feb. 16, 1930
Pache, Francis C.	Stockton, Calif.	June 7, 1876	Oct. 1, 1921
Paynter, Harrison	Des Moines, Iowa	July 21, 1888	Mar. 1, 1941
Ramer, E. Blanche	No record available	Aug. 23, 1890	July 26, 1944
Rosow, Herman	do	July 25, 1907	Mar. 4, 1938
Scott, Robert	Donaldson, Minn.	Sept. 29, 1885	Dec. 4, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Neal, First Lt. Homer S.	Carrollton, Miss.	Mar. 23, 1891	Dec. 15, 1930
Saubert, Maj. Walter J.	Kaukauna, Wis.	Oct. 16, 1886	June 12, 1922
Van Aken, First Lt. Ray C.	No record available	Nov. 16, 1893	Sept. 16, 1943
Williams, Capt. Charles R.	Denver, Colo.	July 24, 1897	Feb. 1, 1922
Civilian dental officer: Denson, Roy L.	Hallettsville, Tex.	Jan. 9, 1892	Oct. 1, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Dixon, Capt. William B.	Spirit Lake, Iowa	Dec. 17, 1896	Apr. 17, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Kallock, Dudley	Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y.	Dec. 10, 1883	Oct. 1, 1931
Paulson, George	Davenport, Iowa	Feb. 4, 1886	Jan. 24, 1944
Phares, Willard	Jacksonport, Ohio	Apr. 12, 1880	Mar. 19, 1948
Roach, Richard A.	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 18, 1883	Nov. 1, 1920
Strickland, Clarence R.	Greenfield, Ind.	May 18, 1882	Feb. 21, 1944
Zimmerman, Randall	Stoystown, Pa.	July 29, 1879	Dec. 4, 1944

LYONS, N. J.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Fagley, Maj. Raymond C.	Shamokin, Pa.	Nov. 19, 1887	May 17, 1935
Flood, Maj. William A.	Walloomsac, N. Y.	May 23, 1887	Mar. 10, 1921
Gardner, Capt. Sidney M.	Denver, Colo.	Sept. 13, 1906	Apr. 1, 1938
Giannini, Capt. Francis F.	Italy	Dec. 25, 1908	Sept. 16, 1942
Hawkins, First Lt. William B.	Little Rock, Ark.	Aug. 4, 1912	
Hoffman, Capt. Harry	Philadelphia, Pa.	Nov. 5, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Kaplan, Capt. Leonard A.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 8, 1914	Mar. 16, 1942
Loeb, Maj. William A.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 28, 1906	Mar. 9, 1935
Lopez, Lt. Col. Louis V.	New Orleans, La.	Jan. 7, 1894	June 14, 1920
Michaels, Capt. Joseph	New York, N. Y.	July 12, 1911	Feb. 3, 1941
Mischler, Jay E.	Atlantic City, N. J.	Feb. 15, 1912	Feb. 2, 1942
Presberg, Maj. Mowey	Rochester, N. Y.	Oct. 1, 1904	Jan. 6, 1936
Rainone, Capt. Salvatore	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 14, 1907	Feb. 2, 1942
Roeker, Capt. Roland D.	do	Mar. 30, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Sewall, Maj. Lee G.	Marlin, Tex.	Aug. 25, 1907	Mar. 7, 1938
Weitz, Maj. Paul	Czernawitz, Austria	Oct. 30, 1903	Jan. 15, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Hinckley, Livingston S.	Newark, N. J.	Apr. 23, 1893	Oct. 31, 1935
Hirschoff, Ernest A. F.	Dresden, Germany	July 28, 1880	July 6, 1925
Strotz, Charles M.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 12, 1881	May 1, 1921

LYONS, N. J.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned dental officers:			
Scopp, Capt. Irwin W.	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 8, 1909	July 22, 1942
Zercher, Maj. Joseph E.	Topeka, Kans.	May 9, 1895	July 16, 1921
Civilian dental officer: Whyte, Isaac H.	Chester County, Pa.	Feb. 1, 1877	Aug. 16, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Gordon, Edward J.			
	Newburgh, N. Y.	July 1, 1875	Feb. 20, 1929
MANCHESTER, N. H.			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Civilian medical officers:			
Drury, Forrest J.	Easton, N. H.	Jan. 17, 1885	Dec. 16, 1930
Maby, Aloysius D.	Cohoes, N. Y.	Oct. 31, 1892	Nov. 1, 1921
MARION, ILL.			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alits, Capt. Bernard H.	Pekin, Ill.	May 29, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Michaelson, Maj. Leon J.	Rochester, N. Y.	Oct. 28, 1913	Do.
Navin, Maj. James J.	Norwalk, Ohio	Aug. 6, 1898	Jan. 6, 1932
Shawver, Lt. Col. John R.	Knox County, Tex.	Feb. 11, 1907	Jan. 3, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Gorisse, Gustave	Rahway, N. J.	Oct. 26, 1887	June 6, 1944
Hunsaker, Curtis A.	Colden, Ill.	Sept. 10, 1887	Jan. 15, 1927
Welch, Edward A.	Springfield, Ohio	May 26, 1890	Mar. 22, 1920
MARION, IND.			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Argent, Capt. Albert H.	Leova, Rumania	Apr. 12, 1912	Oct. 16, 1941
Bean, Lt. Col. Victor H.	Fulton, Mass.	Apr. 6, 1886	Aug. 4, 1929
Botts, Col. Harry H.	Lebanon, Ind.	June 2, 1889	Jan. 15, 1923
Bourke, Maj. William W.	Horton, Kans.	Oct. 31, 1902	Feb. 16, 1931
Fausk, Capt. Walter H.	Altus, Ark.	Sept. 9, 1911	Nov. 1, 1941
Ginsberg, Maj. Stewart T.	St. Paul, Minn.	Apr. 18, 1906	Jan. 7, 1936
Hockett, Capt. Harry G.	Anderson, Ind.	Sept. 11, 1903	July 1, 1942
Jones, Maj. Ernest F.	Milton, Ind.	Mar. 23, 1900	Dec. 10, 1940
Milone, First Lt. Joseph E.	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 28, 1914	Jan. 4, 1943
Weinstein, Capt. Louis W.	Odessa, Russia	Apr. 19, 1895	June 15, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Helck, Capt. Solomon A.	Grayville, Ill.	Feb. 19, 1882	Mar. 28, 1932
Civilian dental officer: Van Brackle, Woodfin H.	Clyde, Ga.	Aug. 12, 1891	May 6, 1925
MEMPHIS, TENN.			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Boals, Maj. John O.	Williston, Tenn.	July 16, 1886	Apr. 16, 1921
Damashek, Capt. Samuel	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 18, 1910	July 8, 1940
Dougherty, Maj. Hugh Robert	Ashland, Pa.	Oct. 4, 1903	Oct. 16, 1939
Foster, Lt. Col. Robert Heath	Shiloh, Miss.	Sept. 13, 1884	Jan. 21, 1933
Gross, Capt. Victor L.	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 18, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Levin, Capt. Jack	No record available	Jan. 26, 1912	May 1, 1941
McCann, Ezelle	Kewanee, Miss.	May 13, 1885	Jan. 15, 1923
Rapp, Maj. Edwin Wallace	Aurora, Ill.	Apr. 18, 1891	Apr. 16, 1932
Rosenkranz, Maj. Otto H.	Duisburg, Germany	Jan. 15, 1882	Aug. 1, 1929
Skinner, Capt. Morgan	Waupaca, Wis.	Jan. 12, 1905	May 22, 1936
Wheeler, Lt. Col. Joseph Ed.	Meridian, Miss.	Sept. 5, 1892	July 6, 1919
Civilian medical officers:			
Cooper, Arthur F.	Trenton, Tenn.	Aug. 26, 1881	May 27, 1944
Dodge, Horace C.	Boulder, Colo.	Mar. 14, 1877	Sept. 3, 1919
Isherwood, Ainsworth V.	Drocut, Mass.	Oct. 1, 1899	Mar. 1, 1943
Love, John M.	Amherst, Va.	May 24, 1878	May 5, 1934
Patton, Marion L.	Bells, Tenn.	Dec. 4, 1898	Apr. 1, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Bergeron, Capt. Maximilian P.	Hinesdale, N. H.	June 6, 1886	July 5, 1928
Civilian dental officer: Reinert, Adrian.	Centerville, Wis.	Jan. 27, 1906	Jan. 6, 1944
MENDOTA, WIS.			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Owens, Capt. Clarence G.	Crookston, Minn.	May 21, 1903	Dec. 1, 1941
Spiro, Capt. Harry M.	Boston, Mass.	Sept. 2, 1913	Mar. 2, 1942
Tompkins, Lt. Col. Harvey J.	Chicago, Ill.	May 14, 1906	July 2, 1935
Trent, Lt. Col. Letcher E.	North Carolina	Sept. 26, 1883	Mar. 9, 1922
Zolondek, First Lt. Sol	Poland	Dec. 15, 1908	Sept. 10, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Singleton, Dennis E.	Paris, Mo.	June 21, 1882	Sept. 1, 1939
Civilian dental officer: Harryman, John W.	No record available	May 17, 1894	Apr. 9, 1937

¹ In 1931.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of ap- pointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bank, Maj. Harry E.	Milwaukee, Minn.	Apr. 28, 1891	Jan. 15, 1920
Bundy, Lt. Col. Harry E.	Aurora, Ill.	Dec. 19, 1889	May 14, 1928
Falk, Capt. Abraham	New York, N. Y.	May 27, 1905	Nov. 1, 1939
Golden, Capt. Howard	Bronx, N. Y.	Aug. 8, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
Hentel, Maj. William	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 25, 1911	May 1, 1941
Katz, Capt. Louis J.	St. Paul, Minn.	Oct. 2, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Litman, Maj. Morris H.	Kanelo, Russia	Mar. 15, 1899	Apr. 1, 1930
Mandell, Capt. Edward H.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 23, 1899	June 1, 1942
McGregor, Capt. Cath- erine G.	No record available	Dec. 12, 1891	Apr. 21, 1944
Minsky, Capt. Armen A.	Russia	Mar. 30, 1904	Nov. 3, 1929
Myers, Maj. Harry A.	Herman, Ill.	Feb. 4, 1890	Apr. 1, 1921
Neal, Maj. Joe M.	Gallipolis, Ohio	Aug. 26, 1892	Aug. 2, 1920
Noonan, Capt. Dan Fran- cis	Waverly, Minn.	Dec. 29, 1883	Apr. 4, 1944
Schwalbe, Maj. Milton L.	New York City, N. Y.	June 2, 1889	Dec. 23, 1940
Utendorfer, Capt. Robert W.	Harvey, N. Dak.	May 22, 1912	Apr. 1, 1944
Westphal, Maj. Kean F.	Pleasant Grove, Utah	Dec. 21, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Ziskin, Maj. Thomas	Grand Forks, N. Dak.	Nov. 29, 1888	Oct. 25, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Abbott, John S.	St. Paul, Minn.	Nov. 15, 1883	Dec. 1, 1944
Burdick, Charles H.	St. Louis, Mo.	Aug. 1, 1886	July 5, 1929
De Courcy, Donald	St. Paul, Minn.	Mar. 3, 1901	June 20, 1930
Hanson, Henry V.	Hutchinson, Minn.	Jan. 21, 1889	Jan. 29, 1923
Jensen, Louis C.	Denmark	June 10, 1888	Aug. 23, 1921
Josewich, Alexander	Milwaukee, Wis.	July 4, 1890	May 1, 1922
Nelson, Edwin G.	La Porte, Ind.	Aug. 26, 1890	July 18, 1921
Nelson, Oscar L.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Apr. 13, 1894	Nov. 8, 1937
Seaberg, John A.	Evanston, Ill.	Mar. 9, 1890	Aug. 15, 1928
Commissioned dental officers:			
Payne, Maj. Ralph S.	Wabasha, Minn.	Sept. 16, 1895	Apr. 10, 1921
Yonover, First Lt. Nathan	No record available	Mar. 20, 1900	Apr. 1, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Koontz, Sylvester	Glenville, Minn.	June 27, 1899	Jan. 1, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Sanderson, Capt. Oscar M.	Minnesota, Minn.	June 2, 1889	Oct. 2, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Engdahl, Fred	Wilbank, S. Dak.	Feb. 27, 1891	Mar. 30, 1944
Fahy, Edward S.	Kinston, Ontario, Canada	Nov. 18, 1876	Mar. 1, 1945
Joyner, Nevil M.	Mason, Tenn.	Mar. 24, 1899	Dec. 10, 1942
Ricketts, Floyd	Jeffersonville, Ind.	Dec. 13, 1889	Feb. 16, 1944
Scanlan, Jerome E.	St. Paul, Minn.	Oct. 16, 1898	Jan. 19, 1944

MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of ap- pointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bailey, Maj. Marion P.	Charleston, S. C.	Jan. 26, 1893	June 5, 1935
Bernell, Capt. Stanley P.	Camden, N. J.	Feb. 14, 1913	Feb. 2, 1942
Rosenfeld, Capt. Frederick	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Feb. 8, 1906	Dec. 21, 1936
Schmitt, Capt. Robert W.	Nichols, Iowa	Nov. 20, 1908	Feb. 1, 1940
Witten, Capt. Morris	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 27, 1913	Nov. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Fisk, Harley B.	Fiskburg, Ky.	Feb. 10, 1890	Sept. 27, 1930
Kienhoff, George W.	Troy, Kans.	May 17, 1885	Jan. 10, 1921
Newhauser, Mayer A.	Monroe, La.	Feb. 26, 1883	May 20, 1920
Pafford, Jefferson W.	Cafee County, Ga.	Mar. 20, 1889	Sept. 17, 1931
Weinrib, Joseph	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 23, 1904	Dec. 2, 1940
Commissioned dental officer: Miller, Capt. James L.	Carthage, Tex.	May 11, 1882	May 3, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Garrett, Capt. James De- Witt	Mount Carmel, Ala.	Dec. 27, 1888	Mar. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Reagan, Cas	Delta, Ala.	Sept. 12, 1889	Jan. 16, 1940
Stanley, William A.	Opp, Ala.	Mar. 22, 1890	Feb. 1, 1944

MOUNTAIN HOME, TENN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of ap- pointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blau, First Lt. Leslie	Hungary	June 5, 1912	Sept. 16, 1943
Crouch, Maj. Henry W.	Charleston, S. C.	Feb. 9, 1900	Mar. 13, 1936
Frankenthaler, Capt. Syl- van A.	Neva, Tenn.	Aug. 13, 1904	Apr. 1, 1942
Gambill, Maj. Ira M.	June 18, 1894	Nov. 6, 1931	
Good, Lt. Col. Richard W.	Corning, Iowa	Mar. 3, 1896	June 15, 1926
Kantor, Capt. Milton	Bronx, N. Y.	Jan. 27, 1912	May 1, 1941
Knapp, Capt. John A.	Union, N. Y.	Aug. 25, 1914	June 15, 1942
Levy, Capt. Bertram L.	Staten Island, N. Y.	Mar. 6, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Morison, Lt. Col. James H. S.	Ewing, Va.	Dec. 4, 1885	Sept. 15, 1934
Prescott, Capt. Kenneth H.	Bloomfield, Nebr.	Dec. 19, 1909	July 6, 1938
Russek, Capt. Allen S.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Feb. 16, 1907	Feb. 2, 1942
Slade, Lt. Col. Charles K.	Willacochee, Ga.	June 14, 1907	July 1, 1937
Waring, Maj. Harold R.	Tyrene, Pa.	Dec. 4, 1899	Jan. 2, 1942
Werner, Maj. Emil A.	Crete, Ill.	Dec. 14, 1890	July 11, 1921
Civilian medical officer: Car- penter, John D.	No record available	Mar. 29, 1880	Feb. 1, 1928
Commissioned dental officers:			
McDowell, First Lt. Har- vey E.	Smithfield, Nebr.	July 3, 1903	Oct. 14, 1940
Nixon, Capt. Marvin O.	No record available	Sept. 4, 1906	Oct. 2, 1941
Talbert, Maj. Harry V.	Hancock County, Ind.	Oct. 30, 1888	June 1, 1930

MURFREESBORO, TENN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of ap- pointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abel, Maj. Samuel E.	No record available	Jan. 27, 1907	Jan. 1, 1945
Adams, Maj. Charles C.	Manchester, Ill.	Apr. 25, 1890	Mar. 2, 1931
Dodd, Maj. David Wil- liam	Vevay, Ind.	July 7, 1892	Oct. 14, 1921
Hawkins, Capt. Henry M.	Magnolia, Ark.	May 9, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Jerrell, Maj. Paul M.	Nobelville, Ind.	Feb. 25, 1895	Oct. 15, 1930
Lawn, Maj. Harold J.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Oct. 28, 1911	Apr. 3, 1937
Martin, Capt. William D.	Gladeville, Tenn.	Apr. 22, 1886	May 1, 1944
Moore, Capt. George B.	Madison, Ark.	June 23, 1907	Feb. 6, 1939
Rosenberg, Capt. George	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 2, 1896	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Covey, Clyde B.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Dec. 13, 1887	Feb. 15, 1920
Moore, John F.	Washington, D. C.	June 19, 1899	May 16, 1939
White, Alvah W.	Upatoie, Ga.	Oct. 10, 1888	Dec. 31, 1928
Civilian dental officers:			
Meyer, Frank E.	Lexington, Mo.	Jan. 12, 1887	Sept. 5, 1922
Phillips, Fred O.	Huntsville, Tenn.	Aug. 15, 1882	Feb. 18, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Glass, USNR, Lt. Sidney H.	Phoenix City, Ala.	Apr. 11, 1898	Feb. 24, 1931
Herndon, Capt. Zelma Lamb	Bement, Ill.	Nov. 13, 1902	Jan. 25, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Barker, Hampton M.	Alabama	Mar. 14, 1876	Apr. 16, 1945
Hind, John C.	Brookfield, Ga.	Sept. 3, 1892	Mar. 1, 1930

MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of ap- pointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alexander, Maj. Gilbert H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 6, 1908	Feb. 14, 1938
Bates, Lt. Col. Clarence E.	Westire, Okla.	June 30, 1894	Jan. 2, 1925
Dougherty, Maj. Arthur McI.	Litchfield, Minn.	Aug. 8, 1901	Jan. 16, 1940
Mengel, Capt. Chester K.	McAlester, Okla.	Jan. 21, 1915	Aug. 1, 1941
Miller, Maj. Daniel H.	Clatonia, Nebr.	Oct. 31, 1899	June 6, 1932
Parker, Maj. James H.	Berryman, Mo.	Sept. 25, 1886	July 16, 1930
Rome, Capt. Albert	Boston, Mass.	May 6, 1907	Jan. 12, 1938
Turner, Capt. Ralph D.	Emporia, Kans.	Aug. 1, 1909	Dec. 16, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Dyer, James H.	Shelbyville, Tenn.	Oct. 8, 1875	June 20, 1921
Freund, Norman L.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 17, 1914	Nov. 15, 1944
Mitchell, Robert	Oklahoma Del. dis- trict, Indian Terri- tory	Apr. 10, 1876	Dec. 3, 1921
Mollica, Stephen	Lipari, Italy	July 16, 1893	Jan. 5, 1931
Robinson, Charles	Hernando De Soto County, Miss.	July 17, 1889	Mar. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Patriquin, Capt. Forrest D.	Newburyport, Mass.	June 23, 1898	May 2, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Athey, Clanton R.	Crenshaw County, Ala.	Dec. 6, 1886	May 17, 1930
Davis, Emmer P.	Slantloud, Mo.	Mar. 25, 1884	Jan. 28, 1944

NEWINGTON, CONN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of ap- pointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Boswell, Maj. Clay S.	Illinois	Feb. 8, 1898	Dec. 1, 1931
Bowen, Capt. Francis D.	Grantsville, Md.	Dec. 2, 1916	July 1, 1943
Brillman, First Lt. Lester P.	No record available	Jan. 21, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Cook, Lt. Col. Ambrose H.	Cincinnati, Ohio	Jan. 17, 1902	Oct. 16, 1928
Dressler, Capt. Morris	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 14, 1902	June 1, 1942
Flerl, Capt. Santo Howard	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Feb. 19, 1901	Mar. 16, 1942
Fox, Capt. Sidney	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 16, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Marcus, Capt. Emanuel	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 27, 1909	Do.
Messina, Maj. Michael O.	Italy	Aug. 8, 1901	Mar. 2, 1931
Musa, Maj. Agha B.	Tahriz, Iran	July 18, 1888	Apr. 4, 1927
Preston, Lt. Col. Thomas R.	New Haven, Conn.	Sept. 2, 1899	June 1, 1928
Prignano, Capt. John Vin- cent	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 20, 1914	July 16, 1942
Schwartz, Capt. George R.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Jan. 16, 1907	Aug. 22, 1935
Whiting, Capt. Herbert S.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 28, 1906	Feb. 3, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Baskin, Abraham	Lepew, Russia	June 8, 1907	Jan. 16, 1939
Brennard, Everett O.	Providence, R. I.	Aug. 7, 1873	Dec. 29, 1919
McGovern, Edward	Bridgeport, Conn.	Jan. 24, 1875	Sept. 1, 1935
Commissioned dental officers:			
Goldstein, First Lt. Hyman	Russia	Oct. 15, 1904	Jan. 17, 1942
Robbins, Capt. Clement J., Jr.	Hampton, Va.	Apr. 3, 1900	Aug. 1, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Egan, Capt. John Joseph	No record available	May 15, 1885	Aug. 3, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Farley, Edward B.	do	Oct. 19, 1885	Apr. 9, 1945
Tyler, Herman A.	East Hartford, Conn.	Aug. 13, 1877	Mar. 6, 1930

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Beranger, Maj. Edgar J.	New Orleans, La.	Aug. 27, 1892	Feb. 24, 1920
Di Tata, Maj. Domenick	New York City, N. Y.	June 2, 1908	Nov. 1, 1939
Musfelt, Capt. William S.	Long Pine, Nebr.	Nov. 22, 1902	(15)
Wiernik, Capt. Harris	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Apr. 25, 1908	Apr. 1, 1942
Zaller, Capt. Seymour	New York City, N. Y.	Apr. 4, 1903	(15)
Civilian medical officer: Guillo- lotte, William F.	No record available	Sept. 15, 1878	June 1, 1944
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Marlette, George C.	Trilla, Ill.	Feb. 5, 1888	Apr. 30, 1930
Otto, Henry J.	New Orleans, La.	June 29, 1879	Feb. 14, 1944
Trepangier, Dalton	do.	Sept. 27, 1898	Mar. 30, 1944

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned dental officers:			
O'Brien, Capt. Arthur G.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 25, 1895	Jan. 9, 1940
Westmoreland, Capt. Wil- liam W.	No record available	Mar. 23, 1888	Feb. 1, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical off- cers:			
Fink, Capt. Frank E.	do.	Oct. 14, 1885	Jan. 11, 1944
Holzberg, Capt. Ida Ruth	do.	June 28, 1898	Jan. 19, 1944
Livant, Capt. Saul	do.	June 6, 1905	July 13, 1943
Michaels, Capt. Leo	do.	Aug. 24, 1893	Jan. 21, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Little, Zack J.	Franklin Mills, Pa.	July 31, 1876	Apr. 20, 1931
Barron, William Power	Rusk, Tex.	June 8, 1877	Apr. 1, 1920
Dryfus, Milton L.	New Haven, Conn.	Oct. 26, 1890	Dec. 21, 1944
Friedman, Edward L.	Carmel, N. J.	Feb. 24, 1885	Dec. 12, 1944
Harberg, Hyman	Bronx, N. Y.	do.	Jan. 19, 1944
Jacobs, William I.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 11, 1944	Jan. 11, 1944
Kliger, Max	Odessa, Russia	Oct. 15, 1893	Jan. 3, 1944
Llotta, Matthew	Italy	Sept. 20, 1886	Dec. 27, 1943
Musante, Joseph	Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.	Dec. 19, 1889	Jan. 21, 1944
O'Connor, Eugene T.	Utica, N. Y.	Aug. 23, 1880	Jan. 26, 1920
Rosenberg, David	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 13, 1896	Jan. 12, 1944
Rubinowitz, Alexandria H.	New York, N. Y.	July 23, 1887	Do.
Sherwood, Arthur	New Haven, Conn.	Apr. 4, 1896	Feb. 14, 1944
Walther, John W.	Coburg, Germany	Oct. 12, 1880	Dec. 5, 1944
Weinauer, Heribert	Passau, Germany	May 14, 1899	Dec. 8, 1943
Wiener, Isidore K.	Newark, N. J.	May 11, 1884	Dec. 18, 1944
Chaney, Herbert M.	City not given, Ohio	July 14, 1873	Jan. 22, 1945
Looram, James F.	New York City	Nov. 22, 1888	Mar. 1, 1940

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Brown, Maj. Ralph W.	La Porte City, Iowa	June 24, 1886	Nov. 15, 1920
Dobson, Col. William M.	New Brunswick, Can- ada	June 24, 1883	Mar. 10, 1929
Harris, Capt. Albert E.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	May 17, 1910	June 1, 1942
Kasper, Capt. Louis	New York, N. Y.	May 26, 1910	June 15, 1942
O'Neil, Lt. Col. Richard T.	Vicksburg, Miss.	June 5, 1889	Jan. 15, 1923
Plumb, Maj. Darley G.	Kirwin, Kans.	Aug. 23, 1883	Nov. 4, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Mayer, Stephen K.	Mainz, Germany	Nov. 20, 1890	Nov. 17, 1943
Steele, Fred E.	Stockbridge, Vt.	Sept. 11, 1883	Aug. 15, 1913
Civilian dental officer: Rogers, Francis.	Southboro, Mass.	Oct. 26, 1878	Dec. 8, 1920

NORTH LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Campbell, Col. Duncan D.	Rochester, N. Y.	July 20, 1885	May 1, 1924
Denning, Capt. Philip P.	Flushing, N. Y.	Sept. 17, 1905	Feb. 2, 1942
Doherty, Maj. William R.	Ohio	Oct. 4, 1912	Dec. 1, 1939
Philadelphia, First Lt. Aaron W.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 16, 1913	(15)
Riley, Maj. Wilbur K.	Wisnar, Nebr.	Sept. 24, 1892	July 16, 1930
Robinson, Maj. Joseph A.	Fort Worth, Tex.	May 1, 1890	July 8, 1923
Snyderman, Capt. Henry	Vilno, Lithuania	Jan. 1, 1894	June 1, 1942
Stathakis, Capt. John	Sparta, Greece	May 10, 1904	Do.
Thomas, Capt. Theodore, J.	Narka, Kans.	July 24, 1904	Oct. 16, 1941
Walsh, Maj. William V.	St. Paul, Minn.	Sept. 8, 1910	Nov. 1, 1930
Wiggins, Maj. Charles Henry	Scoba, Miss.	Oct. 17, 1899	Apr. 10, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Harkay, Clifford	Graves County, Ky.	Jan. 7, 1881	Mar. 17, 1921
Toney, Lee E.	Missouri	Apr. 22, 1886	June 17, 1935
Commissioned dental officer: Adams, Capt. Ward A.	Ozark, Mo.	Nov. 11, 1891	Apr. 14, 1921

(15) No record available.

NORTHPORT, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Carra, First Lt. Angelo D.	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 26, 1914	Aug. 7, 1944
Dancik, Capt. Daniel	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 27, 1911	Dec. 2, 1940
Drake, Capt. Robert J.	Severance, Kans.	Oct. 31, 1889	Dec. 1, 1941
Foster, Lt. Col. Harold E.	Owego, Tioga County, N. Y.	June 1, 1884	Sept. 21, 1927
Hawkes, Capt. James Henry	Rosamond, Ill.	Nov. 18, 1908	July 8, 1940
Huddleson, Lt. Col. James H.	Portland, Oreg.	Mar. 15, 1887	Aug. 2, 1941
Kashe, Capt. Leo H.	Granby, Canada	July 27, 1903	Nov. 2, 1942
Naples, Maj. Angelo S.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Aug. 31, 1903	July 5, 1935
Steinberg, First Lt. Edgar I.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 24, 1914	Mar. 2, 1942
Turner, Maj. William J.	Wilkesburg, Pa.	Sept. 22, 1907	Feb. 6, 1937
Verdel, Col. Louis F.	Memphis, Tenn.	Jan. 24, 1894	Jan. 1, 1922
Civilian medical officers:			
Brown, Leonard	New York City	Nov. 15, 1883	Nov. 15, 1924
Drubin, Lester	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 8, 1913	Oct. 1, 1940
Gilberty, Rich	New York City	Nov. 10, 1912	Sept. 16, 1942
Hermann, M. E.	Austria	Oct. 18, 1900	Oct. 2, 1944
Lazell, Edward	Boston, Mass.	Aug. 3, 1878	Dec. 6, 1921
Triolo, Antonio	Palerius, Italy	Nov. 29, 1896	Feb. 16, 1931
Commissioned dental officers:			
Bourquin, Capt. Justin W.	Pidionte, Pa.	Jan. 3, 1891	July 25, 1935
Weston, First Lt. Michael E.	Russia	May 18, 1907	Dec. 7, 1939
Civilian dental officer: Swartz, Leroy W.			
	Ickesburg, Pa.	Jan. 3, 1880	June 1, 1921

OATEEN, N. C.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical off- cers:			
Anolik, First Lt. William	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 2, 1916	Jan. 17, 1944
Ashley, Capt. Moo	do.	Jan. 30, 1913	Mar. 16, 1942
Bernstein, Maj. David	Minsk, Russia	Oct. 20, 1910	Mar. 13, 1941
Beverly, Maj. Squire S.	Richfield, Ohio	Sept. 6, 1889	Nov. 21, 1927
Gruenwald, Capt. Charles	Warsaw, Poland	Oct. 13, 1906	Feb. 2, 1942
Jacobs, Capt. Paul	Pennsylvania	Apr. 9, 1905	Apr. 26, 1937
Kraus, Capt. Albert	New York, N. Y.	July 17, 1907	(15)
McAllister, Lt. Col. Max F.	Fayetteville, Ark.	May 2, 1904	(15)
Murphy, Lt. Col. James D.	Brookings, S. Dak.	Nov. 2, 1895	Mar. 10, 1939
Quinn, Lt. Col. David E.	Dennison, Ohio	Apr. 20, 1901	Feb. 1, 1932
Rauchwerger, Capt. Solo- mon M.	New York City, N. Y.	June 19, 1908	Dec. 2, 1940
Rogers, Capt. Raymond J.	Oconto, Wis.	Sept. 20, 1906	Feb. 3, 1941
Sedofsky, Maj. Nathan	New York City	June 1, 1910	Feb. 16, 1937
Speir, Maj. Charles H.	Bay City, Mich.	Oct. 13, 1900	Mar. 2, 1942
Spencer, Capt. Samuel	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 18, 1912	June 1, 1942
Tilton, Capt. Wecome B.	Allendale, Mo.	June 3, 1884	Sept. 16, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Barell, Harry	New York, N. Y.	July 16, 1904	Mar. 2, 1942
Brewer, Frank Benton	Viola, Tenn.	June 7, 1894	Apr. 28, 1920
Moyer, Ralph E.	Mountain Grove, Mo.	Oct. 11, 1895	Apr. 1, 1942
Proffitt, Ray V.	Gunnison, Colo.	Aug. 27, 1889	May 20, 1919
Williams, Harry B.	Rushville, N. Y.	Dec. 26, 1879	Feb. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officers:			
Archer, Maj. Isaac H.	Hancock County, Ga.	Nov. 15, 1887	Apr. 1, 1921
Benway, First Lt. Emphy F.	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 22, 1893	Mar. 15, 1937
Civilian dental officer: Daugh- erty, Herbert D.	Nashville, Tenn.	Dec. 17, 1894	Apr. 12, 1937

OUTWOOD, KY.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abel, Capt. Louis	New York City	Sept. 19, 1911	Mar. 16, 1942
Berg, Capt. Lawrence E.	Red Wing, Minn.	Dec. 12, 1901	Dec. 1, 1941
Lipton, Maj. Philip	Riga (Latvia), Russia	Dec. 2, 1909	Dec. 1, 1939
Ross, Capt. Leon	New York City	Jan. 3, 1903	Feb. 2, 1942
West, Maj. Elmer J.	Cloquet, Minn.	Aug. 10, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Westfall, Capt. Marvin F.	Maryville, Mo.	June 21, 1907	July 8, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
James, Samuel H.	Long Island, Ala.	Aug. 20, 1880	Apr. 1, 1920
Kesterton, William J.	Mayfield, Ky.	May 31, 1885	Jan. 2, 1939
Newman, Luther Byron	Helenwood, Tenn.	July 12, 1899	Apr. 27, 1944
Thomas, Irl	Benton, Ky.	June 27, 1891	June 18, 1920
Twente, Julius	Lafayette, Mo.	Mar. 10, 1899	Sept. 16, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Nixon, Capt. James W.	Wells, Minn.	Apr. 27, 1889	Sept. 16, 1940

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Doan, Capt. Duane I.	Goltry, Okla.	June 25, 1910	(15)
Hardgrove, Maj. Thomas J.	Tigerton, Wis.	Jan. 30, 1905	Mar. 13, 1935
Thomas, Capt. Grace Fern	Gothenburg, Nebr.	Sept. 23, 1897	Apr. 1, 1944
Weaver, First Lt. Thomas H., Jr.	Allentown, Pa.	June 10, 1915	Aug. 2, 1943
Wills, Maj. John Walter	Brookhaven, Miss.	Nov. 6, 1882	July 1, 1922

(15) No record available.

(16) In 1941.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officers:			
Carlisle, Chester L.	Columbus, Ohio	July 18, 1876	Feb. 15, 1920
Defeo, Henry E.	Boston, Mass.	July 8, 1900	Nov. 1, 1939
Douglass, William C.	Troy, N. C.	Apr. 27, 1886	Dec. 1, 1925
Lasche, Percival G.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Feb. 21, 1875	Feb. 14, 1921
Mauley, Louis V.	Ackley, Iowa	Aug. 24, 1898	May 20, 1936
Commissioned dental officer:	Spencerville, Ohio	Jan. 12, 1887	Sept. 6, 1921
McCullis, Capt. William W.	Starbuck, Minn.	Mar. 21, 1897	May 1, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Talle, Otto S.			

PERRY POINT, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Clarke, Col. Harry G.	Toronto, Ohio	July 7, 1885	Jan. 11, 1924
Hymowitz, Capt. Abraham	New York	Nov. 12, 1910	June 15, 1942
McGreavy, Capt. Joan F.	O'Neill, Nebr.	Sept. 13, 1906	May 1, 1944
Malinowski, Capt. Mitchell V.	No record available	June 12, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Morrison, Maj. Benjamin G.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 8, 1908	Nov. 1, 1938
Nagler, Capt. Herman	Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 19, 1910	Mar. 1, 1943
Steckler, Capt. Philip P.	New York City, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1910	Feb. 2, 1942
Trollinger, Lt. Col. Arvin E.	Hindsville, Ark.	Apr. 24, 1897	Jan. 18, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Covalesky, Victor John	Forest City, Pa.	Mar. 13, 1913	Oct. 16, 1941
Dolan, John E.	Kankakee, Ill.	Jan. 1, 1882	Oct. 30, 1931
Smith, Lucian C.	Nov. 29, 1875	Nov. 29, 1875	Jan. 22, 1931
Torrey, Eugene W.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 4, 1893	Mar. 11, 1940
Civilian dental officers:			
Lynch, George G.	Larchmont, N. Y.	May 11, 1897	Dec. 13, 1943
Reed, Oscar R.	Labadie, Mo.	Feb. 16, 1887	Jan. 1, 1921

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Edwards, Maj. Thomson	Philadelphia, Pa.	Aug. 13, 1887	Mar. 1, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Davis, William J. L.	Paterson, N. J.	Feb. 5, 1876	Mar. 26, 1945
Diodati, Vincent	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 15, 1889	Oct. 28, 1919
Lewis, John F.	Seranton, Pa.	July 24, 1886	Feb. 1, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Small, John J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 15, 1892	Oct. 6, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Leginus, Capt. Peter G.	No record available	Mar. 29, 1903	Feb. 9, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Blew, Edgar M.	Bridgeton, N. J.	Mar. 27, 1882	Sept. 6, 1944
Harvey, H. Brooks	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 3, 1896	Jan. 13, 1944
Laux, Leo J.	Sayre, Pa.	Dec. 27, 1894	Sept. 1, 1944
Morales, Manuel G.	No record available	Aug. 13, 1890	Feb. 1, 1926
Penrose, Thomas	Paterson, N. J.	Jan. 20, 1880	Apr. 18, 1921
Riggin, George H.	Seaford, Del.	Apr. 7, 1879	Mar. 1, 1944
Samuel, Meredith	Providence, Pa.	Aug. 29, 1875	Mar. 6, 1945

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Golomb, Capt. Milton W.	No record available	Aug. 15, 1906	Dec. 17, 1943
Lussier, Maj. Arthur H.	St. Rosalie, Canada	Jan. 18, 1897	Dec. 19, 1939
McFadden, Maj. Harry W.	No record available	Oct. 15, 1888	Jan. 20, 1945
Murphy, Capt. Samuel Alfred	do	May 9, 1889	Sept. 2, 1941
Nathan, Capt. Louis	do	Oct. 11, 1902	June 1, 1942
Yoder, Capt. Robert D.	do	Dec. 18, 1905	Feb. 23, 1944
Civilian medical officer: Lauer, Cyril F.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Apr. 22, 1889	July 19, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Hayes, Lee W.	North Tonawanda, N. Y.	June 9, 1894	Dec. 1, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Kretz, Capt. Stewart F.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 5, 1908	Apr. 12, 1943
Civilian medical officers:			
Edgar, Joseph C.	Coulterville, Ill.	Apr. 5, 1881	Mar. 13, 1944
Mehler, Carl J.	Sharon, Pa.	Oct. 31, 1882	Apr. 5, 1945
Parker, Albert G.	Clairton, Pa.	Apr. 8, 1908	Apr. 10, 1944

PORTLAND, OREG.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Broun, Maj. James R.	Moss Point, Miss.	Feb. 3, 1907	Oct. 10, 1935
Carter, Col. Paul I.	Hamilton, Va.	Aug. 28, 1885	Oct. 31, 1907
Eisendorf, Capt. Lester H.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 4, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941

PORTLAND, OREG.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Fowlkes, Capt. Everill Wm.	Butterville, Utah	Mar. 31, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Gandin, Capt. Morris M.	Bachmut, Russia	Apr. 18, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Green, Maj. Joseph S.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Apr. 23, 1903	Nov. 4, 1929
Havlicek, Maj. Theodore L.	Verdigre, Nebr.	Sept. 10, 1902	Mar. 5, 1937
Hyman, Maj. Milton D.	New York City	July 2, 1911	June 15, 1942
Keller, Maj. George F.	Wisconsin	Dec. 24, 1899	May 4, 1931
Maguire, Lt. Col. Leo M.	No record available	Aug. 22, 1888	May 1, 1922
McClintic, Maj. James K.	Phillipsburg, Pa.	July 6, 1891	May 1, 1931
O'Toole, Capt. Arthur J.	Omaha, Nebr.	Oct. 16, 1907	June 25, 1937
Owens, Capt. Guy E.	Norton, Kans.	Apr. 15, 1887	June 1, 1942
Revell, Maj. Arthur J.	Scammon, Kans.	Aug. 5, 1904	Apr. 1, 1942
Sherwin, Capt. Richard N.	Willamina, Oreg.	June 20, 1910	June 1, 1942
Wolski, Capt. Joseph B., Jr.	Chicago, Ill.	May 1, 1911	Mar. 1, 1943
Civilian medical officers:			
James, Ernest F.	Altoona, Pa.	May 1, 1874	Apr. 1, 1924
Pfeiffer, George E.	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 25, 1891	Nov. 26, 1920
Williams, Michael	New York, N. Y.	July 8, 1906	Aug. 2, 1943
Commissioned dental officers:			
Carson, Capt. Carlisle	St. Louis, Mo.	May 10, 1895	May 8, 1922
Roloff, 1st Lt. Edwin H.	Maple Creek, Wis.	Dec. 12, 1905	Aug. 2, 1942

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cooper, Capt. Maurice Z.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Feb. 19, 1905	May 1, 1936
Speldt, Capt. Glenn P.	Iowa City, Iowa	Aug. 13, 1897	Apr. 13, 1937
Civilian dental officer: Granata, Tancredi G.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 11, 1891	Feb. 1, 1944
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Caldarone, Alfred.	Providence, R. I.	Feb. 27, 1888	Oct. 24, 1921

RENO, NEV.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blatt, Capt. Samuel E.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 10, 1905	Dec. 2, 1940
Seitz, Maj. Ira J.	Mandan, N. Dak.	Apr. 30, 1888	Oct. 1, 1931
Winkow, Capt. William E.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 4, 1907	July 8, 1940

ROANOKE, VA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adelman, Capt. Solomon	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 17, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Cibelli, Maj. Louis A.	New York City	July 29, 1909	Oct. 3, 1938
Des Rochers, Maj. Jean B.	Chicopee, Mass.	June 23, 1906	Feb. 2, 1937
Faingold, Capt. Joseph E.	St. Paul, Minn.	Nov. 20, 1909	Jan. 15, 1940
Gussion, Capt. Philip	New York	July 13, 1909	Do.
Hudgens, Lt. Col. John C.	Elberton, Ga.	Jan. 10, 1896	Apr. 14, 1925
Leibstain, Capt. Herman	Norfolk, Va.	Jan. 26, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Meyer, Maj. George I.	Pochahon, Ill.	Sept. 14, 1904	Dec. 10, 1934
Oxman, Capt. Morris F.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 3, 1910	July 8, 1940
Ransome, Maj. John T.	Hampton, Va.	June 21, 1893	Nov. 5, 1932
Ross, Capt. Samuel H.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 8, 1906	Mar. 2, 1942
Zobel, Capt. Harold	Grodna, Russia	June 30, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Drake, Clifford	Tennessee	June 24, 1881	Nov. 20, 1928
Pillar, Samuel	New York City	Oct. 19, 1899	Dec. 1, 1943
Wilfong, Clavel T.	Glenville, W. Va.	Jan. 15, 1893	Sept. 18, 1919
Commissioned dental officer: Nolan, Capt. James I.	No record available	July 4, 1886	Feb. 16, 1921
Civilian dental officer: Fussell, George E.	Abbeville, Ga.	May 31, 1892	Mar. 1, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Boice, James M.	Money More, Ireland	June 24, 1881	Mar. 15, 1945

ROSEBURG, OREG.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cohenour, Maj. Robert E.	Joliet, Ill.	Sept. 21, 1913	May 1, 1941
Pisetsky, Capt. Joseph E.	New York City	Nov. 15, 1909	July 16, 1942
Richardson, Lt. Col. W. P.	Salem, Oreg.	Feb. 1, 1894	Mar. 1, 1941
Rosenblyett, Capt. Sidney	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 14, 1907	Jan. 17, 1935
Schaefer, Capt. Otto	Augsburg, Germany	May 5, 1909	July 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Kinney, Kenneth M.	Astoria, Oreg.	Oct. 23, 1890	Nov. 23, 1927
Melvin, George M.	Camden, Miss.	June 30, 1885	July 2, 1919
Commissioned dental officer: Amiot, Capt. William F.	Worcester, Mass.	Mar. 16, 1890	Nov. 20, 1919

RUTLAND HEIGHTS, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Anderson, Capt. Nels H.	Marshalltown, Iowa	Sept. 26, 1907	Sept. 30, 1943
Boral, Capt. Henry	Poland	Nov. 1, 1905	June 1, 1942
Felderman, Capt. Jacob	Providence, R. I.	Nov. 5, 1909	Feb. 23, 1938
Gaines, Lt. Col. Justin E.	Mussel Fork, Mo.	Jan. 22, 1904	May 1, 1930
Gilbert, Maj. Meyer M.	Kuniey, Russia	Nov. 10, 1889	Jan. 16, 1939
Giventer, Capt. Max	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 15, 1908	May 1, 1941
Hechler, Capt. Robert	Springfield, Mass.	June 13, 1908	Mar. 16, 1942
Hoechstetter, Maj. Stanton S.	Wilksburg, Pa.	Mar. 1, 1904	July 28, 1930
John, Maj. Ralph C.	Lescott, Kans.	Nov. 19, 1894	Oct. 28, 1935
Kaplan, Maj. Rubin H.	New York City	Feb. 27, 1907	Aug. 1, 1938
Powers, Capt. Harry J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 16, 1890	Mar. 27, 1939
Smerz, Capt. Anton	Chicago, Ill.	June 13, 1910	Jan. 15, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Hamlin, William E.	Boston, Mass.	Nov. 12, 1875	Nov. 10, 1920
Rooney, John F.	Worcester, Mass.	Nov. 13, 1889	Mar. 16, 1935
Wilson, John N.	Lansdowne, Md.	Jan. 7, 1900	July 1, 1929
Commissioned dental officer:			
Newton, First Lt. Bert W.	Newell, Iowa	Dec. 25, 1895	Dec. 16, 1942

SALINA, KANS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Civilian medical officer: Kenney, Clarence J.			
	No record available	Jan. 13, 1882	Apr. 1, 1922

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Dovey, Maj. Edward G.	Plattsmouth, Nebr.	Nov. 23, 1890	May 1, 1930
Humphrey, Capt. Norton R.	Fairwater, Wis.	July 13, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Mendelson, Capt. Max M.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 13, 1914	Feb. 2, 1942
Roberts, Maj. Nathaniel E.	Lebanon, Ore.	Mar. 30, 1888	Feb. 3, 1931
Rosenberg, Capt. Harold	Bayonne, N. J.	Dec. 3, 1912	May 1, 1941
Winters, Maj. Allen C.	Jacksonville, Fla.	Mar. 28, 1907	July 5, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Forbes, Harry B.	Ogden, Utah	Oct. 29, 1877	Sept. 11, 1944
Hinckley, Elmer E.	Salt Lake City, Utah	Dec. 29, 1878	Feb. 16, 1945
Knowles, Charles E.	Springwater, N. Y.	Oct. 12, 1898	July 8, 1940
Commissioned dental officer:			
Snoddy, Capt. William H.	La Junta, Colo.	Dec. 22, 1894	Oct. 6, 1924
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Hummer, Leo F.			
	Iowa City, Iowa	Mar. 5, 1881	Jan. 7, 1944

SAN FERNANDO, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bailey, Maj. Jesse L.	Bynum, N. C.	Jan. 11, 1905	Mar. 19, 1938
Chandler, Maj. James B.	Madison County, Ga.	Nov. 1, 1903	July 3, 1934
Disney, Maj. Edward K.	Coal Creek, Tenn.	Jan. 6, 1896	Dec. 20, 1940
Hobson, Maj. Lewis C.	No record available	Jan. 15, 1886	Apr. 18, 1930
Leverton, Lt. Col. William R.	Bowie, Tex.	Aug. 20, 1882	Nov. 9, 1928
Malone, Capt. John T.	Louisville, Ky.	Oct. 10, 1890	Oct. 25, 1920
Mapes, Maj. William D.	Pueblo, Colo.	Nov. 3, 1907	May 19, 1936
Mensch, Capt. Saul A.	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 12, 1909	Feb. 3, 1941
Scarborough, Capt. Dorothy L.	Caddo, Okla.	Apr. 1, 1901	Aug. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Crede, William H.	Chicago, Ill.	July 13, 1879	Apr. 1, 1921
Damron, John E.	Union County, Ill.	Nov. 28, 1886	July 11, 1930
Farnsworth, David C.	Lincoln, Nebr.	June 5, 1882	July 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer:			
Bleasdale, Capt. John W.	Cleveland, Ohio	July 25, 1891	July 6, 1922

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Burger, Maj. Max M.	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 22, 1908	June 6, 1938
Berk, Capt. Morris	Kansas City, Mo.	June 2, 1912	Jan. 11, 1939
Friscoe, Maj. Lance E.	Greenville, Ind.	Mar. 1, 1890	Dec. 31, 1924
Creech, Maj. Clarence M.	Pacolet, S. C.	Mar. 16, 1903	Oct. 19, 1931
Donnelly, Col. James G.	Paterson, N. J.	Apr. 8, 1890	Aug. 16, 1921
Feldman, Capt. Sanford E.	San Francisco, Calif.	Apr. 20, 1914	Feb. 3, 1941
Majka, Capt. Frank A.	Tacoma, Wash.	Apr. 19, 1910	Nov. 1, 1938
Mann, Capt. Nathan	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 28, 1906	July 8, 1940
Movitt, Capt. Eli Rodin	Kiev, Russia	Dec. 24, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Schlosser, Capt. Joseph	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 2, 1913	May 1, 1941
Smith, Lt. Col. John V.	Independence, Iowa	Apr. 22, 1907	Oct. 28, 1935
Smith, Capt. Phillip B.	De Pere, Wis.	Mar. 9, 1912	Feb. 3, 1941
Wilson, Maj. Ernest LeRoy	Olmstedville, N. Y.	Apr. 22, 1888	July 16, 1925

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—CON.			
Civilian medical officers:			
Baxter, Geoffrey H.	Sebastopol, Calif.	Apr. 10, 1899	Mar. 2, 1931
Chase, John S.	Denver, Colo.	Mar. 18, 1890	Oct. 20, 1934
Coney, Rember J.	Maysville, S. C.	Mar. 27, 1882	July 6, 1931
Jillson, Walter A.	Orange, Mass.	Feb. 21, 1881	June 15, 1925
Kaess, Andrew Joseph	Vienna, Austria	May 11, 1879	July 14, 1944
Mitchell, Myron S.	City of Gaissin	Feb. 24, 1890	Oct. 4, 1944
Peace, Elber B.	Fort Norris, N. J.	Sept. 25, 1887	Mar. 27, 1922
Weber, Manuel L.	Vobolnik, Russia	Nov. 17, 1892	Nov. 20, 1930
Commissioned dental officers:			
Single, Maj. Harry A.	Merrill, Wis.	June 8, 1893	Mar. 1, 1921
Davis, Arthur L.	Mitchell, S. Dak.	Oct. 13, 1884	June 8, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Bross, Capt. Samuel I.	Nikopol, Russia	Aug. 11, 1880	Sept. 21, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Ehlers, Reginald	Newark, N. J.	Dec. 3, 1886	Sept. 21, 1944
Baldwin, Anton	Baltimore, Md.	Oct. 25, 1887	July 22, 1942
Martin, John F.	Stonington, Conn.	Aug. 6, 1879	Aug. 15, 1921
Swenson, Reuben	Crookston, Minn.	Nov. 16, 1893	Apr. 30, 1941

SAN JUAN, P. R.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Compos Del Toro, Capt. Luis	Puerto Rico	Feb. 22, 1897	Dec. 1, 1938
Serra, Chavarry, Maj. Jaime	No record available	Jan. 17, 1893	Jan. 2, 1929

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Pascal, Capt. Oscar	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 25, 1910	May 1, 1941
Walsh, Maj. John S.	Sunderland, Mass.	Dec. 20, 1898	May 14, 1929

SEATTLE, WASH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Appelman, Capt. Milton L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 3, 1909	Dec. 2, 1940
Clayberg, Capt. Harold D.	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 24, 1892	Mar. 16, 1942
Ruben, Capt. Benjamin D.	East Port Chester, Conn.	Aug. 16, 1890	Feb. 10, 1941
Civilian medical officer: Carey, Leland O.			
	Palmyra, Iowa	Dec. 3, 1886	Dec. 5, 1928
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Caplan, Louis	Albany, N. Y.	Feb. 7, 1900	May 28, 1942
Capps, Paul G.	Illioopolis, Ill.	June 24, 1884	Dec. 11, 1944
Wilkinson, Harry	Brooklyn, Iowa	Nov. 2, 1882	May 16, 1944

SHERIDAN, WYO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bennett, Maj. Edward R.	No record available	Dec. 13, 1905	Feb. 1, 1937
Gloffely, Maj. James S.	Batavia, Iowa	June 15, 1905	Apr. 2, 1937
Mitchell, Maj. Henry S.	Oakland, Md.	Jan. 5, 1891	Oct. 30, 1930
Robins, First Lt. Sol. A.	Bielostok, Poland	Nov. 12, 1902	Dec. 2, 1940
Sterling, Lt. Col. Harold W.	Duenweg, Mo.	Sept. 26, 1903	Apr. 16, 1931
Stewart, Capt. John H.	San Antonio, Tex.	Jan. 1, 1902	Feb. 3, 1941
Civilian medical officer: St. Antoine, Henry			
	Burlington, Vt.	Sept. 23, 1891	July 22, 1919
Commissioned dental officer:			
Clark, Capt. Raymond J.	Maryville, Mo.	Aug. 5, 1895	May 1, 1930

SIoux FALLS, S. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer:			
Cunningham, Capt. Robert S.	Wheeling, W. Va.	Jan. 31, 1907	Jan. 15, 1940
Civilian medical officer: Vermeulen, Peter			
	Zeeland, Mich.	Feb. 3, 1886	Oct. 4, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Riner, Harold L.			
	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 15, 1910	Sept. 20, 1943

ST. CLOUD, MINN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Kaplan, Capt. Samuel	Newark, N. J.	July 26, 1916	Mar. 2, 1942
King, Capt. Llewellyn H.	Washington, D. C.	Oct. 1, 1899	Feb. 28, 1938
Klotz, Capt. Maurice	Belfast, Ireland	June 6, 1906	Sept. 13, 1937
Kutert, Maj. John H.	Spring Lake, Mich.	Aug. 28, 1908	July 8, 1940
Passarella, Maj. Frank A.	Chicago, Ill.	Dec. 12, 1893	June 13, 1930
Rosenbloom, Capt. William	Monessen, Pa.	May 11, 1910	May 2, 1941
Schrier, Capt. Harold L.	New York, N. Y.	Nov. 8, 1913	Mar. 2, 1942
Wiggin, Maj. Dayton C.	South New Market, N. H.	July 18, 1882	Jan. 23, 1923
Civilian medical officers:			
Davis, Charles F.	Bethlehem, N. H.	Oct. 6, 1886	Apr. 12, 1925
Pringle, John A.	Pittsfield, Ill.	May 1, 1888	June 16, 1921
Sharp, Earl	Waldo, Wis.	Feb. 22, 1881	Do.
Civilian dental officer: Trainor, Aloysius J.	Graceville, Minn.	Mar. 9, 1892	Dec. 16, 1920

ST. LOUIS AREA OFFICE

ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Anderson, Frank	Springfield, Mo.	Oct. 25, 1896	Sept. 16, 1944
Cashin, John E.	Montgomery, Ala.	Dec. 25, 1870	Jan. 18, 1944
Gomien, Scott	Colfax, Ill.	Feb. 8, 1894	Dec. 17, 1923
Kaminskas, Joseph T.	Chicago, Ill.	June 3, 1911	May 2, 1938
O'Reilly, William	Aisey, Ill.	July 15, 1881	Mar. 6, 1944
Sheahan, Edwin L.	St. Louis, Mo.	Aug. 10, 1882	Jan. 24, 1944

SUNMOUNT, N. Y.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Aronson, Capt. Abraham	Chicago, Ill.	June 2, 1911	June 2, 1938
Crandall, Maj. Will G.	No record	Apr. 4, 1892	Sept. 1, 1930
Doane, Capt. Edwin A.	Los Angeles, Calif.	July 18, 1906	June 15, 1942
Durham, Maj. William R.	Maxeys, Ga.	Aug. 12, 1902	Dec. 18, 1934
Gustafson, Capt. Carl J.	Sweden	Dec. 24, 1886	May 1, 1941
Lipsecomb, Col. Harold R.	Carrilton, Ga.	Oct. 21, 1894	June 4, 1921
McHueh, Maj. John B.	Summit Hill, Pa.	Nov. 29, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Schwartz, Capt. Louis	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 27, 1903	Aug. 1, 1941
Walters, Lt. Col. Henry W.	Lincoln, Nebr.	June 26, 1908	Jan. 17, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Byrne, Albert B.	Fort Thomas, Ky.	Sept. 9, 1893	July 19, 1944
Crumrine, Leslie B.	Beallsville, Pa.	May 10, 1884	Jan. 2, 1931
Harrwood, Bruno S.	Plock, Poland	Jan. 1, 1880	June 1, 1944
Furlinton, Charles O.	New Hartford, Conn.	June 7, 1874	Oct. 29, 1920
Scott, McClure	Reeston, Va.	Nov. 13, 1876	Dec. 3, 1928
Civilian dental officer: Park, Laurence.	Stevens Point, Wis.	Aug. 13, 1890	Dec. 20, 1921

TOGUS, MAINE

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Balkin, Maj. Seymour S.	Russia	Mar. 31, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Dachslager, Capt. Philip	New York, N. Y.	June 29, 1911	Nov. 2, 1942
Dunn, Maj. Robert H.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 16, 1907	June 17, 1935
Gardner, Maj. William A.	St. Mary, La.	Jan. 20, 1887	Oct. 16, 1937
Harris, Capt. Ralph N.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	June 22, 1907	Feb. 3, 1941
Jump, Lt. Col. Clarence E.	Japan, Mo.	Nov. 1, 1902	Feb. 15, 1937
Kaplan, Maj. Julius A.	Boston, Mass.	Nov. 1, 1898	Nov. 6, 1922
Lipton, Maj. Sidney	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 21, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Mazzola, Maj. Stephen	do.	Dec. 26, 1906	Aug. 1, 1941
Mountford, Lt. Col. Arthur H.	Salem, Mass.	Mar. 23, 1886	June 8, 1925
Namiot, Capt. Charles	Russia	June 28, 1896	Feb. 2, 1942
Newman, Capt. Benjamin	New York, N. Y.	June 20, 1915	June 1, 1942
Schwartz, Capt. David	Austria-Hungary	Apr. 10, 1903	Do.
Staelva, Capt. Stanley J.	Kalisz, Poland	Apr. 10, 1905	Mar. 16, 1942
Ventimiglia, Maj. William A.	New York, N. Y.	July 26, 1910	Jan. 6, 1941
Weinstein, Capt. Sol.	do.	July 24, 1909	Mar. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Davis, Urey G.	Princeton, Ky.	Dec. 15, 1885	May 1, 1923
Commissioned dental officer: Berliner, First Lt. David.	New York	Dec. 12, 1907	Oct. 9, 1941
Civilian dental officer: Butterfield, Percy R.	Winterport, Maine	Sept. 23, 1899	Mar. 1, 1930

TUCSON, ARIZ.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cameron, Maj. Lester	Pictou, Canada	Aug. 1, 1894	July 8, 1931
Drozda, Maj. Joseph P.	Omaha, Nebr.	Sept. 2, 1906	July 1, 1942
Gipe, Capt. Walter W.	Connersville, Ind.	Aug. 16, 1884	May 22, 1944
Greenbaum, Capt. Philip S.	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 2, 1908	July 8, 1940
Gunter, Lt. Col. Roy A.	Canton, Ga.	July 22, 1886	Oct. 20, 1919
McWhirt, Maj. Willis E.	Leampas, Tex.	Sept. 23, 1884	July 4, 1920
Siegel, Capt. Philip	Beacon, N. Y.	Nov. 18, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Titche, Maj. Leon L.	Monroe, La.	Apr. 7, 1910	Feb. 20, 1941

TUCSON, ARIZ.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officer: Anderson, Carl A.			
Sweden	Sweden	Jan. 28, 1879	Oct. 8, 1921
Commissioned dental officer: Yohe, Capt. Perce P.			
Monongahela, Pa.	Monongahela, Pa.	Jan. 1, 1893	Nov. 15, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Seibert, Alexander W.			
Illinois	Illinois	Sept. 6, 1875	Aug. 6, 1919

TUSCALOOSA, ALA.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Albel, Capt. Louis	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 7, 1903	Nov. 2, 1942
Byer, Capt. Louis	Manchester, England	Oct. 1, 1906	Mar. 16, 1942
Center, Capt. Abraham H.	Savannah, Ga.	Mar. 7, 1905	Feb. 3, 1941
Feldman, Capt. Raymond	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 27, 1909	July 17, 1939
Ingram, Lt. Col. George H.	Delta, Ala.	Sept. 6, 1886	Jan. 15, 1923
Johnson, Lt. Col. George L.	Upson County, Ga.	Apr. 13, 1882	Dec. 26, 1919
Kahn, Capt. Edward	Chicago, Ill.	July 7, 1914	Sept. 16, 1942
Rackow, Capt. Leon L.	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 28, 1910	Feb. 3, 1941
Rhodes, Maj. Gilbert A.	do.	Dec. 29, 1889	Feb. 27, 1930
Roberts, Maj. Albert L.	Gilbert, Miss.	Oct. 11, 1888	July 1, 1922
Solovay, Capt. Julius	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 24, 1909	Feb. 24, 1936
Commissioned dental officer: Tyler, Maj. Jesse M.	Bogue Chitto, Miss.	July 17, 1885	Nov. 17, 1920

TUSKEGEE, ALA.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allen, Capt. Robert L.	Barbados, British West Indies	Sept. 16, 1901	Dec. 28, 1931
Parker, Maj. Prince P.	do.	Dec. 15, 1897	Oct. 8, 1924
Branche, Lt. Col. George C.	Louisburg, N. C.	Jan. 10, 1896	Nov. 8, 1923
Carter, Capt. Peter J.	Franktown, Va.	July 28, 1889	Mar. 30, 1925
Davis, Maj. Harvey F.	Chase City, Va.	Aug. 22, 1896	Nov. 21, 1923
Dibble, Col. Eugene H., Jr.	Camden, S. C.	Aug. 14, 1893	Feb. 16, 1936
Dickson, Capt. Leon A.	Portland, Maine	Oct. 17, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Dwiggins, Maj. Horace G.	Kansas City, Kans.	Mar. 17, 1909	May 5, 1938
Johnson, Maj. Simon O.	McIntosh, Ga.	Dec. 1, 1895	Oct. 30, 1923
Kennedy, Capt. James A.	Pine Bluff, Ark.	Oct. 10, 1884	Dec. 18, 1926
Kersey, Capt. George M.	Richmond, Va.	Aug. 2, 1911	Feb. 2, 1942
Lewis, Capt. Willis E.	Charleston, W. Va.	May 14, 1898	Mar. 16, 1927
Looney, Capt. Gordon C.	Springfield, Mo.	Dec. 21, 1904	Aug. 1, 1941
Peters, Maj. Jesse J.	Fort Wayne, Ind.	Aug. 17, 1895	Nov. 1, 1926
Pitts, Capt. Charles N.	Bibb, Ga.	Nov. 3, 1900	Jan. 4, 1932
Richardson, Capt. Peter L.	Charleston, S. C.	May 5, 1898	Oct. 1, 1926
Smith, Maj. Alan P.	Topeka, Kans.	Feb. 27, 1895	Aug. 16, 1927
Taylor, Capt. Junius L.	Newbern, N. C.	Apr. 8, 1912	Feb. 2, 1942
Tildon, Lt. Col. Toussaint	Waxahachie, Tex.	Apr. 5, 1893	Sept. 1, 1928
Williams, Capt. Joshua W.	Lightfoot, Va.	Feb. 12, 1899	Feb. 21, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Berry, Joseph A.	Charleston, S. C.	Aug. 4, 1895	June 1, 1942
King, Drue	Augusta, Ga.	Mar. 16, 1887	Oct. 22, 1923
Lee, Edwin H.	Seguin, Tex.	Mar. 3, 1886	Feb. 2, 1931
Mahone, Loniel A.	Anniston, Ala.	Mar. 16, 1894	May 1, 1930
Commissioned dental officer: Davis, Capt. Thomas B.	No record	July 3, 1885	Oct. 11, 1923

WACO, TEX.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Brannon, Maj. Earl P.	Hastings, Okla.	Sept. 28, 1908	June 1, 1938
Crowell, Capt. Robert W.	Galveston, Tex.	Jan. 6, 1914	Mar. 16, 1942
Friedman, Maj. Carl	New Jersey	Mar. 24, 1914	May 1, 1941
Grossman, Maj. Maurice	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 5, 1907	Jan. 25, 1938
Holmes, Lt. Col. Mansell B.	Mount Vernon, Mo.	Aug. 9, 1895	Jan. 26, 1927
Lupo, Capt. Thomas G.	New York City	May 7, 1910	May 1, 1941
Marinacci, Capt. Alberto A.	Italy	Dec. 1, 1903	Feb. 3, 1941
Rubin, Col. Harry	Weyerross, Ga.	May 16, 1890	Apr. 1, 1921
Watman, Lt. Col. Morris	Odessa, Russia	Aug. 21, 1905	Oct. 16, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Gill, John L.	Rosedale, Mo.	Nov. 9, 1880	Feb. 18, 1925
Laird, John S.	Newton County, Miss.	Jan. 24, 1882	Sept. 16, 1920
McDaniel, John F.	Magnolia, Ark.	Aug. 18, 1896	Nov. 8, 1922
Phillips, Warren M.	Newton, Ill.	Jan. 19, 1884	June 1, 1926
Smith, Joseph G.	Groveton, Tex.	Sept. 20, 1881	Oct. 1, 1928
Commissioned dental officer: Wyatt, Capt. Hamlette G.	Prices Branch, Mo.	Nov. 15, 1892	Dec. 15, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allison, Capt. Harold T.	Brookings, S. Dak.	Apr. 8, 1886	Apr. 30, 1942
Price, Capt. Enoch C.	Waco, Tex.	Jan. 26, 1885	Apr. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officer: Hudleston, William E.	Hayes County, Tex.	Dec. 25, 1891	Feb. 10, 1944

WADSWORTH, KANS.

CENTRAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Anderson, Capt. James O.	Lehi, Utah	Apr. 2, 1899	June 15, 1942
Berger, Maj. Morley	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nov. 3, 1905	Aug. 16, 1935
Epstein, Capt. Benjamin	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 18, 1910	Mar. 2, 1942
Ford, Maj. Harold V.	Kansas City, Mo.	Oct. 9, 1907	Feb. 18, 1935
Freeman, Maj. William K.	San Augustine, Tex.	Dec. 31, 1904	Jan. 6, 1936
Gellman, Capt. Milton B.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 27, 1912	(18)
Glazer, Capt. Michael H.	Riga, Cowna County, Russia	Oct. 20, 1892	Feb. 1, 1938
Gross, Capt. Norman H.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 13, 1911	Oct. 6, 1938
Haynes, Capt. Harry J.	Alexandria, Va.	July 2, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Hoberman, Capt. Morton	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 7, 1910	Feb. 3, 1941
Hoge, Maj. Solomon F.	Waynesburg, Pa.	June 26, 1887	May 16, 1928
Hohman, Maj. Louis M.	Cincinnati, Ohio	Feb. 8, 1896	Jan. 27, 1922
Ingber, Capt. Nathan G.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Mar. 18, 1908	June 3, 1938
Marshall, Maj. Malcolm Y.	Kentucky	Sept. 14, 1889	Jan. 5, 1931
Man, Capt. Walter	Riverdale, Ill.	Jan. 28, 1916	June 15, 1942
Slavin, Capt. Manuel	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 26, 1905	Dec. 2, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Alee, Gail D.	High Point, Mo.	Aug. 7, 1876	Feb. 15, 1920
Hunter, Matthew C.	Alto, Mich.	Feb. 1, 1890	Jan. 16, 1924
Ward, Melgie	Georgia	Feb. 24, 1882	Dec. 6, 1920
Williams, Frank Lee	Ellis, Kans.	Feb. 14, 1885	Aug. 21, 1919
Yates, Albert S.	Groyson, Ky.	Apr. 17, 1893	July 8, 1940
Commissioned dental officers:			
Fishman, Capt. Julius	New York City, N. Y.	Oct. 20, 1909	June 30, 1941
Owen, Maj. Victor S.	West Virginia	June 1, 1898	May 1, 1922
Civilian dental officer: Tate, Walla	Franklin County, Ill.	Dec. 8, 1893	June 26, 1940

WALLA WALLA, WASH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Beatty, Lt. Col. Jesse J.	Rockport, Mo.	Feb. 15, 1886	Jan. 21, 1920
Deagen, Capt. James R.	Bloomer, Wis.	Aug. 29, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Feldman, Capt. Noah	New York City, N. Y.	Jan. 5, 1909	Feb. 3, 1941
Jaffe, Maj. Bernard	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 20, 1908	May 1, 1941
Lioy, Capt. Anthony D.	Jersey City, N. J.	Aug. 21, 1909	Jan. 7, 1944
Muirhead, Capt. Samuel John	Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil	Feb. 11, 1913	May 1, 1944
Smithson, Maj. Carl B.	Alva, Okla.	Aug. 11, 1895	Feb. 23, 1937
Warner, Maj. Oliver M.	Evansville, Wis.	Dec. 31, 1895	Jan. 16, 1933
Civilian medical officers:			
Jamieson, George	Devils Lake, S. Dak.	Oct. 2, 1889	Sept. 17, 1931
Nather, Fred B.	Grayville, Ill.	June 6, 1882	Dec. 12, 1919
Soderstrom, James C.	Malvern, Iowa	Jan. 22, 1905	Mar. 15, 1939
Civilian dental officer: Hamilton, Robert	Chicago, Ill.	July 20, 1891	Apr. 22, 1930

CENTRAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
CENTRAL OFFICE			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baird, Col. John H.	Newark, Ohio	Mar. 8, 1890	July 15, 1921
Boswell, Lt. Col. John R.	Penfield, Ga.	June 14, 1898	Sept. 1, 1925
Brooke, Lt. Col. Charles R.	Prince Georges County, Md.	Oct. 25, 1891	Oct. 1, 1920
Cane, Lt. Col. Byron S.	Saranac, N. Y.	July 23, 1895	May 20, 1931
Cook, Lt. Col. Frederick M.	Heidelberg, Miss.	Feb. 11, 1888	Jan. 21, 1924
Culbertson, Lt. Col. William F.	Paola, Kans.	July 12, 1887	May 16, 1921
Harding, Col. James C.	Chicago, Ill.	Feb. 20, 1893	Jan. 21, 1921
Martin, Lt. Col. Earl A.	Tiffin, Ohio	Aug. 27, 1885	Oct. 1, 1928
Melia, Col. Hugo	Indianapolis, Ind.	Feb. 26, 1888	July 1, 1926
Mueller, Maj. Camillo F.	No record available.	May 30, 1899	Aug. 26, 1939
Murphy, Col. Dennis J.	do	Sept. 11, 1886	Jan. 9, 1921
Rose, Col. Edwin J.	Cadmus, Ohio	June 9, 1884	June 15, 1920
White, Col. Herman C.	Dallas, Pa.	Sept. 28, 1893	Sept. 20, 1920
Wolford, Col. Roy A.	Piedmont, W. Va.	July 11, 1894	Aug. 1, 1920
Yokley, Lt. Col. Charles W.	Baileytown, Tenn.	Dec. 17, 1893	May 10, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Eastwood, Edmund	Greenwich, N. J.	Aug. 26, 1881	Oct. 22, 1941
Farmer, Myron H.	Newnan, Ga.	Aug. 30, 1889	Oct. 29, 1930
Griffith, Charles M.	Jasper, Minn.	May 22, 1882	July 28, 1919
Wood, Clayton L.	Stanford, Conn.	Nov. 9, 1888	Feb. 23, 1922
Commissioned dental officer: Trent, Lt. Col. Ralph W.	Leekesville, N. C.	Mar. 18, 1905	July 1, 1926
Civilian dental officer:			
Beers, Lloyd Y.	Bath, Pa.	Nov. 22, 1886	Dec. 12, 1919
Fowler, Milburn	Skowhegan, Maine	Sept. 21, 1891	May 16, 1920
Gilliam, Paul S.	Crittenden, Va.	Apr. 5, 1888	Aug. 17, 1921

ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES

Veterans Claims Service

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
Commissioned medical officers:			
Brimmer, Maj. Karl W.	McCook, Nebr.	Jan. 18, 1893	May 15, 1944
Crofton, Maj. George H.	Taunton, Mass.	July 4, 1888	Apr. 1, 1920
Dembrow, Maj. William L.	Russia	May 28, 1889	July 1, 1918
Drummond, Maj. Henry S.	Russellville, Ark.	Nov. 3, 1885	Apr. 1, 1931
Johnston, Maj. Harry V.	No record available.	May 16, 1883	Oct. 15, 1928
Minthorn, Maj. Martin L.	Moorhead, Iowa	Nov. 6, 1895	Mar. 6, 1923
Rider, Maj. Ernest B.	Morgan City, Iowa	Dec. 25, 1888	May 21, 1938

¹⁸ Feb. 1, 1940; Mar. 2, 1944.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
CENTRAL OFFICE—Con.			
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES—Con.			
Veterans Claims Service—Con.			
Civilian medical officers:			
Ashley, Charles W.	Clinton, Ind.	Dec. 22, 1882	July 18, 1921
Barry, Howard J.	Oregon, Wis.	July 28, 1879	May 18, 1925
Brandenberger, E.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Apr. 11, 1887	July 12, 1921
Conger, Jason H.	Brushton, N. Y.	July 15, 1887	Dec. 12, 1921
Cook, Richard L.	Washington, D. C.	Nov. 5, 1878	Mar. 27, 1920
Ditchburn, David	Bareley, Pa.	Apr. 25, 1878	Mar. 21, 1921
Ernst, John R.	Louisburg, Kans.	Feb. 24, 1884	Feb. 20, 1930
Fales, Ella Roy	Huntsville, Ala.	Aug. 9, 1874	Sept. 1, 1944
Hall, Jesse L.	Smithwick, Kans.	Dec. 13, 1886	Sept. 16, 1920
Howell, Dent H.	Marion, Ill.	Feb. 5, 1879	Mar. 1, 1921
Israel, Isaac J.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Aug. 20, 1885	Dec. 3, 1923
Lancaster, George	La Plata, Md.	Jan. 13, 1888	Dec. 1, 1930
MacLain, Marshall	New Jersey	Jan. 23, 1890	Nov. 15, 1920
Mehibop, Clarence W.	Dubuque, Iowa	Apr. 1, 1872	Jan. 3, 1944
Shirkey, Ivy G.	Sissonville, W. Va.	Jan. 31, 1890	Apr. 16, 1925
Thompson, Burton	Troy, Ind.	Dec. 29, 1885	Jan. 20, 1920
Travers, Edgar E.	Cambridge, Md.	Feb. 5, 1885	Dec. 15, 1930

Board of Veterans Appeals

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
Commissioned medical officers:			
Clark, Lt. Col. Fred H.	Georgia	May 6, 1895	Aug. 3, 1920
Gladding, Maj. Walter R.	New Church, Va.	June 28, 1898	Apr. 10, 1942
Kimberly, Maj. David	No record available.	Oct. 1, 1899	Mar. 19, 1942
Koch, Maj. Benno F.	LeRoy, Wis.	May 10, 1891	Jan. 15, 1921
Ladd, Lt. Col. John M.	Petersburg, Va.	Jan. 25, 1891	Dec. 1, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Brooks, Alexander	New York City	Jan. 19, 1886	July 20, 1921
Caldwell, Bernie	New Castle, Va.	Dec. 22, 1877	Dec. 1, 1919
Cooper, Edwin H.	Findlay, Ohio	Jan. 12, 1878	Mar. 22, 1920
Fisher, E. Moore	Chester, England	Nov. 2, 1875	Nov. 1, 1919
Foxwell, Raymond	Leonardtown, Md.	Dec. 20, 1891	(19)
Gilchrist, Edgar	Wolfsburg, Pa. (employee on extended sick leave)	Nov. 13, 1879	Sept. 16, 1904
Groover, Gordon	Savannah, Ga.	Feb. 24, 1892	Apr. 1, 1931
Nelson, John	Nebraska	Jan. 15, 1884	Aug. 1, 1920
Smith, D. O.	Derby, Iowa	Mar. 24, 1881	(20)

Insurance Claims Council

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cavanaugh, Maj. Leo M.	Cumberland, Md.	July 6, 1888	Dec. 5, 1921
Knott, Maj. William L.	Washington, D. C.	Jan. 18, 1909	July 2, 1937
Leonard, Maj. Edward A.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 8, 1883	May 20, 1920
Schroeder, Maj. Leo P.	Calumet, Mich.	Sept. 13, 1889	Aug. 29, 1921
Stewart, Col. Harrison M.	North Adams, Mass.	May 16, 1888	Nov. 27, 1922
Stretch, Maj. Clarence M.	No record available.	Mar. 4, 1893	May 27, 1930
Trucease, Maj. Joseph P.	Butler, Pa.	Sept. 29, 1898	Dec. 22, 1930
Yost, Maj. Ernest L.	No record available.	Mar. 30, 1891	Jan. 17, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Drew, Henry C.	Baltimore, Md.	Apr. 5, 1887	(21)
Heffner, William J.	Springfield, Mass.	May 23, 1879	Mar. 5, 1919
Kneeder, Harry	Collinsville, Ill.	Sept. 23, 1870	Mar. 27, 1944
McDermott, Bernard A.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 19, 1884	Oct. 16, 1924
Osterhaus, Karl	Norfolk, Va.	Mar. 7, 1882	Dec. 1, 1919
Thompson, Ralph	Springfield, Ohio	Sept. 14, 1894	Feb. 15, 1945
Villaroman, Isabelo R.	San Rafael, Bulacan, Philippines	July 8, 1909	Sept. 14, 1944

MOUNT ALTO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bacon, Lt. Col. Frank S.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Jan. 12, 1906	Nov. 16, 1931
Bardsley, Col. Lewis G.	Bridgewater, Conn.	Dec. 27, 1888	Mar. 1, 1921
Bersack, Maj. Solomon E.	Ukmerge, Lithuania	Feb. 3, 1908	Jan. 15, 1940
Bimenthal, Maj. Basil	New York, N. Y.	Nov. 23, 1899	Aug. 15, 1938
De Angelis, Maj. Carmelo E.	do	June 29, 1911	May 1, 1941
Eisner, Capt. Cyrus I.	do	Mar. 27, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Feinstein, Capt. Harold R.	do	Oct. 17, 1912	Mar. 16, 1942
Finck, Capt. Harold Y.	Jersey City, N. J.	July 2, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Goebel, Lt. Col. Clarence J.	Hartington, Nebr.	Oct. 16, 1900	Oct. 7, 1930
Goldberg, Maj. Herbert A.	New York, N. Y.	May 7, 1909	Feb. 14, 1936
Haynes, Lt. Col. Grady O.	Gate City, Va.	Oct. 31, 1895	Sept. 3, 1924
Kauffman, Maj. William P.	Port Jervis, N. Y.	June 24, 1904	Oct. 1, 1938
Kessler, Maj. Israel	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 18, 1908	Mar. 22, 1937
Levatin, Capt. Paul	Boston, Mass.	July 14, 1913	Feb. 2, 1942
Lindsay, Capt. Merrill K.	Topeka, Kans.	May 20, 1884	Feb. 7, 1944
Nesbitt, Maj. John W.	Sycamore, Ill.	Mar. 19, 1908	Feb. 7, 1937
Paul, Capt. Norman	Russia	Apr. 14, 1901	Dec. 1, 1941
Perkins, Maj. Hanson T.	Springfield, Md.	Aug. 26, 1889	Sept. 1, 1925
Pettengill, Maj. Warren M.	Haverhill, Mass.	Feb. 23, 1894	Mar. 30, 1931
Resta, Maj. George A.	Louisville, Ky.	Dec. 23, 1904	Sept. 16, 1931
Taylor, Capt. Ingram C.	Milo, Iowa	Oct. 7, 1904	July 8, 1940
Traum, Maj. Aaron H.	Fort Morraan, Colo.	Mar. 22, 1907	Jan. 4, 1935
Weinberg, Capt. Benjamin A.	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 17, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Barshp, Maurice M.	Baltimore, Md.	Dec. 25, 1889	Nov. 24, 1928
Giltner, Harry A.	New Washington, Ind.	Nov. 6, 1878	Apr. 25, 1944
Gunion, John Paul	Washington, D. C.	Sept. 15, 1876	Aug. 25, 1921
Lacy, Justin E.	Bedford County, Tenn.	Oct. 18, 1878	Feb. 1, 1921
Commissioned dental officer: Lanier, Maj. William D.	Birmingham, Ala.	Feb. 24, 1889	Sept. 26, 1919

REGIONAL OFFICE

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bvington, Maj. Samuel B.	Charlestown, W. Va.	Nov. 29, 1886	Oct. 10, 1921
Meade, Maj. Spencer V.	New York, N. Y.	July 19, 1904	June 14, 1938
Reichard, Maj. Morris	Hungary	Sept. 9, 1881	Feb. 28, 1924

¹⁹ Feb. 8, 1926, to June 30, 1941; Nov. 3, 1943.

²⁰ June 27, 1918, to May 15, 1919; Sept. 16, 1920.

²¹ Feb. 1, 1920, to Aug. 30, 1922; Oct. 16, 1922.

WAUKESHA, WIS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Garment, Maj. Edward M.	Boston, Mass.	Dec. 10, 1905	Apr. 8, 1937
Johnson, Maj. Herbert L.	Willacoochee, Ga.	Nov. 2, 1891	Apr. 1, 1927
Kellam, Maj. John W.	Pungoteague, Va.	Nov. 2, 1890	May 1922
Kimber, Maj. Karl E.	Clark County, Ohio	Jan. 3, 1907	Sept. 28, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Asper, Guy P.	York Springs, Pa.	Apr. 17, 1880	July 15, 1921
Carlin, Seymour	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 21, 1912	Mar. 16, 1942
Cassidy, Franklin	Charlestown, Miss.	Nov. 24, 1886	June 1, 1921
Darius, Dean J.	Athens, Greece	Aug. 2, 1908	Oct. 17, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Glicklich, Isadore.	Stepan, Russia	Feb. 15, 1896	Mar. 23, 1931

WEST ROXBURY, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baxley, Lt. Col. Haughton W.	Baltimore, Md.	Apr. 22, 1896	Feb. 18, 1922
Cassell, Capt. Edward F., Jr.	Nielose, Mass.	June 30, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Dalton, Maj. Stephan J.	Marlboro, Mass.	Nov. 4, 1894	Nov. 1, 1920
Imburgia, Maj. Frank J.	Akron, Ohio	Jan. 8, 1907	Feb. 2, 1937
Livingston, Lt. Col. Stanton K.	Wilbraham, Mass.	Apr. 10, 1898	Dec. 22, 1930
McLaughlin, Maj. Joseph H.	Whitman, Mass.	Sept. 30, 1893	Feb. 11, 1939
Rudman, Maj. Benjamin W.	Hartland, Maine	Dec. 2, 1892	Aug. 20, 1920
Saiwen, Maj. Robert	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 3, 1911	Feb. 1, 1940
Shahon, Maj. Henry L.	Aydin, Turkey	Apr. 16, 1896	May 2, 1941
Simonetti, First Lt. Louis J.	Capriati al Volturno, Italy.	Mar. 17, 1906	Mar. 1, 1943
Stein, Maj. Tobias	Zelva, Poland	Sept. 10, 1906	Jan. 21, 1939
Toltz, Capt. Julius B.	Drinsk, Russia	Sept. 25, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Sorkin, Joseph J.	Russia	Mar. 2, 1893	Feb. 2, 1937
Tartakoff, Samuel	Boston, Mass.	Oct. 2, 1899	Jan. 12, 1925
Commissioned dental officer: Kadison, Capt. Charles G.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 1, 1900	July 11, 1938
Civilian dental officer: Delaney, Henry A.	Bronx, N. Y.	Aug. 17, 1888	June 7, 1924
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Medalia, David B.	Moscow, Russia	Dec. 12, 1888	Jan. 17, 1944
Moran, Andrew C.	Manville, R. I.	Apr. 27, 1890	Oct. 1, 1920
Sharry, Charles F.	Somerville, Mass.	Sept. 23, 1886	Oct. 4, 1944

WHIPPLE, ARIZ.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Hornyak, Maj. William J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 23, 1909	Oct. 16, 1939
Reed, Maj. Ernest Corydon.	Wichita, Kans.	Nov. 7, 1894	Oct. 23, 1930
Weinstein, Maj. Selig B.	Stepan, Poland	June 10, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Brann, Harold	Roland, Ill.	May 28, 1884	Dec. 15, 1920
Daniel, Grover C.	Oliville, Ky.	Nov. 24, 1891	July 11, 1919
Faby, John E.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 22, 1876	Apr. 15, 1920
McCreary, Marcellus	Evergreen, Ala.	Apr. 12, 1874	May 1, 1944
McKenna, Harold	Montgomery, Minn.	June 1, 1898	Aug. 23, 1930
Robins, Seymour	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 15, 1908	May 10, 1943
Wilkiemeyer, Fred	Newport, Ky.	Sept. 7, 1879	Sept. 16, 1925
Commissioned dental officer: Kettner, Capt. Eugene C.	Trinidad, Colo.	Oct. 17, 1895	Feb. 1, 1921

WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Birnbaum, Maj. Leo	New York City	Aug. 20, 1894	Jan. 15, 1935
Cooper, Maj. Philip	Boston	Nov. 11, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Levitt, Capt. Harry	New York City	Jan. 8, 1904	Mar. 16, 1942
Warszawsky, Maj. Harry	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 5, 1909	Feb. 16, 1937
Weiss, Capt. Andor A.	Czechoslovakia (now Hungary)	June 14, 1906	Dec. 1, 1939
Weissberg, Capt. Jonas	New York City	Dec. 16, 1909	Nov. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Levy, Emanuel	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 30, 1886	Apr. 1, 1920
Salomonsky, G. H.	Richmond, Va.	Mar. 12, 1903	Jan. 11, 1935
Commissioned dental officer: Sawyer, Capt. Bertram H.	Melrose, Mass.	July 5, 1894	Apr. 15, 1922

WICHITA, KANS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Fitzgerald, Maj. Edward M.	Pine Island, Minn.	Aug. 29, 1904	May 1, 1936
Hinkle, Maj. Warren I.	Bigelow, Mo.	Dec. 2, 1895	Feb. 1, 1939
Paye, Maj. Philip H.	Grosse Pointe, Mich.	Sept. 14, 1909	May 1, 1941
Pearce, Lt. Col. Albert R.	Michigan	Oct. 27, 1888	Nov. 1, 1921
Zerlin, Capt. Isidore	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Apr. 11, 1909	Jan. 4, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Curtis, Howard C.	De Kalb County, Tenn.	Dec. 6, 1881	Jan. 31, 1925
Purves, George K.	Tracy, Minn.	Oct. 22, 1874	Nov. 1, 1944
Shelly, Hargus G.	Mulvane, Kans.	Nov. 18, 1881	June 1, 1922
Commissioned dental officer: Clais, Capt. Otto R.	Duluth, Minn.	Nov. 2, 1894	Feb. 2, 1925
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers: Boland, Frank W.			
	Walnut, Iowa	June 4, 1882	Jan. 16, 1944

WOOD, WIS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adashek, Capt. William H.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Jan. 25, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Bensman, Capt. Louis L.	Peoria, Ill.	Apr. 7, 1912	Dec. 1, 1941
Berger, Capt. Louis M.	Chicago, Ill.	Aug. 18, 1908	Feb. 23, 1937
Bresnahan, Lt. Col. John F.	Boston, Mass.	Dec. 18, 1881	Jan. 29, 1931
Coon, Capt. William L.	Denison, Iowa	Sept. 27, 1906	Oct. 10, 1938
Dimond, Maj. Edgar A.	Lamar, Mo.	Sept. 30, 1912	Oct. 17, 1939
Fairall, Capt. Emmett R.	Kidder, Mo.	Mar. 29, 1892	Apr. 1, 1942
Falk, Capt. Victor S.	Stoughton, Wis.	Mar. 4, 1889	Apr. 17, 1944
Feingold, Capt. Philip P.	Russia	Aug. 4, 1899	Dec. 5, 1940
Fritz, Capt. William H.	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Nov. 28, 1907	July 1, 1942
Golkin, Maj. James	Russia	Apr. 21, 1908	Jan. 18, 1939
Jansen, Capt. Harold G.	Albany, N. Y.	Nov. 8, 1889	Apr. 1, 1942
Liberman, Maj. David L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 4, 1893	May 1, 1924
McKie, Capt. John F.	Near Northboro, Iowa	Sept. 4, 1882	Apr. 1, 1944
Mullins, Lt. Col. Glenn	Douglas County, Ga.	Apr. 2, 1892	Nov. 27, 1931
Primakow, Capt. Max J.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Oct. 12, 1906	Jan. 25, 1935
Rhea, Maj. Clarence W.	Forney, Tex.	Sept. 22, 1890	Apr. 1, 1921
Sagi, Capt. Joseph H.	Penbrook, Pa.	Aug. 8, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Sanfelloppo, Capt. Anthony J.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Mar. 23, 1913	Mar. 1, 1943
Schaeffer, Capt. Bernard S.	do	Feb. 4, 1914	Jan. 15, 1940
Shirley, Maj. Amos R.	England	May 12, 1887	Mar. 30, 1920
Slaney, Lt. Col. John G.	Richland County, Wis.	Mar. 23, 1901	Mar. 8, 1932
Slaybaugh, Maj. James C.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Aug. 30, 1907	May 23, 1936
Stein, Maj. William	Jersey City, N. J.	Jan. 19, 1906	Mar. 3, 1938
Szymanski, Capt. Stanley R.	Eric, Pa.	July 1, 1912	June 15, 1942
Trepagnier, Capt. Francis B.	Chicago, Ill.	May 29, 1905	Aug. 1, 1941
Vogl, Maj. Henry L.	South Milwaukee, Wis.	Apr. 13, 1906	Aug. 26, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Alpert, Henry R.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 13, 1907	Feb. 3, 1941
Artman, Edward L.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 2, 1891	Mar. 14, 1938
Guilbert, Gerald D.	Yam Hill, Ore.	Mar. 24, 1896	Sept. 3, 1936
Kristjanson, Hjorleifur T.	Thyngayaisysla, Iceland	Mar. 18, 1876	Apr. 17, 1944
Liefert, William C.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Aug. 22, 1885	June 1, 1920
Maereklein, Arthur G.	do	Sept. 29, 1878	Mar. 16, 1944
McLaughlin, William J.	Templeton, Wis.	Apr. 29, 1885	Oct. 5, 1944
Meyst, Charles H.	Glencoe, Minn.	Feb. 9, 1876	Nov. 1, 1919
Orban, Louis C.	Budapest, Hungary	Apr. 11, 1889	Apr. 24, 1944
Parks, Charles William	Lincoln, Nebr.	June 30, 1888	Oct. 20, 1930
Schlomovitz, Benjamin H.	Milwaukee, Wis.	May 18, 1889	May 1, 1923
Sutherland, Justin	Sylvestor, Wis.	Dec. 15, 1875	Sept. 11, 1944
Thomas, Clyde O.	Elizabeth, Ill.	Feb. 24, 1906	Mar. 16, 1945
Wilson, Richard S.	Harrison County, Ky.	Oct. 22, 1905	Oct. 2, 1939
Wolf, Morris	Muncie, Ind.	June 30, 1879	Mar. 1, 1921
Woodward, William T.	Democrat, N. C.	Feb. 8, 1883	Aug. 16, 1944
Commissioned dental officer: Egrena, Maj. Paul H.	Monticello, Minn.	Aug. 25, 1890	Mar. 13, 1920
Civilian dental officers:			
Baker, Roy H.	Girard, Kans.	Jan. 15, 1890	Mar. 11, 1922
Clark, Alexander	No record available	Apr. 25, 1896	May 15, 1944
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Burke, Charles H.	New Hampton, Iowa	Dec. 12, 1884	Jan. 26, 1931
Froede, Herbert	Milwaukee, Wis.	Apr. 28, 1895	Jan. 18, 1944
Kenney, Joseph F.	Delavan, Wis.	Mar. 28, 1886	Jan. 10, 1944
Land, Richard J.	No record available	May 8, 1900	July 1, 1930
Weed, Linton G.	Oshkosh, Wis.	Oct. 27, 1894	May 1, 1941

Reread these names and then you will understand what we are trying to do.

They kick about the way minority groups are treated in this country. I want you to note the number of a certain minority group represented in this list of doctors.

In some places you will find more doctors from minority groups than there are patients of that group in the hospital. A great many of those doctors are aliens, or else have only recently come to the United States, and can barely speak the English language. Many of them do not have that bedside technique so necessary to establish that confidential relationship between a physician and his patient so essential for a doctor's success in his practice.

Many of them are disliked by the other doctors in the institution, many of them are resented by the nurses, many of them are disliked by the patients themselves.

With that situation in view, we have brought in this bill which has for its purpose the setting up of a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration and to untie the hands, if you please, of General Bradley and General Hawley in order that they may select doctors and pay salaries commensurate with their abilities. This measure will give them the right to go out and get doctors who meet the requirements and get rid of the restrictions that have stirred up so much trouble inside the hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take all the time of the committee because there are other Members who wish to speak. I trust, however, there will be no opposition to this bill. It is one of the best measures of its kind ever proposed to this House, so far as the veterans are concerned.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I am profoundly grateful, profoundly happy, that a measure I have favored and fought to secure the passage of for a very long time is about to become law. I am not entirely satisfied with the bill. I preferred bills that I myself introduced, the provisions of which were in a bill which later General Bradley recommended the enactment of. I felt that kind of Medical Corps would prove more satisfactory to those employed in the corps and would insure better service for the veterans. However, I am thankful to have this bill. Day after day I have taken the floor of Congress and pleaded and pleaded for a medical service. Day after day I pleaded with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to have more beds and better care for our veterans. Now at last the battle is won in the House. Later it must pass the Senate to become law. We must then make sure that the law we pass is carried out by the Veterans' Administration. Never again must tragic conditions—deplorable, inexcusable conditions, even beatings, in the hospitals for the mentally sick, due to overcrowding and lack of vision—take place again.

Briefly, this bill before us, H. R. 4717, would abolish the medical service in the Veterans' Administration as at present constituted, and would establish in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director.

The functions of the department would be those necessary for complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The bill provides that the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the Office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service. It provides that the Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the Chief Medical Director, one Deputy Medical Director, eight Assistant Medical Directors, a Director of Nursing Service, a Chief Pharmacist, Chief Dietitian, Chief Physical Therapist, and Chief Occupational Therapist, each at a fixed statutory salary. Provision is made for the appointment of such other personnel and employees as may be authorized under the bill for the Office of the Chief Medical Director. The appointments in the Office of the Chief Medical Director are made for a period of 4 years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause, and reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Provision is made for the appointment by the Administrator of additional doctors, dentists, and nurses without regard to the Civil Service Classification Act, and also for the appointment of those with civil-service status such as managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, scientific personnel, and other medical and dental technologists. The conditions of eligibility for appointments, including professional and other qualifications, are set out in the bill for both those having civil-service and non-civil-service status. Provision is made for appointment of persons under the act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and for the payment for their services under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

As to doctors, dentists, and nurses, there is provided a probationary period of 3 years, with necessary administrative provisions for review of employment records and for their separation from the medical, dental, and nursing services if the person is found not fully qualified and satisfactory. Promotion of doctors, dentists, and nurses is provided for on the basis of examinations, and automatic promotions may be made within grade. Those now in the medical service as presently constituted will be continued therein until their qualifications are determined for service in the new department.

Provision is made for including in the computation of service for civil-service reinstatement purposes service performed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery by persons receiving appointments therein, and who at the time of such appointments shall have a civil-service status, and whose employment in the new department is terminated at any time. This provision, however, will not permit restoration of any position which has been abolished by this act.

As to doctors, dentists, and nurses, other than specified officials in the office of the Chief Medical Director established in the bill, provision is made for the grades and per annum full pay salary ranges showing the minimum and maximum within the grade.

The bill provides for specialty ratings for doctors, dentists, or nurses, sets out the conditions under which such ratings may be made, and prescribes the rating to be as an allowance, equal to 25 percent of the employee's pay, in addition to his basic pay, provided that his pay plus the allowance may not exceed \$11,000 per annum.

The bill provides that persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions of and entitled to the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended. This was determined upon by the committee in preference to a military system of retirement.

For the non-civil-service employees, other than those in the office of the Chief Medical Director, provision is made for the establishment of disciplinary boards and for their organization and procedure, for the purpose of conducting investigations and answering charges. The Administrator, on recommendation of such board, where charges are sustained, would take the necessary action, which would be final.

The bill provides for appointment under civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, of such additional employees, other than those specifically exempt therefrom by the bill. It also provides that these employees shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status upon certification of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where such person is presently employed.

Provision is made for increasing the minimum salary range for hospital attendants. The range as provided in the bill runs from \$1,572 minimum to \$1,902 maximum.

The bill requires that the Administrator establish a special medical advisory group, composed of members of the medical and allied scientific professions, to be named by the Chief Medical Director. The function of the group is to advise the Administrator through the Chief Medical Director, and the Chief Medical Director direct, relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans and other matters pertinent to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. It is required that this group hold regular calendar quarterly meetings, and that the number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to the members be fixed in accordance with existing law and regulations.

Provision is made for the attendance at meetings of associations for the promotion of medical and allied sciences of the personnel in the Office of the Chief Medical Director, and doctors, dentists, and nurses generally, subject to available appropriations. Provision is made for the placing of such employees in schools of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service and in civil institutions with the consent of the authorities concerned, for a period not to exceed 90 days in any one year for the purpose of increasing their professional knowledge or technical training, with the proviso that not more than 5 percent of such personnel may be placed on such duty at any one time.

Provision is made for employment by the Administrator, upon recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, and without regard to civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, of certain types of personnel on temporary full-time, part-time, or fee basis, and for certain other types on a temporary full-time or part-time basis, but that no temporary full-time appointments shall be made for a period of more than 90 days.

Provision is made for the establishment of residencies, and appointments to such positions without regard to civil-service or classification laws, rules, or regulations. This training in most specialties would embrace training outside the hospital in connection with the school, part of the time not being spent on work directly productive to the Veterans' Administration, but for the purpose of increasing the professional knowledge and technical training of the employee.

The bill provides that the Chief Medical Director, with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate the necessary regulations for the administration of the Department and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to travel, transportation of household goods and effects, and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

It is provided in the bill that before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of the act shall be issued by the Administrator, exercising authority conferred by the act, other than administrative rules or orders governing conduct of the activities of the Department or interagency rules governing its relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives dealing with these matters for study, to consider whether such proposed rule or regulation is made in accordance with the spirit, letter, intent, or purpose of the act. Provision is made for the effective date of such rules or regulations in the event of action by these committees, or in the absence of such action.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill will pass the House unanimously. It has been a long hard fight to secure the passage of any medical service bill. I am not satisfied with this bill but it is at least a very forward step in establishing a strong medical corps.

It was reported unanimously by our committee. I am glad to pay tribute to the subcommittee that worked on the drafting of the bill for its painstaking and exhaustive study and the results that it achieved. I refer to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], the ranking Democratic member, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. We are grateful to them for their very hard work.

I also thank the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans and also the chairman of the Committee on

Rules, and the members of both those committees for reporting out the bill unanimously. It has meant much work and many debates.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is long overdue. It resulted from the fact that we did not have a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration during the war and from the fact that we were not able to secure the services of the most expert physicians and surgeons. This situation has been true for a good many years, Mr. Chairman, and, personally, I have felt at times that laymen were almost practicing medicine in the hospitals. There has been no excuse for the conditions in the hospitals, no excuse for overcrowding, no excuse for inadequate care. There was stubborn opposition to improving conditions.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to explain section 16 of the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is a long section. May I explain it when we come to reading the bill? That is the one that sends the regulations of the Veterans' Administration back to the committee before they go into effect.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to take that up later when we read the bill for amendment. I shall be glad to answer that later.

Mr. RABAUT. I refer to section 16.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Our wounded men require a highly specialized care, and in order to secure this highly specialized care it is necessary to pay our physicians and surgeons more than is being paid at the present time by the Veterans' Administration. For instance, we have over 14,000 amputees who will require very expert surgical care and special operations in the shaping of their stumps, in order that artificial limbs may be properly fitted. Then there are from 1,200 to 1,500 veterans with spinal-cord cases which also require expert surgery so that they may have ample opportunity to become almost normal and in order for them to get about with their braces and their crutches, and in order for them to earn a living. Some of these men are getting around today, although previously it was thought such improvement would be impossible.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak also of the so-called plastic cases, those wounded men who were so terribly mutilated that when they were first picked up on the battlefields their faces did not resemble human faces. The plastic surgeons have done a remarkable job by skin grafting, the putting in of bones, the making of artificial noses, and in general the entire reconstruction of the face, so that the men in the future may feel that they look like other people. Miracles have been and are being performed for these boys. Much still remains to be done. Many special surgeons are leaving the Army and Navy. The placing of veterans' hospitals near medical centers will allow these highly trained specialists to go to these hospitals to treat the veterans on a fee basis. Very fine work is done in fitting and making artificial eyes. The use of very

powerful drugs today must be administered by trained physicians because overdoses may prove very disastrous. There is a boy at Walter Reed Hospital today who has had a very bad case of osteomyelitis and has had 14 operations. He participated in the first engagement in the African campaign. A wonder drug had been used for him recently, and it seemed to be curing his osteomyelitis. They have now been unable to secure that wonder drug, and today his osteomyelitis is redeveloping.

I should like to read into the RECORD a letter that one of the surgeons received who is now with one of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in which the Secretary of the American College of Surgeons declines to recommend him as a member of the surgical board. As you Members know, unless a surgeon is able to become a member of the American College of Surgeons, his rating is not high in the community. This bill will bring up the standard of the hospitals and medical service and training so that I think the doctors will be able to qualify for that membership.

The letter from the American Board of Surgery is as follows:

THE AMERICAN BOARD OF SURGERY,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 18, 1945.

I regret the delay in replying to your letter of July 30, which has been due to my absence from the city.

In evaluating your training to date, I wish to say it is doubtful whether any credit can be given for the period from July 1938 to January 1940, inasmuch as your work was not confined to surgery. This is one of the strict requirements of the board, enforced in all instances, and inasmuch as you were doing general practice during this time, it would not seem that you could meet the board's requirements in this regard.

The board has not in general accepted training in the veterans' hospitals, as these institutions have not as yet been finally approved for graduate training in surgery by the American College of Surgeons. Some of these hospitals are under survey at the present time, but until they have been fully approved I cannot give you any information as to how much credit might be allowed for this work.

Very truly yours,

J. STEWART RODMAN, M. D.,

Secretary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the chairman of the committee in paying tribute to the splendid work of the gentlemen who have been handling and who are now handling veterans' affairs. General Hines, in spite of what somebody may have reported in publications recently put out, is regarded, I think, throughout the Nation as a good administrator and a splendid gentleman. We on the committee were closely associated with him and have appreciated his services throughout the years. I also join in the tribute to General Bradley and to General Hawley. I think that those gentlemen are going to acquit themselves splendidly in the high positions which they have assumed. As to General Hawley, I was soon convinced that he was an outstanding medical man and I believe that he is going to

do his best to give us a splendid administration of the medical side of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, this bill grew out of an investigation which was conducted by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House early this year. The members of that committee went throughout the United States and went into the hospitals and examined conditions from top to bottom. We reached a certain conclusion. I want to say here parenthetically that I found no great cause for criticism in the hospitals that I visited. I found nothing of grave moment for which the Veterans' Administration could be seriously criticized.

I want to say that in defense of the men who have been handling the medical side of the Veterans' Administration. I do not mean to say everything was perfect. True, I found weak places, things needing correction, things not to my entire satisfaction, but many of the weaknesses were the result of war conditions and, no doubt, common to other hospitals in the country, private and public. But we can and should strengthen our medical set-up in every way possible and that is what we are undertaking to do in this bill.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. With the exception of the crowded conditions of the hospitals, will not this bill cure nine-tenths of the troubles we found?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill or a bill similar to it was recommended by General Hines before General Bradley took over.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Yes. General Hines testified about a former bill embodying some of the same material we have in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. When General Bradley came in, he endorsed the bill and asked that it be passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank my chairman for his contribution.

This bill is the result of a lot of hard work. This is rather a pioneering bill. I tell you very frankly that your committee worked on this bill very hard over a period of months.

We did not take snap judgment in reporting out this bill. We wrote and rewrote paragraphs and sections many times and tried to analyze every part of it.

Our objective in presenting this bill has been to achieve efficiency, not that the Veterans' Administration has not been efficient, but we felt that it could be made more efficient in the medical service, and we want to achieve more and greater efficiency. Admittedly there was room for improvement. Our objective has been to free the Veterans' Administration from some of the shackles that now, we think, act as an impediment and a deterrent to the best medical service. For instance, as everyone knows, doctors rendering this very high service to our veterans have had to come through the Civil Service Commission. I have felt and the members of that great

committee have felt, and I believe you as Members of the House feel, that you can hardly expect the very highest type of service when you have to get all doctors through the Civil Service Commission. I say that not in a spirit of antagonistic to the Civil Service Commission, but I think we ought to place medical men who have charge of rehabilitating and restoring and treating these veterans on a higher plane than to have to subject themselves to an examination under civil service to get a job in the Veterans' Administration. I think a great many fine medical men do not like to submit to that. Many outstanding medical men might be inclined not to seek this work rather than submit to the red tape and annoyance of employment through civil service.

Now, let me give very briefly an outline of the bill.

The first thing we did was to abolish what we now have in the Veterans' Administration. We abolish the old and create a new medical service under the title of "Department of Medicine and Surgery."

We place the employees in the Veterans' Administration in the medical service in what I am pleased to call for the want of a better designation four categories. In the first category we establish a Chief Medical Director, a Deputy Medical Director, and eight Assistant Medical Directors, top-flight medical assistants. We fix the salaries for those few men. In this bill they are statutory officers in the medical service. These men are to be appointed by the Veterans' Administrator and, of course, he will collaborate with the Chief Medical Director of the Medical Service, who is at present General Hawley. These men, of course, are to be appointed without reference to the civil service. Their salaries are fixed. They will be appointed without an examination even, because they are top men, they are policy-making men. Then in the same category we authorize a director of nursing and provide for the appointment, if desired, of a chief pharmacist, and certain other chiefs, and fix their salaries. All appointments in this category are for periods of 4 years, but reappointments may be made for like periods.

In the second category, under paragraph (a) of section 4, we provide for the appointment of doctors, dentists, and nurses. Under this bill, the doctors, dentists, and nurses are likewise to be appointed outside of the civil service. That is the second group. But they will take an examination, such examination as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe. They will, like all other employees in the Veterans' Administration, receive civil-service retirement benefits. That is the only connection they will have with civil service. They will retain their civil-service retirement benefits, but they will be selected from outside the civil service.

In the third category, we have established certain other groups of employees. In that category we have the great group of employees, those below the doctors, nurses, and dentists. All those employees below doctors, dentists, and nurses, ex-

cept those in section 14, will be under civil service and will be selected through civil service. Of course, they will have retirement benefits under the civil service just as all the other employees in the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The appointment of doctors, dentists, and nurses will be for a probationary period of 3 years. The object of that, of course, is to see how they get along and see how they perform during that period of 3 years. It all makes for efficiency. Not only are doctors, dentists, and nurses appointed as a result of examination but promotions are likewise based upon examination. The present medical service, of course, is continued, subject to examination and approval of their qualifications. In the fourth group or category will be found the temporary employees listed in section 14. As one would expect, they are not placed under civil service.

General Hawley was particularly anxious about the establishment of residences in the hospitals for the training of younger men and also the creation of specialists. The bill makes provision accordingly. The bill provides for disciplinary boards to hear charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct upon the part of doctors, dentists, and nurses and makes the decision of the Administrator final.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to point out a matter in the bill in which there were differences of opinion in the committee. I refer to placing osteopaths in the bill, along with medical doctors. General Hawley, who is to administer this bill and on whose shoulders the medical administration largely rests, strongly urged that this not be done. He opposed it and thought it was inadvisable to do it. He was under the impression that it would cause a lot of trouble and confusion, particularly among medical men, and we all agree that we need harmony. Frankly, I do not know enough about osteopathy to discuss its work in detail, but since it seems to be generally objectionable to medical men and since General Hawley, who must make this bill work, earnestly requested the committee to leave it out of the bill, I was among those who voted against including it in the bill.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not compulsory. It is merely optional with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is true, but when you put it in the bill General Hawley seems to be of the opinion that it might be the cause of confusion and strife and he urges against it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion that this bill, as a whole, is one of the finest bills ever reported out of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee. We lay no claim to perfection. Like other legislation, it may have

to be amended as the need may be shown, but it is, I think, a great forward step in obtaining for our veterans the finest medical and hospital service in the world. We want them to have that. These heroes must have the best. I am happy that it was my privilege to give weeks and weeks of my time in framing this most important bill for our veterans. As chairman of the subcommittee that worked so long in framing the bill, I want to express my appreciation to the splendid gentlemen who served with me, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. I believe this bill will go far toward curing whatever shortcomings there may have been in our veterans' hospitals. This bill creates and establishes the greatest hospital system in the world. I hope this House gives its unanimous approval to this bill and I trust it will become a law very soon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to congratulate and thank the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and particularly members of the subcommittee who did such a wonderful job on this bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Section 1 of this bill abolishes the medical service in the Veterans' Administration, and in its stead establishes a department of medicine and surgery under a chief medical director.

Second. It fixes higher salaries for the doctors, nurses, dentists, and pharmacists. What the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] referred to as the top-flight men. The purpose of this is to attract a higher standard of skill among the men and women who have most to do with our injured and ailing veterans.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wonder upon what the committee based the number of eight assistant directors.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not know.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There will be an amendment submitted to make that read "not to exceed eight."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The bill further provides for the setting up of disciplinary boards to handle troublesome conditions in the hospitals. It provides for the appointment of a special medical advisory group to aid in getting better skill among the medical profession who are working on these veterans.

The civil-service feature of the bill is one I wish to discuss more at length. You will recall that last spring certain charges were made in certain publications in the United States to the effect

that first-rate men were getting third-rate medical care in the veterans' hospitals throughout the United States. The Congress by resolution authorized members of the Veterans' Committee to make an investigation. This investigation was made. I personally investigated hospitals from Pennsylvania clear through to Nebraska. I am sure when I tell you of my findings in those hospitals that I am speaking the opinion of a great majority of the committee, if not all of them, who were also out going through hospitals in various parts of the country.

First, I found the hospitals very, very good. I found the charges made in the magazines were mostly made out of whole cloth. There were a few isolated cases that gave an opportunity for some reporters to write up a story, but it did not apply to the hospitals generally. I found the food was good, well prepared, and clean. I found the veterans in the hospitals well pleased, on the whole, with the service they were receiving. This does not mean, however, that we did not find conditions that should be corrected, for the best interests of the veterans.

One of these conditions, that practically all of us found to exist, goes right back to what the civil service makes possible. I am going to paraphrase now a colloquy I had with the Administrator of one of these hospitals, and what he said in reply to me applies generally to every one I visited.

"Yes; we have a doctor or two, probably a nurse or two here that is destroying the morale of the veterans."

I said, "Why don't you get rid of them?"

"I cannot."

I said, "Why?"

"Because of civil-service regulations. The mantle of the cloak of civil service is wrapped around them and they are protected."

I said "What is the matter with these doctors?"

"Well," he said, "they are good in their medicine. They know their books. I cannot criticize them for that, but they have the wrong attitude toward the patients. They call them 'jerks.' They talk to them as if they are in there only to increase compensation for some ailment. They tell them they are not there in good faith."

I found cases where nurses had thrown bedpans at the patients, called them "malingerers" and said that they should not be there. Yet, in each instance, the professional capacity of those individuals was good.

Then I said, "Why can't you get rid of them under civil service?"

"Under civil service, I would have to file charges. They lie there for 30 days. I have to call in their colleagues to testify. They won't do it. I do not have time to follow it up. What happens? They are simply transferred to another hospital. The veterans in another hospital get the same service as the veterans here."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. From the gentleman's acquaintance with Government employment generally, would not

the gentleman say that civil service leaves something to be desired in employment throughout the field service for a similar reason?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would not go that far at this time. I have always been an advocate of civil service; I believe in it; I have worked for it in the State legislature at home. Let me say in answer to the gentleman's question that the Veterans' Committee of this House is not interested in the civil service, it is not interested in the doctor, it is not interested in the nurse, it is not interested in the employees of the hospital, but it is interested in the veteran, the boy in the bed who needs the service; and if under civil service the veteran in the bed is not getting what he needs, then the civil-service regulations should be changed in the interest of the veteran.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am, of course, heartily in accord with the spirit the committee has shown, but my thought is that the same thing that is interfering with getting efficient and satisfactory—I should say satisfactory rather than efficient—satisfactory personnel in the veterans' service, I am inclined to believe, exists in some other fields of Government service, and there is room for improvement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Undoubtedly the gentleman's criticism has merit, but in answer to the gentleman from South Dakota, I want to say that I am talking for the veterans.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that this puts the responsibility fairly and squarely on the medical service and does not give the medical service a chance to say that they cannot get such and such men out because of civil service? They will have to be very carefully selected.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is exactly right; and we are trying to make the service sufficiently attractive in the hospitals to draw a better class of doctors; we are increasing salaries hoping it will attract better men to the service and keep those already in the service interested in their work.

Further than that, we have not taken away any retirement or bonus benefits they have earned under civil service. We are only giving to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the right to discharge an employee who is not rendering first-grade service to the veterans. That is all the change we are making in the inroads upon the civil service. But I say that when civil service interferes with the veterans getting first-class treatment, I mean the bed patient, the boy in the bed, if civil service is the cause of that, we should amend the civil-service regulations to that extent; and that is where the subcommittee has done such a magnificent job in this bill.

Something was said in regard to section 16. The gentleman from Kansas will explain that in detail. Let me first say to the membership of the House, however, that you all voted for a similar provision last July when the revised GI bill was before you and passed this House unanimously. That is the reason for its

being in here. The reason for its being in the revised GI bill which is now in conference is that the regulations interpreting the GI bill and the manner in which it is to be administered were not written in accordance with the intent of Congress and the Veterans' Committee of this House. If they had been it would not have been necessary to amend it. If this regulation had been in the original bill so that the Veterans' Administration would have had to submit its interpretation, rules, and regulations to the committee that drafted the bill or to a subcommittee, the GI bill would be a functioning much better than it is now and more to the satisfaction of the discharged veteran.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One further question, and first let me say that I am in accord with what the gentleman has been saying about the bill; but for the purpose of the record I believe attention should be called to one sentence in section 16.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman does not mind, I wish he would wait until the gentleman from Kansas takes the floor, for he is going to discuss that section in particular.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will touch on it now. I may say that the reason I am asking the question and wish it answered now is because I must go to an Appropriations Committee hearing in just a minute or two.

The sentence to which I refer reads as follows:

Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Finance of the Senate or by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either.

Would the gentleman state whether "duly authorized subcommittee" means a committee with majority and minority party representation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay tribute to the entire membership of the Veterans' Committee and emphasize the fact that in approving this bill they took into consideration only the welfare of the veteran. I am aware that certain groups, organizations, and individuals may not like certain provisions of this measure, but when we legislate for veterans I say we should legislate for them and no one else. No matter how much particular individuals on the outside may be hurt, we should consider this legislation purely from the standpoint of the veteran. Your committee, I submit, has reported to you a veterans' bill, and nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] a member

of the subcommittee that worked on this bill.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is good legislation and I see a great necessity for it, because it will give to those in charge of the medical policy of the Veterans' Administration an opportunity to revamp, reorganize, and make certain corrections in policies that have existed in these hospitals since their inception; policies that should have been corrected a long time ago. In my opinion, they could have been corrected from an administrative standpoint and not through the necessity of additional legislation.

As a member of this committee I have had an opportunity to visit many of these hospitals in the past few months. I spent 4 days at a tuberculosis hospital down in North Carolina and also visited a tuberculosis hospital at Mendota, Wis. I spent over 3 weeks at Wood, a general hospital in Milwaukee, Wis., and some time at the general hospital in Biloxi, Miss., and the mental hospitals at Gulfport, Miss., and Waukesha, Wis.

Mr. Chairman, I have come to the very honest conclusion that the medical service in these hospitals has been poor and mediocre. I came to that conclusion from some of the things I have seen in these hospitals and because of the extremely weak and imaginary medical policy that has prevailed in the Veterans' Administration ever since its inception. It could not be otherwise, and I am going to explain to you the reasons.

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

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been impossible for General Hines, as Administrator, to clean up this condition under the present law because he could not fire these doctors. He had to accept them, they were forced on him, but with this bill those changes can be made.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The gentleman is correct that this legislation is proper, that it will give the Administrator an opportunity to get rid of undesirable personnel, but he has always had that opportunity under civil service. I am for this provision knocking out the civil service; do not misunderstand me.

Mr. RANKIN. An article appeared the other day which I hope the gentleman noted. I know the other members of the committee saw it. This article cited the instance of one doctor who got on the civil-service list at the age of 86 or 87 years old and it cited another one who had been in an insane institution. What we are doing is untying the hands of the Veterans' Administration so that they can get the right kind of doctors to do the work.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent piece of legislation and it will bring about an opportunity to correct those conditions. The point I make is that these evils have existed ever since the organization of the Veterans' Administration and cannot be attributed to the civil service nor can they be attributed to the difficulties brought about by the war.

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

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that all the years prior to the war this condition which he is now describing existed?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is my honest opinion.

Mr. DOYLE. Why was it not corrected before?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I will tell the gentleman the reason. There was a man at the head of the medical department who was completely dominated by a civilian and did not have the opportunity to exercise the judgment that a free, independent doctor should be able to exercise in a position of this kind.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will read the list of the names I put in the RECORD today and the date these men were selected, he will find that this trouble has grown up since the war broke out, that is, within the last 3 or 4 years. This trouble did not exist 10 years ago.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. It has increased.

Mr. DOYLE. One further question, and I refer to section 16 of the bill, and I direct the inquiry to the attention not only of the distinguished members of the subcommittee, but the chairman of the main committee as well.

Section 5 specifies that a doctor of osteopathy also may be employed. Relating section 5 to section 16, line 19, where it provides that the committee of the House shall consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, and intent, I wish to ask this definite question: Is it the intent of Congress that osteopaths may be employed? In asking that question, I will state frankly that I am in favor of osteopaths being employed, but I know of no way that the Veterans' Administrator will know whether or not it is the intent of Congress that osteopaths may properly be employed, unless the Congress speaks out on it. I want the RECORD to show whether or not it is the intent of Congress that osteopaths shall be employed.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. He is given discretion.

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

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

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from California to that particular provision of the bill which says he may be employed.

Mr. DOYLE. I know that, and that leaves it entirely up to the Administrator.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is absolutely so.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to know specifically whether or not it is the intent of the Veterans' Committee of this House, if the question arises, to allow osteopaths to be employed.

Mr. KEARNEY. Speaking for myself, that was the intent of the Veterans' Committee when this section was put into that bill.

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

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from California that it leaves it

optional with the Veterans' Administrator. This rule or regulation that the gentleman refers to in section 16 is merely a guard against what might be an attempt to make laws by regulation, and I understand there is a bill in the Senate to make it apply to all departments. But that section will not have the slightest effect on the employment of osteopaths.

Mr. DOYLE. I would like to ask either the chairman or the distinguished speaker another question or so, because I want to have this stated specifically.

As I understand this bill, it could easily be the case that the committee of Congress declare that it was not the intent of Congress that osteopaths should be employed, and I want to know what the intent of the committee of Congress is, as a matter of record, if I may have the answer, please, to that question.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has had the answer two or three times. It is left optional with the Administrator.

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

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I suggest to the gentleman that he offer an amendment to the bill, if he wants to make it mandatory; otherwise, it is permissive. Personally, I feel that any osteopath should be allowed to practice, provided he is also a doctor.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will be able to get a few additional minutes, because I think I have a message that this Congress should hear.

When I say that the type of service that our veterans have received throughout the years is poor and mediocre, I say that under the policy existing it could not be otherwise. In the first place, a professional man is attached to an institution for one of two reasons; either because of the pay which is allowed or because of the opportunity that is given him to reach professional attainment and to develop in his own profession. Neither of these was permitted under the old system, and as soon as a doctor became affiliated with a veterans' hospital, he developed very shortly into a glorified clerk. Most of his time, yes, 60 percent of his time was spent in writing out reports, in running errands, and in doing those things that are not necessarily of a professional nature. They did not let that man experiment. They did not give that man an opportunity to grow with his profession.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That doctor was never given an opportunity to take a refresher course. I have come across instances where men who have been connected with the institutions as head surgeons have not had an opportunity to take these courses. As an illustration, the head surgeon in Biloxi, Miss., who had been there for 25 years, on many occasions had requested an opportunity to take refresher courses so that he could keep abreast with, and be cognizant of, the developments in his profession, but he was not able to take them. That was

generally the practice that prevailed in those times.

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

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

Mr. KEARNEY. If he did take those refresher courses, is it not true that he took them at his own expense?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is correct. Those things were discouraged. That doctor was not given an opportunity to grow with his profession. This has been a weak and unimaginative policy.

As an illustration, it was 6 months after the great wonder drug, penicillin, had been recognized and had been employed throughout the entire world that the Veterans' Administration started to use it. You will find examples of this throughout the entire policy and program employed during that period.

The average doctor has told me that after a short time he was interested only in getting his monthly pay check and in his eventual retirement. They took all of the ambition out of that professional man, they took all of the opportunity away from him and did not give him the things that were needed. Most of these men are good men, they are kindly men. They were generous to their patients. They had a proper understanding from a sympathetic standpoint. But they felt that inadequacy.

The most starting fact backing up the things I say is that throughout that entire period of time the doctors of the Veterans' Administration contributed very little to the advancement and development of medicine. That is a singular thing and an unfortunate one, because the Veterans' Administration has had a great opportunity, like other institutions. This is the greatest medical institution in the world, and they have had opportunities to contribute to the development and advancement of medicine, but they have not done that except in some minor developments, such as in osteomyelitis and in cancer at Hines University.

So, I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is much-needed legislation. I also say that most of these things could have been corrected by administrative methods through a policy instituted by a strong man at the head of the Administration.

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

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Compare the mental institutions of the Veterans' Administration with the State mental institutions, and you will find that up to the time this unusual condition occurred at the beginning of this war there was not a State insane institution in America whose record compared favorably with that of any veterans' mental institution throughout the country.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is a correct statement, and I heard that same analysis made before our committee; but the fact is that it is an unfair comparison because the Congress of the United States appropriates at least twice the amount per patient that is available to the various State, municipal, and private hospitals throughout the country. There

is no reason why the Veterans' Administration should not give much, much better service than that which is given in the State institutions, because we appropriate twice the money that is available to take care of the patients in the private hospitals.

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

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If they had had the medical service all this time which I have begged for for years, and I have begged the Administrator to approve it, then they would not have had these things happen. The men would have been in as they were in the Army. They would have had a fine type. They would not have had beatings as they did in one of the hospitals, which was very tragic.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Why, there is no doubt about that.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The passage of this bill will strengthen the hand of the Administrator in correcting the evils that the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Without question, it is of great assistance.

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

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Following the thought expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] in regard to osteopathic doctors, I think it might be reasonable to point out that there will be a large section of our veterans who may have been accustomed to calling upon osteopathic doctors before they entered the service. Now, if they enter these hospitals, they may again call for that type of service. Therefore, I think it is proper for the committee to have included osteopathic doctors in this bill, since they may be required.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That may be correct except that I would make this observation. Those who testified before the committee in behalf of including this profession stated that their profession allowed them to perform medicine and surgery of every possible type, including brain surgery and stomach surgery. I say that I do not know whether these gentlemen are qualified to do that type of work. If they could restrict it, according to my interpretation of that profession, which is the manipulation of the hands, I think that would be all right.

Mr. DONDERO. That could be determined by the medical administration that we are setting up under this bill.

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

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The man who appeared before the committee stated that in those States where they were licensed they had

to pass exactly the same examinations that medical doctors do.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Yes.

Mr. DE LACY. The gentleman has made a brilliant statement concerning some of the evils in this medical set-up and has placed his finger on the administration, and I think justly. I would like to inquire, in view of his statement, if he regards the way the distinguished chairman opened this debate—namely, naming a lot of people of apparently Jewish ancestry and then later trying to put the burden of the evils of this administration upon them—is in any way related to the extensive powers on page 6 of this bill which make it possible for the Administrator to choose and to define the qualifications and to make appointments without regard to civil service? Is there any effort here, sir, to weed out any class of doctors of any origin whatsoever from the service?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I regret that you have brought up this question. In all fairness and frankness, I am going to tell you from my study and observation I found in these various hospitals, and I am not going to give a reason for it, but in these hospitals, eight of which I visited, over 40 percent of the medical personnel of these institutions was of the Jewish faith. I am not giving a reason or explanation for it and I am not passing upon the qualifications of these men because I know in many instances they are excellent doctors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield one additional minute to the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say that the statement that I called anybody's name even of the Jewish faith is not true. I merely called General Hines' name, General Bradley's name, and General Hawley's name. The gentleman from Louisiana is making a very fine statement. I think he has answered the question very well.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The thought occurs to me that this legislation will perform much good. But this same legislation under the old medical policy would not have done a bit of good. It has to be done administratively. General Hawley is going to have a terrific job ahead of him. He is going to have a hard time to attract into the hospitals men of sufficient professional attainment to be able to do the job. I do not know how he is going to do it. But this bill makes it much easier for him because there are three things that will attract a man into these hospitals. One is adequate and sufficient pay. A doctor is entitled to that. We have increased the pay under this bill. That may bring some of these better talents into the hospital. It gives retirement benefits. Above all things, it gives the doctor an opportunity to come into a growing institution, an institution that is cognizant of the development of medical science.

General Hawley has shown great wisdom in determining that these hospitals

should be established in large cities, where there are medical schools, medical centers, where they will be able to employ the services of great specialists on a part-time basis; where they will be able to take residents and interns into the hospitals and give those young men an opportunity to know medicine, so that our boys can get the very best possible service that can be given.

I think this investigation has resulted in great good. We all want to be fair. We do not want to break up this great system. I have the highest admiration for General Hines as an Administrator, but I think that General Hines, and I think Dr. Griffin, and I think those who have had charge of the medical policy of the Veterans' Administration should be highly criticized and condemned because they gave our veterans third-rate medicine through that period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, as has been well said, the primary interest of this committee is, as it always has been, in the welfare of the disabled veterans of the wars of the United States. The committee proposes here to give the best fighting men that this world has ever known the best medical service that is within reasonable reach of the taxpayers of this country. We think we have accomplished that very purpose.

If the Committee will permit, I will run through this bill hurriedly and take up some of the points that have not been discussed, and then I will answer such questions as the Members may care to ask.

In the first place, section 5 primarily sets out the requirements of the appointees.

First, he must be a citizen of the United States of America. There has been some criticism of that, but we maintain that any man who wants to serve the American veterans, if he cares enough to serve them, certainly should care enough to become a citizen of this country.

He must be in the medical service and hold a degree of doctor of medicine or doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator. He must have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States, and so on.

We also provide so that we would not lose the services of these men who are now in uniform in these hospitals, so that these men who will soon be on terminal leave from the armed forces can immediately accept appointment under the Veterans' Administration and continue to serve in the Veterans' Administration and at the same time receive their terminal leave. Otherwise, we would lose their services.

Section 6 points out clearly that the appointments in this new medical department shall be by the Administrator only after qualifications have been determined and satisfactorily established

in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Administrator. In other words, he says just exactly what requirements these men shall meet, and if any man, meeting these other two basic qualifications, can meet those requirements, then, certainly he should be entitled to practice in the veterans' hospitals.

As was previously pointed out, these men in the new medical department, even though they may have been with the Veterans' Administration for some time, are there on a probationary period for 3 years. If, after review by a board of their records, their services have not been satisfactory, they can be removed.

Promotions of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only upon examination given in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Administrator. In order that there should be no question as to the propriety of these men receiving full pay from the Veterans' Administration, we provide that these doctors, dentists, and nurses now in the present medical service shall remain in their present positions until the Administrator shall have determined their qualifications as hereinbefore provided.

Now we come down to one of the most important sections of the bill, and that is section 7. In that you will see we have set out the various grades of these medical men and we have set out the salaries to be paid. You might be interested to know that in 1929, which was the supposedly peak year as far as prosperity in this Nation is concerned, a study shows that the average net income of the non-pay-roll practicing physician was \$5,224. That income later on for these nonsalaried physicians dropped to \$2,948; and in 1941, with a little better times prevailing, the average income for these nonsalaried doctors went back up to \$5,047. You will see that in this pay scale we are starting these new men at \$3,640, and that as they go through the progressive grades they may reach a maximum salary of \$9,800. That should be the inducement, the quid pro quo, this stuff we all try to get our hands on, that impels men to do certain things.

One further observation as to nonsalaried physicians: A study completed in 1941 shows that more than one-quarter of the nonsalaried physicians in the United States reported net incomes of less than \$2,000. So with this scale of pay which we have provided in this section we feel that if lack of income, lack of pay, has been keeping doctors from the Veterans' Administration, this one section certainly will overcome that objection. Further than that, we know that people do not get sick by the clock. We found that in many of these hospitals under civil-service regulations and under the wage-hour law and other regulations doctors practice 40 hours a week. As we have gone through hospitals and seen 4:30 come around, we have seen doctors put on their hats and walk out, because if they had worked a few minutes overtime, compensatory time would have had to be given them, and it would have taken a great deal of complicated figuring and bookkeeping to straighten it out. In section (b) we provided that notwithstanding any law,

Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

There has been some discussion to the effect that one reason why perhaps we did not get the type of doctor we feel the veteran should have—and I feel that I can speak with a little bit of authority after having spent more than 2 years as a patient in veterans' hospitals—was that there was not enough inducement for a doctor to learn or practice any specialty. For this reason, in section 8—and this was largely upon the recommendation of General Bradley and General Hawley—there is provided a method by which a doctor may become a specialist. To do that, as shown in section 8 (b) he will not be rated as a medical or surgical specialist unless he is certified as a specialist by an American specialty board recognized by the Administrator where such board exists, or if no such board exists, where he has been examined and found qualified by a board appointed by the Chief Medical Director from specialists from the Department of Medicine and Surgery holding ratings in the specialty to which the candidate aspires.

Section 8 (b) provides that these men who by their desire, by their study, and by their efforts and aided by some of these things we will tell you about later, where they can take refresher courses and attend clinics to get the special training, they may, having qualified as specialists, receive 25 percent additional pay as qualified specialists. I may say frankly that I was not in full accord with that entire section and I felt, personally, that this pay of 25 percent should be collected only when these specialists were actively and actually practicing their specialty. I thought it smacked a little too much of the Army flying pay that some of our arm-chair flying officers have received, although their time for flying had long passed, but they keep qualified for that 50 percent merely by spending 4 hours a month in the air.

We also provided for retirement. There was a suggestion made that we should set up in the bill a retirement feature similar to that in the Public Health Service which is exactly the same as the Regular Army; however, in studying that we felt that that in itself would require the setting up of an entirely separate retirement system and machinery within the Veterans' Administration and we thought, through comparison of the facts and figures, that the retirement given in these higher salary ranges, the retirement provisions of the civil service, in other words, was adequate to properly compensate and care for a man in his older years after he ceased the active practice of medicine in the Veterans' Administration.

Section 10 provides what military men know as B-boards, benzine boards, disciplinary boards, if you wish to call them that, which will function after the 3-year probationary period. There is provided machinery permitting five doctors, senior employees in grade, to hear charges against any one of these men, doctors, dentists, or nurses, and after

having made their investigation, having had a trial, in which the charged person is entitled to have his own attorney to combat the charges, if they think he has violated the regulations and is subject to discipline, the disciplinary board makes a recommendation, which must be reviewed by the Administrator and we provide that the decision of the Administrator, whether he approves in whole or approves in part or modifies in whole or in part, shall be final.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If we had had the salutary provision of section 10, to which the gentleman refers, in effect previously, does not the gentleman think we would have avoided a great deal of the trouble that has cropped up?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am quite sure much of the trouble would have been avoided, because as we went through the hospitals, talking to the chief medical officers and others, we found certain conditions to exist. I may say in passing that this is the only place in which I found myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] in many months. I did not find conditions as bad as he described them. I did find the magazine articles gross exaggerations, although in each hospital I did find sore spots. There were doctors who did not come up to what we thought they should and what the chief medical officers thought they should; but in view of all the red tape and the difficulty of bringing charges and proving them under the civil-service regulations, the chief medical officer got to the point where he said, "I cannot do anything about it anyway," arranged for a transfer of the man, and by so doing the inefficient doctor simply changed the scene of his activities, but the evil was not remedied.

Mr. RANKIN. If this law had been in effect, and the gentleman from Kansas has had a great deal to do with preparing this law, because he is on the subcommittee that did prepare it, then the head of the Veterans' Administration could have made the necessary changes and could have cleared up the situation?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it would have enabled them to have acted much more expeditiously.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I congratulate the gentleman and his committee on the splendid contribution they have made to the welfare of our veterans; but does not the gentleman think that the new administration ought to have the power to summarily remove, if you please, those doctors who have been attached to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. There is at present a medical service in the Veterans' Administration. Immediately on the passage of this bill that is wiped out, there is no more medical service in the Veterans' Administration; immediately upon enactment of this bill there is cre-

ated a new department of medicine and surgery and under that new department all doctors, dentists, and nurses must be appointed. So that these doctors who have not measured up to certain standards, these doctors who are not fit to administer to the ills of American veterans, will be dropped from the rolls of the Veterans' Administration, they will not be taken into this new department, although they will still retain their civil-service rating and may receive appointments in some other branch of the Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On that point the gentleman states that they will retain their civil-service status.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does that apply to both nurses and doctors?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Doctors, dentists, and nurses; that is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Am I to understand that under the new set-up the nurses will not have any civil-service status?

Mr. SCRIVNER. We were talking now about those who are presently employed in the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Those are the ones I am referring to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If they are not retained by the Veterans' Administration under this new department they will still have their civil-service status as classes P and S, 3, 4, 5, or whatever it may be, but they will not be employed by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Assume now that they are taken over.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman is talking now about those who will be accepted in the new department?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They will not be under civil service. They will be under the regulations of the Veterans' Administration, but for retirement purposes they will be under the civil service, and that is the only place there will be any contact with those appointees with the civil service.

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

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Outside doctors could still be appointed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right. We are talking now about your full-time medical service.

If I may proceed to section 11, this may need a little bit of explanation because it may not be clear to many. First, we have taken care of doctors, dentists, and nurses. As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] told you, there was a fourth category, auxiliary services, which takes in hospital attendants, dining room attendants, cooks, and bottle washers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It includes social workers, dietitians, and all that. Those are still under civil service and will remain under civil service. But this section provides that those other employees, those cooks or dietitians and those who are now presently employed in the medical service shall be transferred to the new department of medicine and surgery only if the manager of the hospital, home, or center, where they are presently employed, certifies that their services have been satisfactory; in other words, we know that there are some attendants who should never have been on the pay roll. They are on there now and you could try from now until doomsday but you could not get them off because of civil service. If the manager believes that this particular dietitian or cook is not qualified, has not been a proper employee, he merely refuses to list the name of the employee as having performed satisfactory service and that employee will not be taken into the new department of medicine and surgery.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am sorry, I have but a few minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. The only thing I am interested in, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa said that the gentleman from Kansas would reserve a minute to discuss section 16, and I would like to know something about section 16.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Time is so very short when you get on a bill like this that the time allotted me is not anywhere near enough.

Section 12 provides for an advisory group, which already exists. The only change is that we require them to conduct quarterly meetings and make recommendations.

Section 13 (a) provides that these doctors may attend meetings of their medical societies and all that to be kept current with the new practices and techniques that have grown up.

Section 13 (b) provides for 90 days in a calendar year where these doctors, not to exceed 5 percent, may be assigned to certain clinical schools and postgraduate courses, where they may pursue courses at the expense of the Administration.

Section 14 empowers the chief medical director to employ without regard to civil service, physicians, dentists, and nurses, on a temporary full-time basis, although not to exceed 90 days on a part-time or fee basis. That is particularly necessary at this time because there is growing every day a greater and greater load of claims for compensation and pensions that cannot now be met. In the District of Columbia alone there are more than 10,000 undecided compensation claims pending. This section means that the Administrator can go to the doctors of the District and have them work on a part-time basis, maybe evenings, or on a fee basis, and take care of examinations and help to break down this ever-increasing load of claims which exists not only here, but all over the entire Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Can the gentleman in that additional minute discuss section 16?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I will be very glad to, but I wish I had more time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I know from the buzzing I have heard back of the rail and elsewhere that some question has been raised about section 16. As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out a few minutes ago, almost this same section was adopted unanimously by the House in July when we passed the amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Had a similar provision been in that bill originally you would not have been receiving the letters you are receiving today about the delays and red tape encountered in the administration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I should like to offer this suggestion, which I think will be entirely agreeable to the gentleman and the committee. On page 15, line 1, after the word "either", strike out the period and insert "if the Congress is in recess or adjournment." Then, on line 12, after "thereof", insert "as provided in subsection (a) hereof." In other words, if the Congress is in session the full committee ought to act.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think that is fair and acceptable and the gentleman's suggestion meets somewhat what we had in mind. All this does is regulate the regulator.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the gentleman will agree that if we had had this in some other measures we all might have been much happier.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that. The committee of which I am chairman has monthly meetings with the Administrator to discuss these matters. But a subcommittee should not act if the House is in session.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I agree perfectly. The reasons why the subcommittee was put in there, so that these regulations could be scanned during recesses and adjourned sessions, because we know that there are going to be regulations written every day, and we felt it would not be fair to hold them up until we get back into session.

Mr. LANHAM. It is my purpose to offer these amendments.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] spoke to me about his proposed amendments, and I have told the members of the committee on

our side about them. The amendments are satisfactory to them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the suggestion is well made and I agree with it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it would be satisfactory to the committee on this side also.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It should be.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In respect to this just what would this consultation with the committee be?

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman means in relation to section 16?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is not up to the committee or any subcommittee to determine whether the regulation is wise. That is the administrative end of it. We do not want to interfere in that at all. All we do is this. Having worked on this bill, knowing its contents, and knowing what we intended to have and what the purpose of the bill was, all the committee is ever empowered to do or is expected to do or should do is merely to scan that regulation and see whether or not it is in conformity with the letter, spirit, and purpose of the bill and the intent of Congress, and finally to see that there are no unusual or unexpected uses made of the powers herein granted, because we have granted a great deal of power here to free the Administrator's hand and let him do a job. We would be concerned, to be sure, that he makes no unusual or unexpected use of that power.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Apparently the gentleman is using synonymously the terms "Committee on Finance of the Senate" and "Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation" and "Congress."

Mr. SCRIVNER. No. Because in the Senate the Finance Committee handles veterans' legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But why should a committee which is merely an arm of the Congress determine a thing of this sort?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I was mistaken a moment ago about the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] being on the subcommittee. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] was on the subcommittee that worked out this bill. I now yield him 10 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly what we are trying to do by this bill. I am not prepared to say why the Veterans' Administration needed correcting. I do not know whether it is because we did not have an efficient administration or whether it is entirely the civil service. I suspect it is a little of both, and I suspect further that any agency of the Government which took over the job that the Veterans' Administration had to do when this war started would have been in serious difficulties before too long. It is the biggest job any agency of our Government has had to do. I think we could anticipate trouble no matter what agency

had it. But regardless of that, which is water over the dam, so to speak, our job is to get an organization set up which will be of real service to the veterans of this country. As we looked over the Veterans' Administration, I think the primary thing that we developed was that the medical service was not what it should be. There are a lot of things which go to contribute to a good medical service. We could not possibly pay medical doctors of this country out of the Treasury of the United States the amount of money necessary to give the veterans the kind of treatment which they ought to have and which they need.

In other words, we could not go out and compete for the type of specialists and experts that these men are entitled to. So we have to give the doctors going into the Veterans' Administration something else. We have to try to provide more security in their jobs. We have to give them a decent retirement system. We must provide an agency and an organization of Government in which they can find some professional pride in serving. That is what we have tried to do. This is not a matter altogether of unharnessing the Veterans' Administration from civil service and raising the salaries. It is an effort to create a medical organization in the Veterans' Administration in which a doctor will feel proud to serve and of which he will be proud to be a part. After looking the whole situation over and trying to work these various matters into the medical service of the Veterans' Administration, we decided that the best way to do it was just to junk the whole business and start all over again. So we took the present medical service as it exists in the Veterans' Administration and simply said that it is hereby abolished. In other words, we threw it out. Obviously, we have an organization here—a going organization—and we could not take an organization consisting of thousands of people and say it was junked. We had to provide some way to get back the parts of it that we wanted to salvage. That is what this bill tries to do in addition to putting into the law those things which will contribute, we believe, to a better medical service. So we started at the top, and looking at the medical service more or less as a pyramid, with the medical director at the top, we ran down the pyramid a little bit and sliced off a chunk, and we said from here on up these men will be appointed directly by the Administrator.

Then we went down the pyramid a little bit further and we took the doctors, dentists, and nurses, and we said with reference to those that they shall be selected without reference to civil-service requirements, but would be selected after their qualifications are established by the Administrator on examination. Then we had the vast bulk of the remaining personnel of the Veterans' Administration—those are the thousands and thousands of people who work in the Veterans' Administration and who make up the vast base of its operation—we wanted to get a good many of those people back but at the same time provide the Administrator

with sufficient discretion so that in the event there was someone in the organization he did not want he could get rid of that party. So in section 11 we provide that all of those people—who generally speaking represent the third group—should be moved back intact into the Department of Medicine and Surgery, subject only to the receipt of a certificate of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where that person is presently employed. When they go back, they are completely under the civil service. That is the method we used to reconstruct this entire system.

Our primary concern, as I said before, was with the professional end. We have taken doctors, dentists, and nurses out of the civil service. Some of the committee members felt we were going a little too far. General Hawley felt we should go further than that; that we should go down into some of these other brackets, such as physiotherapists, occupation therapists, and dietitians, and put them in the non-civil-service classification also. We decided not to do that, because we did not want to disturb, any more than we have to, the existing civil-service status of the employees of the Veterans' Administration. We felt that, generally speaking, these professional employees could be recruited and would be satisfactory employees, and that they did not have direct connection with the veterans, the patients, which the others do have. So, we only stepped down to take in those three categories to be left out of the civil service.

We did try to do some additional things to get doctors into the Veterans' Administration. Doctors are not going into the Veterans' Administration just for the salaries we provide. Men with the ability we want to take care of these veterans can go out into private practice and make a lot more money than we have provided, even under the compensation we have set up, and which is more generous than under existing law. We had to do something in addition to that. General Hawley wanted a better retirement system. He wanted us to put in the retirement system which the Public Health Service has. We would have done that if there was any way by which we could do it. I think the committee would generally like to have seen a more generous retirement system, but we could not do it without taking in the military retirement system or substantially the civil-service retirement system, or, in the third place, setting up an entirely independent and separate one for the Veterans' Administration. We did not want to do that. So, we left the retirement system as it is under the present civil service. We have some misgivings about its being good enough, but it was the best the committee could do without writing a special provision.

Section 8 relates to medical specialists, and seems to me very important. It is one in which General Hawley took a great deal of interest. That is the one which permits a man to be declared a medical or surgical specialist, and receive 25-percent increase in compensa-

tion. The 25-percent increase in compensation is important, but I do not think it is as important as setting up a specialist class, which gives a man a sense of professional accomplishment in the Veterans' Administration. One of the great things among professional men is to have a sense of professional accomplishment. It is the ambition of General Hawley to bring into this medical service men who have a high rating, men of even a national reputation, so that other doctors will be proud to serve with them. One of his pets is this section 8, which sets up a system of medical and surgical specialists, allowing them additional compensation for additional qualifications, and in addition it will give them the pride which a man has in some professional accomplishment.

The matter of attending schools, which was mentioned by my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], apparently in the past has been discouraged. I do not know whether under existing law the Administrator would have had the authority to send men to school and to pay their expenses, but we put it into this bill in plain language so that there could be no question at all but that the doctors in the Veterans' Administration can be sent to school, and their expenses, while going to school, paid. That in itself is a singular inducement to men in the medical profession who want advancement. We do not want the Veterans' Administration to be the backwater of medical science in this country. That organization should be in the forefront of medical science. The only way we can keep men in the Veterans' Administration in the forefront of medical science is by providing a method for them to go to school, and to pay their expenses.

It has been suggested that perhaps that provision was a little broad and might permit some abuse, but I would rather see an authorization of that sort abused a little than not have any at all, and have the type of medical help which we want for the veterans.

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. As I understand it, if a man is with the Veterans' Administration and receives this training and is afforded an opportunity to go to school, with part of his expenses paid, in order to keep himself abreast of scientific research and keep his hand in with current medicine, if he should retire from the Veterans' Administration or this new board, he would have to refund that money if he left within a short period of time thereafter, would he not?

Mr. ENGLE of California. If he leaves the service within 2 years after the completion of such course, he must reimburse the Veterans' Administration for the money which was advanced. That is to keep some fellow from going to school and then immediately leaving the service.

There is one section that will probably be subject to some controversy and I wish to mention it briefly. That is this

section 5, which prescribes the qualifications of those in the medical service and states:

They shall hold the degree of doctor of medicine or doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator and shall have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. General Hawley did not like this provision, and he said so in his testimony. In addition to that, I believe the general felt that he wanted to get along with the medical doctors in this country, and he was having trouble enough straightening them out with the conditions existing in the Veterans' Administration without having something put in this bill which might cause friction and antagonism. The Veterans' Administration wants to work very closely with the medical doctors in setting up the medical organization in the Administration. For instance, General Hawley wants to tie in with the schools of medicine, wants to set up the hospitals in such way that medical specialists will come to them to treat the veterans daily. He was afraid of this provision. But let me call attention to the fact that there are a lot of safeguards thrown around this provision. In the first place, it is purely a permissive section. It states, in effect, that the Administrator "may" employ osteopaths; and in addition to that, section 6 (a) states that the appointment of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator without regard to civil-service requirements. The thing which puzzles me a little is why the medical people should be so concerned about this provision where it is so thoroughly safeguarded, and where a medical man is, in fact, at the head of the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. Just a minute; then I will yield.

I wish to add this one further statement, that as far as I personally am concerned as a Member of Congress I do not like saying to a veteran that he shall not have treatment by an osteopath if he wants it. In other words, by putting it in the bill, we will authorize the Administrator to hire osteopaths. Then if the veterans of this war receiving treatment under this act want osteopaths at least it cannot be said that the Congress of the United States has denied them that privilege. The authorization is there.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. I think the gentleman has very strongly and clearly stated an answer to the question I was going to ask; therefore, I will take no further time, because I was going to ask what the gentleman's opinion was as to the intent of Congress with reference to the employment of osteopaths, or authorizing

them if the veterans wanted treatment by osteopaths.

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to say that I happen to be one of those who has supported the American Medical Association in their opposition to the socialization of medicine; but I also take the position that the American Medical Association has no moral or legal right to say to me, to my son, or my nephew: "Thou shalt not have access to an osteopath in a veterans' hospital."

If the American Medical Association is sincere in not wanting Government dictatorial programs with respect to medical assistance, they should withdraw their opposition to this provision.

I propose to support the provision, because if a veteran wants an osteopath he is entitled to have one and it is not up to Congress to deny him that right simply for the purpose of making a job administratively practical to some administrator.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I agree with the gentleman. I do not care as a Member of Congress to say that a veteran shall not be treated by an osteopath if he wants to be treated by one.

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HEDRICK. Suppose the veteran requires and wants a chiropractor and the treatment of a man of that character, what do we do about that?

Mr. ENGLE of California. We have not had that up for consideration. If the gentleman wants my personal opinion, I will say that we should not employ or authorize the employment of any particular kind of treatment except that which is recognized and established. The osteopathic treatment has certainly been recognized. There is a difference between that and the fellow, for instance, who believes in voodooism or something of the sort.

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Who is going to decide which veteran has the right to osteopathic treatment, and which veteran shall have penicillin, and so forth. We have to have some supervision here.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That supervision is in the bill which provides only that the Administrator may employ osteopaths if the veteran wants them.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman said we are not going to deny the veteran the right to make a certain choice. We cannot deny him the right to have penicillin, sulfabiosol, or any other drug he wants, can we?

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not a question of saying to a veteran: "You shall not have penicillin" or "you shall not have something else." We have laws, rules,

and regulations in the States which qualify men to administer medicine. We qualify a pharmacist to make up that medicine. I cannot go to the drug store and buy anything I want to this afternoon unless I have a physician's prescription. So what the gentleman brings up is entirely beside the question.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I did not follow the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We are not trying to deny the veterans penicillin or any other medicine. We are trying to see that he gets it and we are untying the hands of the Veterans' Administration and of the head of the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration so that he can see that the veteran gets what he needs.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point in the Record to read Resolution No. 390, passed by the American Legion at its national convention in Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, this resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Veterans' Administration under its educational program is permitting returning veterans to take courses in osteopathy and chiropractics: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Rehabilitation Committee request the Veterans' Administration to permit payment for treatment of a service-connected disability by a licensed chiropractor or licensed osteopath in the same manner as payment is allowed to any licensed medical doctor in any and all cases where the veteran himself elects to have such treatment for his service-connected disability.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The gentleman stated that the salaries of the doctors have been raised very materially from the present scale under the provisions of section 7 of this bill.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Yes. Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Will it not be true, as a matter of practice, that these increases will go generally to those who have been in the service the longest, and not entirely on the basis of skill and ability?

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

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to answer the question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The promotions are by examination and on recommendation. So there is a merit system in this medical service bill.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That, I believe, is correct—the positions these men get are established by examination.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Nevertheless, the discretion is left with the head of the service. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if it is not true that the promotions will be made

entirely upon recommendation of the superiors of those presently in the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, no. A board acts upon all promotions and examinations. I do not think the gentleman need worry about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset may I say that I intend to support this measure because it will aid materially in providing the necessary medical care and attention our disabled veterans need and deserve. Throughout the entire period of time I have served in this legislative body I have given my full and unqualified support to all beneficial and worthy veterans' legislation, and that course will be followed as long as I am a Member of this great law-making body. Our veterans who are disabled must be cared for. We cannot neglect them in any respect. This measure will provide assistance for these men, and I will support this measure.

May I further say that it is my firm belief that in Gen. Paul Hawley, as head of the Medical Section of the Veterans' Administration, the man best qualified to handle the many and staggering problems that come before us in these untold thousands of cases has been selected. General Hawley is a Hoosier by birth and residence. After he completed his education he began the practice of medicine at College Corner, in Union County, Ind., with his eminent father, Dr. Harry Hawley. They had a large practice, and General Hawley, as his father, was highly successful in the practice of his chosen profession. General Hawley then entered the Army, in the Medical Corps, where he has made rapid and steady advancements until he was placed at the head of a group of our hospitals in the European theater during World War II, and he was made a major general because of his valor, his skill, and his fine attainments in his profession. I am confident General Hawley will render a great service to the people, to our Nation, and to the disabled veterans in this capacity. I commend him to the people everywhere. He is made of the right stuff, as was evidenced upon invasion day, when General Hawley, with his insignia removed, went upon the beach and advanced with our boys in the face of withering gunfire and the thunderous crashing of bursting bombs all about him. And, too, he is a thorough American. With Gen. Paul Hawley at the head of the Medical Corps in our Veterans' Administration I am confident our veterans will receive the proper care and training, and that the very best of medical care and attention will be given to every veteran who applies therefor.

Mr. Chairman, we must never stint our aid to the veterans of all our wars. They are our heroes, and they will remain forever our heroes. And as we go forward in this postwar period, let us resolve to do our best for our veterans, and that

every disabled veteran who needs care and medical attention may have it. We must rehabilitate them in order that the future years may bring joy and happiness, and that their lives will not be blighted by the ravages of war because of inattention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly explained by this time. I want to state that the reason why, in my opinion, this bill was brought into being, was due to the fact that for many years, especially from the late twenties down to the beginning of our entry into the war, the Veterans' Administration, so far as hospitals of America were concerned, and so far as medical treatment of the various patients was concerned, it was on the downward grade. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] in supporting the statement that he has already made concerning his investigation of the veterans' facilities in the United States. Since 1937 I have probably been in nine-tenths of the veterans' facilities of this country. Sometime during the early spring of this year, along with other members of the Veterans' Committee, I made an intensive investigation of some of the facilities, especially into the treatment of our disabled, and found that in many instances the care of these veterans was not in accordance with the American standard, in the treatment of men who have worn the uniform in time of national emergency and suffered disabilities as a result of their gallant service. I remember one particular hospital, conditions in which were brought to the attention of the committee not only by an investigation by some of the members, but it also became necessary for the Veterans' Administrator to send into this facility undercover men in order to get at the truth as to the treatment and abuse of the patients that happened to be quartered therein. As a result of that investigation the United States attorney's office at Brooklyn, N. Y., brought before the attention of the grand jury the cases of eight attendants who were charged with various degrees of assault upon the patients at this particular facility. There was also stationed at this hospital a group of enlisted men of the Army and some 15 of those soldiers were court-martialed for abusive treatment of the patients. Those men were fined, I believe, \$50 and confined to their quarters for a period of 6 months. What the outcome of the cases were I have no information up to the present time. The above state of affairs should not and will not be tolerated so far as I am concerned.

We found on investigation that some doctors, not many, were men who were left over, let us say, from the horse and buggy days. The articles that were written in *Cosmopolitan* and other periodicals in many instances were true. I am convinced that the bill we are about to pass was brought to a head largely by the investigation made not only by the members of the Veterans' Committee,

but also as a result of findings by some special investigators from the Veterans' Administration and by the newspaper writers. Some mention has been made here concerning the type of professional personnel that we have in the facilities today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. KEARNEY. I regret, for one, that it has entered into this debate. This is my personal opinion, and I think it meets with the approval of a vast majority of the Members of the House, but I do not care what the doctor's name is so long as he is able to give good medical care to the veterans in our hospitals. The cry of our disabled is going to ring down through the years to come. These men deserve the best treatment we as a Nation can give them—and that treatment regardless of the cost. The heat of battle is over and we now face the cold, stark reality of postwar legislation. We can do no more than carry out our duty to those who need medical care and hospitalization. I believe this bill can certainly be described as a magnificent step in the right direction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, your Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has spent a great deal of time, study, and effort in preparing the legislation which is before you today. Naturally, as a result of our investigation of these various veterans' hospitals throughout the country we arrived at conclusions as to certain things needed to be done. We had different opinions about these things which needed to be done but we reconciled them after some difficulty in the committee. The bill you have before you today is the result of that give and take, and it is the best that we are able to present.

This bill has the endorsement of those who are familiar with the problems which it tries to correct. As the chairman of the committee pointed out to you earlier this afternoon, it has the approval of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who is naturally the person most concerned with this legislation because he is going to have the duty of carrying out its provisions.

Some reference has been made here today to the use of osteopaths under the provisions of the language of this bill. I think undue importance has been attached to that part of the bill. If an amendment is proposed by anybody, and I hope it will not be, to knock that provision from the bill, I am going to have quite a bit to say about it. I will oppose such an amendment. The members of your Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation are not interested in any jurisdictional dispute between doctors of medicine on the one hand and the doctors of osteopathy on the other.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I learned that in county hospitals sometimes there is a lot of conflicting jurisdiction between the civilian heads and the medical heads. Is the set-up the gentleman's committee has devised to eliminate that sort of conflict?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. It is, indeed. We found that the heads of some of these veterans' hospitals, the doctors, were doing entirely too much paper work, that they were prevented from making the rounds of the wards because of that fact, among others. We are trying to provide sufficient personnel under the provisions of this bill to take care of that problem, which I presume is one element of what the gentleman has in mind?

Reverting to this other proposal I was discussing, with respect to the kinds of doctors who will be employed under the provisions of this bill, this is a bill for the veterans, this is not a bill for the doctors, this is not a bill for the bureaucrats in the Veterans' Administration. I repeat, this is a bill for the veterans. It is a queer thing that while a war is on everybody is for the serviceman and nothing is too good for him, but when the war is over—it happened after the last war and it is happening again now, and we have seen evidence of it this afternoon—well, we are not quite so interested in the welfare of the serviceman. I say that because of the fact that during this war both the Army and the Navy used osteopaths not only in the United States but on the battle fronts. Now what happens? When the boy is discharged and comes back home and goes to a hospital we try to take osteopathic services away from him. It simply does not make sense; it does not add up. Let us be a friend of the veteran today, just as we were when he was fighting this war for us. I will have some more to say about that.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the Committee just how many States have the same requirements.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. There are 8 States, I will say to my colleague, in which doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine take the same examination. They have the same board and receive identically the same license to practice. There are 30 additional States in which doctors of osteopathy are licensed to practice major surgery.

Mr. FENTON. Can the gentleman tell the Committee just what States require 1 year of internship after graduation?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am not sure about that.

Our point is not that we think osteopaths are going to cure all the problems of the veterans but that in those jurisdictions where they are qualified it should be possible to use their services since the Veterans' Administration cannot find enough doctors of medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Veterans Committee, of which I am a member, has given a great deal of thought and study to this bill. Under the leadership of Chairman Rankin and under the leadership on the minority side of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and other able members on the committee who served in the last World War, all of whom have a great interest in veterans' matters, serious study and consideration has been given and they have tried to open up a new day in medical science and medical surgery for the benefit of the veterans who have sacrificed to win the war and have now become or may become patients in the great Veterans' Administration of this country. It may surprise some of you to know that there are something like 83,000 patients now in the Veterans' Administration. It was the duty of this committee, and they have sought to discharge their duty, in giving legislative leadership to the establishment of the finest medical service and the greatest medical organization in the history of the world. That has been the effort of the committee. They feel after having made a most careful investigation of the various hospitals throughout the country that the former Veterans' Administration prior to the appointment of General Bradley was handicapped—handicapped from the bottom to the very top—handicapped in respect to being able to get people in the lowest ranks such as attendants because of the shortage of labor and handicapped with reference to the procurement of doctors because of the shortage of doctors. I understand even now that the war is over, as of January 31 there will be a shortage of something like 10,000 doctors and physicians who are needed in the Veterans' Administration. It is a colossal task to place upon the shoulders of any one man such as the great General Bradley, and it is a great responsibility that is resting upon the shoulders of the men in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation who have drafted this legislation. It is a great responsibility resting upon this Congress. But I am certain that the committee and the Members of Congress intend to do their very best to carry out the obligations that we owe to the men whose health has been impaired and whose physical ability by reason of wounds on the battle front has been impaired. That, in general, sums up today the thought, the hope, and the intentions of this committee. We believe we have made a great step forward in setting up this medical corps.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I am very much in favor of this bill and particularly section 7, which raises the compensation of doctors employed for the treatment of our veterans. I am very anxious that we get the best medical service possible for our disabled veterans. The thing that bothers me is this: The Administrator necessarily must delegate to some assistant the duty to recommend which of the doctors shall be placed in

the chief grade, which in the senior grade, and which in the other grades. It seems to me that in turn that official will ask the manager of the facility involved to recommend who shall get the promotions.

I should like to ask the gentleman if we have any assurance that the Director will promote doctors to the higher grades solely on the basis of their skill and ability without regard to seniority and length of service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one-half minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an answer to the gentleman's question?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. For the benefit of the gentleman from Wyoming, the manager or chief medical officer of a hospital has nothing whatsoever to say about who shall be appointed or what promotions shall be made. That is purely under the chief medical director, under the Administrator, upon examinations duly given, and qualifications met thereon.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman is quite right. There is nothing to fear. For the first time, we have untied the hands of the Veterans' Administrator, to give him an opportunity to cut the red tap and administer to the veterans. This bill is drawn in the interest of the veterans and not in the interest of the doctors of this country.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman and I want to congratulate my colleague on his splendid presentation of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad that this bill is passing on the anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. At that time we sent our boys to fight. Mentally, I know each one of us resolved that each of those boys and girls should have the best possible care when they returned. Instead of finding beds for their racked and injured bodies when they came back, they found our crowded conditions, long waits for hospitalization and inadequate care. Coming back from the war, they found us as little prepared for their care and for peace as we were for war before Pearl Harbor. From today they can look forward to more adequate medical care. We must see that good care is continued. It means more than just passing a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see in this measure a provision in section 5 which puts doctors of osteopathy on a high plane with doctors

of medicine. I favor that as I have great faith in the science of osteopathy.

Naturally, I want veterans to have the very best of care. I believe well selected doctors of osteopathy are also capable of giving them that care. My experience with osteopathy, together with the endorsement of veteran organizations, together with my desire to furnish veterans their choice all cause me to favor including osteopathic doctors in section 5 of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in bringing to the House H. R. 4717, the committee is bringing to you a bill on which they have worked rather long and diligently. The membership of the committee is convinced, I am sure, as all of you are convinced, that the best fighting men on earth should have the very best treatment that we as a grateful Nation can give them. I am sure we are able, as a nation, to give them what they deserve.

I do not agree with all the provisions of this bill. Indeed, it would be a miracle if a bill were brought from a committee, in which every member of the committee agreed on every point. But I am convinced that this bill, which is long overdue, will provide machinery through which we can improve our services to our veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in the half minute remaining to me I merely wish to add to what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts said a moment ago, that I am more or less glad this bill comes up on the anniversary of the most dastardly event in the history of civilization, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and at a time when those who are fighting with us under Chiang Kai-shek are now being blasted by Communists throughout this country.

It is time to put Americans on guard and to take care of our disabled heroes who made it possible for us to live in peace and security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired, all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the medical service in the Veterans' Administration, as at present constituted, is hereby abolished and in its stead there is authorized and established in the Veterans' Administration a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director. The functions of the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator) pursuant to this act, other statutory authority and regulations established pursuant to law, for the medical care and treatment of veterans.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state that all Members have been given permission to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If it is not taken out of my time.

Is this taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. RANKIN. I will ask that the gentleman be given more time. I want to straighten the Chair out on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the unanimous consent I obtained was that all Members be given five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on this bill. Under the rules of the House a Member who speaks in the House has 30 days when he asks permission to revise and extend remarks, he is not limited to the 5 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had as much faith in this proposal as has been expressed by its proponents. I predict that this new machinery which is being set up here—and I am taking into consideration the good intention that is back of it—will not do what you believe it is going to do.

I have heard a great many disparaging remarks about the doctors in the present Veterans' Administration set-up. I was the first examiner in my county and section for the Veterans' Administration. I have never been employed by the Government in any of the veterans' hospitals, but I have had some experience with physicians in such hospitals. Let me say that in my judgment those physicians have performed just as fine service as can be expected from the new set-up, so far as ability is concerned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is there not a tendency in all bureaucracy to slow down, and to lose initiative, whether it be doctors, lawyers, or any other groups?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I shall answer the gentleman's question by predicting that within a year or so after this program is set up Members will be taking the floor of this House and say the same things about it as are now being said about the present set-up.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this measure, but I am not as sanguine that the results will be as great as some seem to think. You are going to set up a dictator of veteran medicine here and this person is going to have a lot of power. It will be a one-man control over medicine and surgery. You do not find anything like that in private medical institutions or, for that matter, in State medical institutions. They have governing boards and bodies, not dictators.

There will be penalties attached for violations of rules under this set-up and the dictator of medicine will prescribe the penalties.

Do you know how you could get a real medical service for the veteran? Give

him the opportunity of choosing his own doctor in his own community.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find that General Hawley is arranging in many communities so that a veteran may have his own doctor and the doctor be paid, particularly out-patients from hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to know whether it is the gentleman's considered opinion that the Director of Veterans' Affairs can dominate these doctors so that we will not get the best work out of them and their work will not be the best for the veterans?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not know what the attitude of the man who operates this institution will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As written here, is that a possibility?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is possible. I would not want to say, though, that he would do that. But here is what is not taken into consideration, I am afraid, as should be. That is, the intangibles in the practice of medicine and surgery. The supposition is that under this bill you are going to get a higher grade of medical doctors than has obtained heretofore. I seriously doubt that. In the first place, I have not any particular complaint to make against the doctors serving in the Veterans' Administration. I still think they have done a mighty fine work and I base that upon my own experience in that particular field.

I wish it might be possible to amend this bill so as to divide responsibility in the operation of this program and not leave it to an individual. Why do we have to set up a czar over practically every agency that we establish. This measure should provide for a board composed of at least seven members.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that in having a Surgeon General of the Army and Navy that there is a dictator or that in having a Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, he is also a dictator?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I may answer the gentlewoman from Massachusetts by quoting the statement of George Washington in his Farewell Address when, in referring to the danger of centralizing the powers of Government said, "the love of power and proneness to abuse it dominates the human heart." That is the only answer I can give. It may be unavoidable so, perhaps, I do not know.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Army and the Navy need help of a higher standard.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The lady has a little more confidence in the effectiveness of legislation to bring about those changes than the gentleman from Ohio. That is where we disagree, perhaps.

At the proper time I am going to offer an amendment to strike out section 16 of this bill and shall discuss it at that time more fully. But at the moment I would like to say that I do not consider it even legislation. The proposal here is that you submit certain questions regarding proposed changes or rules and regulations, whatever you might call them, by this Veterans' Administration to the Finance Committee of the Senate and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House before putting them into effect, which will give either one of these committees the power to veto or even to legislate. Now, we have courts in this country, and it is presumed when Congress passes a law that it has passed a law. It is supposed that we know the contents of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Ohio. I feel very strongly, and I know that many of the doctors and many of the nurses have performed very fine and very expert service in the care of the veterans. Many of the examiners and many of the rating doctors have suggested ways as to how a man's disability could be connected with the service. Many of them owe their health and their livelihood to those very doctors today. Also, Mr. Chairman, those very doctors have told me that they have felt stifled so far as any chance of improving their surgery and their medicine is concerned. They know that before the Board of American Surgeons they are considered not first rate, and it hurts in every way. Also, Mr. Chairman, under the present system it has seemed that laymen have interfered in the practice of medicine. I inspected a veterans' hospital some years ago and there was a business manager in charge. When I arrived at 6 o'clock at night there was no doctor on the post. The manager had invited all the doctors to a dinner some miles away. There were some very sick men at the hospital. The patients told me at that time that often the business manager took the floor boys, the attendants, away to do the work about the offices and took the doctors away to rate cases so that the patients did not have the care that they should have.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. While the gentleman from Ohio was speaking he indicated that the cure for this would perhaps be for the veteran to secure the services of his home-town doctor. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts indicated that that is possible now. Will she please develop that? I have many let-

ters from doctors in my district who say they have veterans in these communities who need some attention, yet they are unable to be taken into some of the veterans' facilities. How can that veteran at this particular time secure the services of the local doctor at Government expense?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that provision is made in this bill to employ doctors on a fee basis and on part time, and General Hawley has said that more doctors would be used on part time and on a fee basis. I think later on possibly a veteran can select his own doctor and the Veterans' Administration will stand back of the treatment of that physician.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there anything in this legislation which would make that possible?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, the provision for part time and fee basis.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it the section that refers to auxiliary wards?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; there is a section that refers to the part-time service or the fee that can be given to the doctor. The doctor would be paid a fee for taking care of the veteran.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] suggests that it is section 14. I have read that. I am wondering how the local doctor can get the information so he can go to the director and make application to become one of the part-time doctors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He can write directly to Maj. Gen. Paul Hawley, head of the Medical Service at the Veterans' Administration at Washington, or to the branch office in his area, which has a number of regional offices under its jurisdiction, or to the local office in his city or district.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the mechanics of it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. Or he can direct his application for part-time or fee basis to the Veterans' Administration here, to Maj. Gen. Paul Hawley, Director of the Medical and Surgical Service, at Washington. Many will have to be taken in because there is a pitiful shortage of doctors. Also, it will be helpful to have the services for the veterans of highly trained specialists who are not willing to give full time to their care.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. However, that is subject to the direction of the Administrator, is it not? That is entirely within his control?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It should be, otherwise a veteran might select a doctor who would have very little experience. We want the best for our veterans. They have given us their best. We owe it to them to give them the best we can. Nothing is too good for them. We must try to restore them to normal. We must set high standards, and I think the veterans should have their own hospitals where they can go if they want to.

They ought not to have to wait. They cannot get houses and they cannot get hospital beds. It is very difficult for them to get doctors on the outside. I saw men on the Italian front last October who had been 158 days without replacement. As they lay in mud holes, in the ice and snow in fox holes. They must have longed for beds, for a house in which to live, and looked forward to their homecoming. And if lying wounded on the ground, or even on cots in the air evacuation hospitals, they must have longed for a more comfortable bed in a real hospital in the United States. They deserve completely good care and treatment everywhere. This bill, though late, will help insure it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the following: Office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service.

SEC. 3. (a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the Chief Medical Director, one Deputy Medical Director, eight Assistant Medical Directors, and such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this act.

(b) The Chief Medical Director shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator. During the period of his service as such, the Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of \$12,000 a year.

(c) The Deputy Medical Director shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator. During the period of his service as such, the Deputy Medical Director shall be paid a salary of \$11,500 a year.

(d) There shall be eight Assistant Medical Directors, appointed by the Administrator, who shall be paid a salary of \$11,000 a year each: *Provided*, That one shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operations of the Dental Service.

(e) The Director of Nursing Service shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operations of the Nursing Service. During the period of her service as such, the Director of Nursing Service shall be paid a salary of \$8,000 a year.

(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, each chief shall be paid a salary of \$6,000 a year.

(g) Any appointment herein above provided shall be for a period of 4 years subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

(h) Reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER:

On page 2, line 10, after "Medical Director", insert "not to exceed" before "eight Assistant Medical Directors."

On page 2, line 25, strike out "There shall be" and insert "There may be not to exceed."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHELF: Page 2, line 16, after the words "He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine", strike out "appointed by the Administrator" and insert "(a) be a citizen of the United States, (b) hold the degree of doctor of medicine, who shall have successfully completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, be duly licensed to practice medicine or surgery in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia, and who shall have regularly practiced medicine or surgery continuously for a period of not less than 8 years appointed by the Administrator."

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I think the old order changeth, giving place to the new. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate and commend the chairman and members of the Veterans' Committee on both sides of the House for the excellent job they have done in giving to the veterans of World War I and World War II a new deal, insofar as medicine is concerned. I do not think there is any doubt but that this bill is going to help the veterans of all wars to receive that high type of medical care and treatment to which they are entitled. It is an emancipation proclamation, as I see it. As one who has laid in a hospital for almost 3 months during this war, I feel that I can speak with some knowledge as just what can be expected as the result of this legislation. For that reason, I offer this amendment, which I sincerely hope will be received as a constructive amendment. I want to try to clarify if I can the language where it says "he shall be a qualified doctor." I am sure that within your acquaintance there are doctors who may be a "qualified doctor" to the extent at least that they have graduated from a medical school and have received a degree of doctor of medicine, but they may not have actually practiced medicine. My amendment is an attempt to clarify such situation. I personally know of two doctors who are qualified doctors in that they were duly licensed, but one of these has not written a prescription for even a pill in over 25 years, the other likewise has not practiced in years and therefore is not capable of holding down a job such as this. If we are going to have a chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration, I feel that that man, in all fairness to our disabled veterans, should have regularly practiced medicine for a period of not less than 8 years continuously, if you please, so that he would be really qualified to hold this job. I do not feel that 8 years is out of reason or out of order insofar as this bill is concerned.

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

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman made a statement that this was an emancipation proclamation. I think that is probably true. We were seeking to emancipate the Director of the Veterans' Administration. In the same breath, the gentleman is now asking with respect to one of these positions that we qualify the phrase "doctor of medicine." If we are going to free the hands of the Administrator, we must free them to the point that he can appoint those men he feels are qualified to fill these positions. Of

course, I am in sympathy with the idea expressed by the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. The chief medical officer must have qualifications to fill such a high position with the care of thousands of maimed, wounded, and disabled veterans to help rehabilitate at least to the extent of having regularly and continuously practiced medicine. I think the man who is his assistant should have regularly practiced medicine for at least 5 years. The man who is in charge of dentistry should at least have been practicing dental surgery for 5 years. Insofar as the other doctors under him are concerned, I think that that is taken care of in a very fine manner in the bill in the later section whereby they will be allowed to go to school in order to keep abreast with modern medicine, the latest techniques in surgery and wherein their expenses will be furnished them. This is as it should be because our veterans are entitled to the best medical care—that is why I want and advocate here not a "qualified doctor" as the head, but one who has had sufficient practice of medicine—who knows the practical side of medicine as well as theory in books—not a man fresh out of medical school—for according to this present language—as a "graduate doctor"—he is therefore a "qualified doctor" under the law. This is not enough.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The entire idea of the committee was simply to make it possible for the Veterans' Administration or the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to really administer this section and to free his hands so far as possible. Now, if we find he is stepping a little far afield and is not getting the type of man we want and if we find there must be some restriction, I feel sure the gentleman will find that the committee will go along with him.

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

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I cannot see how the committee very well could object to an amendment of this sort. It merely states that the man must have had 8 years' experience.

Mr. CHELF. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not see anything wrong with that. I am surprised that the committee did not put in some minimum limitation with respect to the qualifications for holding that position.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, I have been admitted to practice law for 14 years. I worked my way through school. As a result of that, without parents or funds, I was unable to make a living for the first 3 months that I was out of law school. I had to take a job which was completely foreign to my profession of the law. I served as secretary to the Honorable Ben Johnson, my illustrious predecessor, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky. That grand old gentleman, God bless him, learned of my plight and gave me a job. I worked at that job as his secretary for almost 2 years. I had no contact whatsoever with my profession. Then, later on, by the grace of God and my good friends back home, they elected me as prosecuting attorney of Marion

County, where I served three 4-year terms. Of course, then I was back in my profession, studying, reading, learning, and, above all, practicing my profession as a lawyer. But if I had stayed on as his secretary, or sold insurance, stocks, bonds, or automobiles, I would not have been a qualified practicing attorney. Had I stayed away from my profession for 10 years or so, according to law, I would, nevertheless, have been a duly licensed attorney; but, had a vacancy developed as circuit judge in my district and I had run for it, what kind of a judge do you think I would have made? Why, I would not have known a leading question from hearsay evidence.

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

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Would the gentleman's amendment eliminate General Hawley?

Mr. CHELF. No; I do not think so, because I think his record adequately qualifies him. I am sure from what was discussed here on the floor today that he has practiced for more than 8 years, and possibly 10 or 15. But if he, or anybody else, has not practiced medicine or surgery at least for 8 years, he has absolutely no business as the head of such an important medical post wherein the lives of our men are at stake.

Mr. GREEN. He could not have been a practicing physician in the Army.

Mr. CHELF. Well, if he was regularly engaged in the practice of medicine before coming into the Army, that, of course, qualifies him. I do not think there is any question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object this time, but there are some Members who would like to finish this bill today and would like to vote on the bill. Certainly the membership has had an opportunity to talk all day. We are all in favor of the bill. I am not going to object this time, but the next time I shall.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am in agreement with this amendment, because I am sure all of us know men who are qualified doctors of medicine who have simply occupied desk jobs. They may be good at planning. They have enormous influence over the practice of medicine, but they never delivered a baby or they never took care of a kid with diphtheria. They do not know the problem of the man who takes care of the sick. I do not want desk doctors down here, however skillful

they may be at drawing plans or lobbying. I want people who know about the reactions of people who are sick.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who is himself an eminent doctor in his own right, and I am extremely honored to have him support my amendment because now I know that I am right with the doctors in the House supporting me.

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

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Would the adoption of this amendment prevent consideration of those men who went directly from medical school into the armed forces, in which they practiced their profession, of course?

Mr. CHELF. Yes; it would preclude one in such circumstance from serving as the chief medical officer, but it certainly would not insofar as the members of the medical staff under him are concerned. Frankly, I did contemplate offering an amendment stating that any member of the medical staff should have regularly practiced medicine not less than 3 years, but after reading the bill through and gathering the information that they would be afforded an opportunity to attend refresher courses and in such manner thereby be able to study and keep abreast with medical science and developments, I thought that would be taken care of, so I withdrew any idea I had of offering an amendment with reference to that feature. But, as I say, I am interested in this bill. I want this bill to do the job that this committee have planned for it. I feel that it will, but in my heart I feel also that these boys in our veterans' hospitals are entitled to real doctors, the best that money, brains, and education can secure and produce. We do not want an incompetent at the head who has not really practiced medicine. It is for such reason I offered my amendment and I sincerely trust that the House will adopt it in the interest of our veterans who have spilled their blood that the world might be a better place in which to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is unnecessary as far as citizenship is concerned, because the bill provides he must be a citizen of the United States. It also provides that he must be a doctor of medicine and he must have served a satisfactory internship.

As to attempting to put a strait-jacket on the Administrator from the standpoint of the number of years he has practiced, I think that is entirely unnecessary. We are going to have to trust somebody. If we cannot trust the Veterans' Administrator, we had better remove him. So, I think the amendment is entirely unnecessary. I think the bill takes care of the situation. I congratulate the subcommittee on its work in that regard. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

The question was taken; and on a division, there were—ayes 30, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 3, line 6, strike out subsection (e) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Director and Deputy Director of Nursing Service shall be qualified registered nurses, appointed by the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the nursing service. During the period of her service as such, the Director of Nursing Service shall be paid a salary of \$8,000 a year and the Deputy Director shall be paid a salary of \$6,000 a year."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my acceptance.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there is an error in the amendment. The figure \$6,000 should be \$7,000. I ask unanimous consent that it may be modified accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 3, line 6, strike out subsection (e) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Director and Deputy Director of Nursing Service shall be qualified registered nurses, appointed by the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the nursing service. During the period of her service as such, the Director of Nursing Service shall be paid a salary of \$8,000 a year and the Deputy Director shall be paid a salary of \$7,000 a year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I present this amendment is because it seems to me the Director of Nursing Service is a sufficiently important position that the person holding it ought to have a deputy director as her stand-in when of necessity she is compelled to be away from her desk, whether out of the city on inspection tours, attending professional meetings or conventions, or on other business. We have made such provision for the Chief Medical Director; he has a deputy medical director who draws only \$500 less than the Medical Director himself. It seems to me a mere matter of good sense that if we want maximum efficiency in the Nursing Service it is almost as important to have a most capable deputy director of Nursing Service as it is to have a deputy medical director. I have provided that the Deputy Director shall get a salary only \$1,000 less than the Director of Nursing Service. Not to provide for such a deputy director is putting an undue burden and responsibility on the Direc-

tor of Nursing Service. She would have no top-notch assistants until clear down to the regional assistants, or, as they are called, assistant directors out in the field.

I hope there will be no objection to this amendment and that the Members of the House will accept it, because it seems to me to be eminently worth while.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman has offered this amendment. The Medical Corps bills that I introduced would have provided better pay and retirement conditions. As the gentleman from Minnesota has said, frequently the Director of Nursing must be out in the field. She must have a well-trained, well-qualified assistant to take her place in the office in Washington on such occasions. And while she is in her office her assistant director often will be out in the field.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very important amendment.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. For example, suppose major matters relating to nursing in veterans' hospitals are brought to our attention and we want quick action. If the Director of Nursing Service is out of the city or ill, or on vacation, then we must wait for action on our requests until she gets back. She ought to have a qualified deputy under her so that a person who is substantially her equal in ability and authority is on duty all the time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I am not satisfied with what has been done for the nurses in this bill, but it is better than present conditions. It offers the nurses more security.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Is the gentleman familiar with the provision for an Assistant Director of the Nursing Service at \$5,180? And if so, is it the gentleman's intention to strike that out and substitute what he has proposed?

Mr. JUDD. No; that is not my intention. As I understand it, and as I was told by a member of the committee, the term "Assistant Director" means a grade of nurse in charge of a certain type of work in hospitals throughout the country. I understand it corresponds to the term "chief grade" as applied to doctors.

Mr. ENGLE of California. What salary does the gentleman provide for the Deputy Director of Nursing?

Mr. JUDD. Seven thousand dollars. It is similar to the provision for the Chief Medical Director and his Deputy Medical Director, save that the Deputy Medical Director receives only \$500 less than the Chief Medical Director whereas in my amendment the Deputy Director of Nursing would receive \$1,000 less than the Director.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Veterans' Committee will accept this,

or at least that the House will vote the amendment into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a salary of \$12,000 for the chief medical officer and \$11,500 for his assistant. As stated by the gentleman from Minnesota, an assistant should be just as well qualified as the chief and must take over the chief's duties whenever the chief is absent.

The discrepancy between the amount proposed to be paid the chief nurse and assistant nurse is out of all reason. The gentleman's amendment modifies this to a degree, but I do not think that there should be a bigger spread between the chief nurse and the assistant chief nurse than the bill proposes as between the chief medical officer and the assistant chief medical officer. While I think the salary proposed is a little high, nevertheless, I am not disposed to get into a controversy in regard to it. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] if he would be agreeable to amending his amendment to read "\$7,500"?

Mr. JUDD. Instead of \$7,000?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. I will accept the modification.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the chairman of the Veterans' Committee accept the amendment and make it \$7,500?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I would not go that far. The amendment goes far enough.

Mr. KNUTSON. As a matter of fact, I think the entire bill, as far as salaries are concerned, goes plenty far enough. The gentleman will meet with no dispute on my part from that standpoint.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do think, however, that the committee was in a most expansive and generous mood when it drafted this measure. However, these are inflation times and the buying power of the dollar today being only 50 cents as compared with 100 cents when the Republicans were in control, I realize we must raise salaries all along the line, both public and private. It will probably be necessary before the New Dealers get through experimenting with the Government to make further increases all along the line. So I am not so optimistic as to believe that this is the final word.

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

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will compare these salaries he will find there is not very much of an increase, as a matter of fact, in the salaries except of those at the top. There is a very slight increase.

Mr. KNUTSON. I find that when the Veterans' Committee gets through fixing salaries there has been very little left out.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] accepts the amendment that I suggested. May I ask that the chairman of the Veterans' Com-

mittee, in the interest of harmony, accept it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman from Mississippi would accept it. I think it was a mistake in not doing it before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 47, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. There shall be appointed by the Administrator such additional personnel as he may find necessary for the medical care of veterans, as follows:

(a) Doctors, dentists, and nurses;

(b) Managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians; scientific personnel, such as pathologists, bacteriologists, chemists, biostatisticians, and other medical and dental technologists.

With the following committee amendment: Page 3, line 22, strike out "such."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Any person to be eligible for appointment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery must—

(a) Be a citizen of the United States.

(b) In the Medical Service—

Hold the degree of doctor of medicine or doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator, have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

(c) In the Dental Service—

Hold the degree of doctor of dental surgery from a college or university approved by the Administrator, and be licensed to practice dentistry in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

(d) In the Nursing Service—

Have successfully completed a full course of nursing in a recognized school of nursing approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a graduate nurse in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

(e) In the Auxillary Service—

(1) Manager of hospital, home, or center—
Have such business and administrative experience and qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe;

(2) Pharmacist—

Hold the degree of bachelor of science in pharmacy, or its equivalent, from a school of pharmacy approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a pharmacist in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia;

(3) Physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other auxillary employees shall have such scientific or technical qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe.

(f) Persons may be appointed under this act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and may be paid for their services

rendered under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 3, insert a new section "(e)" reading as follows: "In the Auxillary Service."

Page 5, at the end of line 7, strike out the period and insert a colon.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEDRICK:

Page 4, line 8, after the word "medicine", strike out the phrase "or of doctor of osteopathy."

Page 4, line 12, after the word "surgery", strike out the words "or osteopathy."

Page 4, at the end of line 11, strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment to H. R. 4717, I hope the members of the committee will not think this action is for selfish reasons. I have no ax to grind with the osteopaths. As a matter of fact, I have many close friends who are members of that profession and for whom I have the highest regard.

I am offering this amendment in the interest of the Veterans' Administration and in the interest of our veterans, who will receive treatment in the various veterans' hospitals.

It is my own personal belief that the osteopaths have not had a thorough and rounded course in medical science compared with the regular medical physicians. In other words, it is my understanding, schools in which osteopathy is taught do not give their students as wide a field in general medical knowledge, especially in the use of drugs and surgical training as compared with the grade A schools of our American medical colleges. However, I do believe osteopathy has a field all its own.

If the osteopathic physician would limit his practice to that field only for which he has been trained, the medical profession would not object but would encourage patients to avail themselves of such treatment.

It appears in many parts of the country the osteopaths are endeavoring to do those things which the allopath, or medical doctor, is trained to do. These are the objectionable features, and we physicians are opposed to osteopaths being recognized and accepted by the Veterans' Administration on equal basis with the medical doctors.

It is doubtful, if the majority of the fathers and mothers of our veterans would be satisfied to have their disabled sons and daughters treated by men of this profession, except in cases where osteopathy is indicated.

I have been reliably informed that there are osteopaths who claim to be medical doctors and frequently tell their patients they have an M. D. degree. It is my understanding, men in this profession made statements to the veterans' committee they were medical doctors, when this bill was being considered. Gentlemen, if this be true, it certainly

would not be necessary to recognize them as osteopaths, as they would be eligible to serve in the Veterans' Administration as medical doctors and not as osteopaths.

As a veteran in the Medical Corps of World War I and as a practicing physician for 27 years, I am greatly interested in the health, welfare, and proper treatment of our disabled veterans returning daily from the bloody battlefields of foreign countries where they fought and served. The best treatment that can be procured for these men and women who have been fortunate enough to return is none too good.

It is understood the purpose of House bill 4717 is to insure the best scientific care and treatment known to medical science to hasten as near a complete and satisfactory recovery as possible to these returning veterans.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Members of the House, if osteopathy is established in the Veterans' Administration on equal footing with the medical profession, do they believe the veterans would receive the best scientific treatment available?

And if they do not further believe having two schools of thought working side by side on equal basis in our veterans' hospitals throughout the country might cause confusion and disagreement between the professional men assigned to these institutions?

This might seriously result in the retardment of the scientific treatment to which these veterans are rightfully entitled, and likely would also lessen the efficiency of the entire veteran system.

Therefore, Members of the House, I would urge each of you to support my amendment to this bill.

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

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if the gentleman would state to the Committee whether or not he is a member of the medical profession.

Mr. HEDRICK. I am.

I have had reliable information that certain osteopathic physicians have stated on frequent occasions that they had M. D. degrees. I am also informed that some of the osteopaths that appeared before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation made the statement that they had M. D. degrees. It is perfectly possible that some of them may have had M. D. degrees. If the osteopaths had M. D. degrees, why would it be necessary to pass this bill at all? They would be eligible for employment by the Veterans' Administration as M. D.'s and would not have to get employment as osteopaths. By itself, that does not look reasonable, I am sure.

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

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Does the gentleman think the Congress should say to the Veterans' Administration that it cannot employ osteopaths?

Mr. HEDRICK. I think under this ruling the Surgeon General of the Veterans' Administration can hire an osteo-

opath if the patient desires this treatment.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is all this bill gives him the right to do. He can do it if he wants to. It is purely permissive. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it simply means that the Veterans' Administration cannot hire an osteopath under any circumstances. Does the gentleman believe that should be done?

Mr. HEDRICK. I do not know. I really think it will cause confusion.

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

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If an osteopath is an M. D. as well as an osteopath, then he should be employed, is that not true?

Mr. HEDRICK. If an osteopath is an M. D., we would have no objection to his being employed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have some very fine osteopaths who are also M. D.'s.

Mr. HEDRICK. Some of them may be. I could not say about that.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I should like to have the gentleman answer this question: What chance would an osteopath have under the bill as it is now written with an M. D. running the show?

Mr. HEDRICK. If I were running it he would not have any chance, I promise you that.

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

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. The very thing they are trying to avoid, I may say to my colleague, confusion in the Administration, and this investigation that has just been concluded by the committee, will be the thing that will occur if this prevails.

Mr. HEDRICK. I believe it will cause a lot of confusion if we have professional men from two schools of thought. For example, if a patient at a veterans' hospital who really needed penicillin was being treated by an osteopath, there might be confusion between the osteopath and the M. D. as to what treatment should be pursued, and as a result the veteran probably would not get the thorough treatment he should have as a veteran of the World War.

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

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. What would the gentleman say in the case of a veteran who did not care to be treated with the use of drugs? Would the gentleman object to a Christian Science practitioner treating him?

Mr. HEDRICK. Yes, I would object to it if I were running the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. RAMEY. Then the House of Representatives should never talk about bigotry again, should it?

Mr. HEDRICK. I say that you have to have a head of all organizations,

You cannot have a mixture and use more than one class of professional men. You would have confusion and overlapping.

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

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that mentioning Christian Science is bringing religion into the question?

Mr. HEDRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come before you with clean hands on this proposition. I am not a doctor of medicine. I am not a doctor of osteopathy. I have no doctors of any kind in my family on either side, except one doctor of philosophy with whom, of course, I claim no relationship.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will not deny, however, that he is from the State of Missouri, the home of osteopathy?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I do not deny it. My hands are still clean. The Kirksville College of Osteopathy is not in my district.

The gentleman may be further assured that if my people in my district especially the veterans were 100 against what this proposed amendment would do I would not be so interested in it. I should like to point out, seriously, some things which deserve your consideration in connection with this amendment which my friend, the gentleman and doctor of medicine from West Virginia has offered. I understood him to contend that the parents of the veterans would object if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given the power to hire osteopaths under certain conditions. Now, it is most singular that that kind of argument should be made. Is this a new proposition? Of course, it is not. They did not object when their sons were given this kind of treatment in the hospitals in Europe and in the Pacific.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. I said except where osteopathy was indicated. They would object except in cases where osteopathy was indicated.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Then they would not object where osteopathy is used?

Mr. HEDRICK. That is right.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement to that effect. It is difficult to reconcile it with his amendment which would prevent the Veterans' Administration from using doctors of osteopathy.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman state whether General Hawley appeared before the committee and supported or disapproved of this?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am glad to answer that question. He did appear before our committee. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that he did not object to the qualifications of osteopaths. What he did indicate was that he hoped he would not be involved in a jurisdictional dispute between doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine as he might be if this provision was left in the bill. At no time did he say anything derogatory about doctors of osteopathy. He at no time in the hearings said he would not provide these services if authorized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is not answering the question. Did he approve of this amendment?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. He could not have taken any position on the merits of it. It has only now been introduced and I suppose he has never seen it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I do want to be fair. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. General Hawley is against putting osteopaths in this bill and so stated several times. He asked us not to put them in the bill. That will be corroborated by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]. It will be corroborated by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], who is on the subcommittee and who is for the osteopaths. It will be corroborated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], who is for the osteopaths.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would modify that corroboration to this extent. General Hawley said he preferred not to have them in, but he said that we were writing the legislation.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. He did indeed. I do not wish to misrepresent what he said. It is all in the hearings. What I said—and if the gentleman from Louisiana had been listening, he would have heard me—was that General Hawley did not object with reference to the matter of qualifications. He said he was not interested in what kind of degree they had, but he was interested in what kind of work they could do. You will find that on pages 45, 46, and 47 of the hearings. The gentleman from Louisiana is beside the point. General Hawley did say he preferred this provision be left out of the bill but did not do so before the committee from the standpoint of the qualifications of osteopaths. The committee obviously was not impressed with his argument.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I think the Congress should be informed as to the exact field of osteopathy. Will the gentleman be so kind as to tell the Congress to what extent those doctors can practice because, if I recall, the president of the association said they were qualified to practice any type of medicine or surgery.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman is in error, I believe. He did say

in 8 States; they are qualified and are licensed to practice the same as are doctors of medicine and that in 30 States they are licensed to practice major surgery. Certainly, we are not trying to give the veterans something they should not have or force anything on them. The American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and all the other veterans' organizations I know of, have gone on record in their national conventions in favor of giving the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authority to hire these people when qualified. General Bradley and General Hawley are in favor of this bill. Naturally, they do not like everything in it. I do not either. But certainly we have no ground for adhering to their argument that we should not involve them in a jurisdictional dispute. This is a veterans' bill. This is not a bill for doctors of medicine or doctors of osteopathy or the bureaucrats in the Veterans' Administration. Certainly osteopaths cannot be hired at the present time. This law will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to hire them. It provides in sections 5 (b) and 6 that the Administrator shall set up the qualifications they must have. You can be sure General Bradley is not going to put any quacks in his medical service. What he needs is qualified doctors, regardless of what kind of college degree they hold. He cannot get them unless we give him the power.

It has been charged that it would create confusion to use more than one kind of doctor in veterans' hospitals. Experience indicates otherwise. This is not an untried Government policy. There was no confusion between the doctors of medicine and the doctors of osteopathy during this war in the Army and Navy hospitals. There has been no confusion from the United States Employment Compensation Act, under which the civil-service employees are given the right to use doctors of osteopathy. There was no confusion during this war when legislation which every one of you voted for enabled doctors of osteopathy to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States to deliver the babies of our veterans. What is good for the serviceman should be good for him when he takes off his uniform and becomes a veteran. All of you voted to enable him to study osteopathy at Government expense under the GI bill of rights last year. Let us be consistent.

This bill is permissive in character. It does not force the Veterans' Administration to hire osteopaths. It does give them the power and safeguards it by providing that the Administration shall determine their qualifications. When they admit they cannot get enough doctors of medicine and then oppose tapping a huge reservoir of medical talent to whose qualifications they do not object, such action does not appeal to reasonable men interested in the welfare of the veteran and I am sure will not appeal to Congress. I am not against doctors of medicine. I prefer them personally. But I am not prepared to say a veteran cannot have an osteopath when needed and preferred by him. Are you?

It is pure poppycock to say doctors of medicine would not enter a veterans' hospital using doctors of osteopathy. The doctors of medicine will not boycott our disabled veterans. General Hawley testified that they worked together in Army hospitals. Together they have written a glorious page in American medical and surgical history. I salute them both.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as some of you know, I happen to be a physician.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FENTON. Not at this time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FENTON. In just a moment.

Just about a year ago I had the privilege of touring Europe with the Military Affairs Committee, and saw what a great job General Hawley, who was chief surgeon of the European theater, was doing in the medical profession for our wounded heroes.

General Hawley, I might say to you, is just as much interested in the welfare of the veterans as any individual in this body. He has shown himself to be a great doctor and a great administrator. If it were not so, he would not have been appointed as Director of the Medical Department of the Veterans' Administration.

To clear up any doubts you may have as to General Hawley's thought in this matter, may I read to you a letter addressed to me under date of December 5?

DECEMBER 5, 1945.

HON. IVOR D. FENTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FENTON: This is in reply to your inquiry as to my position regarding the inclusion of osteopathic physicians in the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration under H. R. 4717.

I am strongly opposed to the inclusion in the medical service of the Veterans' Administration of any school or cult of the healing art which bases its practices upon theories rather than demonstrable facts. This is not to say that in regular medicine there are not gaps in knowledge that are yet to be filled, but, regular medicine abandoned theories as a basis of practice after the work of Pasteur, Koch, Laverin, and other pioneers in scientific medicine. This and other scientific work has caused the disappearance from medicine of almost every school of medicine which has been based upon theory rather than fact. Hahnemann, for example, exerted a profound influence upon regular medicine, but once regular medicine applied the reforms pioneered by Hahnemann, his school of medicine slowly disappeared and the homeopathic school remains today only as a name—for physicians accepting scientific principles and practicing regular medicine.

It is a mistake to perpetuate schools of medicine opposed to the great scientific facts now being made in medical research. It would be impossible to integrate into one efficient medical service for the Veterans' Administration, a school of healing which holds tenaciously to the theory that most, if not all, human ailments are the result of dislocations of the vertebrae. With X-ray technique so developed that minute variations in normal structure can be demonstrated and measured, it is impossible to show that diseases are caused by displaced

vertebrae or cured by manipulation of the spinal column. I do not mean to infer that, in a few conditions, osteopathic manipulation is not helpful, however, physical medicine, a specialty of regular medicine has long employed comparable methods in the treatment of these selected cases and there is no need for a special school of medicine for such cases.

The additional requirements of the great majority of schools of osteopathy in this country are not comparable with the grade A schools of medicine. It seems to me that if we employ osteopathic physicians, we shall have to say that we require one standard of competence for the regular physician, and a lower standard of competence for the osteopathic physician. This, and the irreconcilable divisions in thought will produce friction in the staffs of hospitals. For these reasons, I am unable to support the inclusion of osteopathic physicians in the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. HAWLEY,
Major General, A. U. S.,
Acting Surgeon General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want first to address myself to the general provisions of the bill and then to the specific provision under consideration in this amendment.

I think the committee should be complimented on bringing in a bill that certainly will improve the medical care in the veterans hospitals.

I want to say to those gentlemen who are suspicious of me that I am a member of the medical profession still in good standing, a fellow of the American College of Surgeons because I passed a specialty board, and I am rather proud of that particular fact. I am not speaking to you, I hope, from any partisan standpoint.

You do have in the bill the requirement that certain qualifications must be set up for men to become specialists; that they must pass an American specialty board. What does that mean? It means that those men who are going to be specialists in hospitals must pass an examination prescribed by the American Medical Association, by the American College of Surgeons, or the American College of Physicians and Surgeons. This is a good approach, and should be done. I do, however, feel there is a provision in this bill which should be changed. It comes in section 14 which sets up residencies in hospitals and makes it possible for osteopaths to have residencies in veterans hospitals.

I may say to you Members who might have some doubts, that the Medical Council Board has set up certain reservations, certain qualifications, and they are quite high, for men to take residencies in hospitals, and one of those qualifications is that a person cannot be an osteopath and be on that board and get credit.

In other words, if you pass the bill with section 14 (a) in it, you will nullify the thing you want to do. You want to give good service to the veterans in hospitals, but with section 14 (a) in the bill you will

not be able to get good men to go into those hospitals for residencies because they will receive no credit. Now, do you want to help the veterans? Do you want to have a high quality of service or do you want mere quantity of service?

An osteopath does not do anything that a regular physician cannot do. A regular physician and surgeon covers the entire field. You have a specialty field here for osteopaths which I do not believe ought to be in this bill. I think you will, as the gentleman who preceded me pointed out, set up some irritations within your staffs, you will have a lack of cooperation that will eventually reflect on the type of care the veterans get in the hospital. So I say in all fairness to the veterans that you ought not to set up qualifications in this bill and include the osteopaths. If you are going to include osteopaths, why not also include chiropractors, neuropaths? They are all specialties; why not include them? They have just as much right to be in here as the osteopath; but if you do include them, you are not going to get the high qualifications in the men who serve the veteran.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman has read the bill, he will find that physiotherapists are provided for.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are no qualifications set up for them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, yes; it provides for them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It provides for mechanical physical therapists. It provides that they shall have the qualifications prescribed by the Director.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will establish the qualifications required, and they will be uniform.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; but the gentleman has just heard the letter read to the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], written by General Hawley. In view of that letter, there is not much possibility of an osteopath, chiropractor, or neuropath being appointed under the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from the osteopathic State.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. General Hawley, on page 15 of the hearings, refused to take a stand on a similar question asked him; he did not take a stand similar to that which he took in the private letter written to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The letter stands as read.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. General Hawley will have the last say. Why insist on this amendment?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Because General Hawley might not always be Director of the Veterans' Administration. It seems to run in my mind I

heard some threat of his resigning because of some political pressure.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Would it make any difference?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am only concerned about giving the highest quality of care to the veteran.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am neither a doctor of medicine or of osteopathy, nor do I come from the State of Missouri, the home of osteopathy. I would call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact, however, that during the recent American Legion convention I attended the sessions of the National Convention Rehabilitation Committee and this very question was argued longer than any other resolution that was before that committee. The opinion was almost unanimous in that committee that if the veterans desired it there should be available to them the art or science of osteopathy and they went still further and included chiropractors.

After the First World War there were thousands of veterans trained as osteopaths and chiropractors. Advocates of the resolution also stated that after the recent war there will be still more thousands trained in that science, and if that science has any value at all then the veterans should be entitled to use it. If it has no value as a science, then the Veterans' Administration should not be spending the taxpayers' money to educate the returning veterans in those two professions.

I have no axe to grind for or against either profession. I have friends with whom I have fished, hunted, and had social activities who were doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine. If there are cases in which these veterans want that science and they desire it, if they feel it will result in their recovery more rapidly, they should have it. There were many men at this meeting in Chicago who took the floor and testified to the results that they had obtained and to the results their sons then in the Army had obtained. May I point out that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall prescribe the regulations and conditions under which these doctors of osteopathy shall be recognized by the Veterans' Administration.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What service does an osteopath perform that

a regular doctor does not perform and could perform?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know. I am not a doctor of medicine or osteopathy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

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

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell us what service an osteopath can render that cannot be rendered by a qualified physician or surgeon?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I would not argue with the gentleman about that. The point is that many people under certain conditions prefer osteopathic treatments and I believe veterans should have such treatments if they want them. That is the American way.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would the gentleman include chiropractors.

Mr. SHAFER. I would if the committee had seen fit to include them in this legislation.

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

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Would it not be a great service to the veteran to give him the kind of medical practitioner he wants?

Mr. SHAFER. Certainly. This bill only provides that they will receive osteopathic treatments when they themselves indicate they want them. Certainly they are entitled to such a choice.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia who introduced this amendment to eliminate osteopaths from this bill, and those who have spoken in favor of the amendment, are doctors of medicine. They have an axe to grind. Personally, I think their stand is a selfish one and it is indefensible. We are here today to legislate for the veterans and not for the doctors. We will have the opportunity to do the latter later.

I reiterate, I believe that when veterans want the services of licensed osteopathic physicians while being treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals, they are entitled to have that treatment.

Heretofore, the Medical Section of the Veterans' Administration has refused to authorize osteopathic services for the care of veterans in hospitals and for out-patient services. As a result, many veterans who sought such services have had to do so at their own expense.

In the course of the hearings on this legislation, General Hawley, Acting Surgeon General for the Veterans' Administration, said:

I say we used osteopaths in the rehabilitation hospitals in the European theater of operations. That service in one hospital was headed by a man who was a doctor of osteopathy and a doctor of medicine. All the men who worked under his supervision were doctors of osteopathy.

It is true that General Hawley and Gen. Omar Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, have not recommended the inclusion of osteopaths in this bill. But in spite of that, I feel that the first duty of

Congress is to the servicemen, rather than to any school or combination of schools of medicine or medical politics, and notwithstanding any possible arguments between the American Medical Association and the osteopathic doctors.

Dr. Ralph Fisher, of the Philadelphia College of Osteopathy, told the committee:

It has been suggested, I understand, that if osteopathic physicians are appointed to the Medical Corps, the doctors of medicine may refuse to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration. To boycott the Government would be bad enough, but the idea of boycotting the disabled veteran if he is furnished the services of doctors of any school of medicine other than represented by the M. D.'s, is a bill of goods no one can sell to the Congress, the medical profession, and, least of all, the disabled veterans. In my experiences, if the professional organizations let the doctors alone the doctors of medicine and the doctors of osteopathy would get along all right. Most of this friction talk is a bugaboo and a red herring anyway.

Surgeon General Hawley testified before this committee the other day that a physician in whom the veteran has no confidence is worse than no physician. Many veterans place their confidence in osteopathic physicians and surgeons. Their family physicians have been doctors of osteopathy before going into the service. Many of them will not get the relief they know could be obtained if osteopathic services were available. Such of these as are ambulant cases leave the Government hospitals and obtain osteopathic services at their own expense. We submit that it is grossly unfair to those veterans not to appoint osteopathic physicians to the Medical Corps and assign them to the veterans hospitals for their treatment.

That the disabled veterans want osteopathic services in the hospitals and for out-patient services is definitely evidenced by the fact that in the 1937 and succeeding national conventions, the DAV specifically requested the Administration to make osteopathic services available.

The resolution passed at these conventions reads as follows:

Whereas there are many disabled veterans throughout the United States who desire and need osteopathic treatment for their disabilities acquired in the World War; and

Whereas there is no provision in the National Veterans' Administration for such cases to have osteopathic treatment for their particular disabilities; and

Whereas there have been demands made by them for special dispensation to be made that they have osteopathic treatment; and

Whereas they have been refused such demands; and

Whereas many disabled veterans have received untold benefits from treatments of service-connected disabilities as a result of osteopathic therapy, obtained at cost to the veterans in preference to the free medical treatment afforded by the Veterans' Administration: Be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention here assembled at Columbus, Ohio, this July 31 to August 7, 1937, recommend that the Veterans' Administration rules be so amended that osteopathic service will be available to disabled veterans on application through the various regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

Doctors of osteopathy are licensed in all States. To withhold the benefits of osteopathic services from disabled veterans, as has been done in the past, seems to me indefensible. By the provisions of

Public Law 553 of the Seventieth Congress, Congress made osteopathic services available to injured and occupationally ill civil employees of the Federal Government. Surely the disabled veteran is entitled to no less consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat this is a bill to help the disabled veterans, not one to help the medical doctors. This amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to repeat that I have absolutely supported the American Medical Association in its fight against the socialization of medicine. I think it is awfully cheap and unfair and un-American for a member of that association to stand up here and deny the veterans of this country the right to have osteopaths treat them if that is what the veterans want. We have 30 States that have licensed this profession. It has been accepted by the people of this country. There is not one sound reason on earth for me to support a proposal merely to satisfy a group of physicians or to satisfy an administrator when the desires of the veterans of this country are at stake. I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. When this question first came before the committee, I was a little enthusiastic to include osteopaths and make them available to the veterans, because I was under the impression that an osteopath was a doctor who would give physical manipulation and under many circumstances afford much relief to the patient, and to that extent I thought it would be fine. But when we had an opportunity to cross-examine Dr. Fisher, who represented this organization before the committee, I was informed that the members of this profession were competent, according to his impression, to practice any type of medicine or any type of surgery. I recall he was asked this question: "Speaking for the profession, is it intended that these doctors who may be employed would also practice surgery in the hospitals?"

"Yes, I think that he would do the surgery if he is qualified to do so just as a capable medical surgeon would. He is certified to be a specialist in surgery and he is accredited by our national association."

I recall having asked him: "What contribution has your profession made to the advance of the science of surgery and medicine?"

And this doctor, who is the head of the organization, said: "I do not know."

So I am a little concerned and feel that these doctors will be placed on the same plane and given the same prestige as doctors of medicine. I have nothing against this profession. I have utilized their services of manipulation for rheumatic conditions personally, and they do very fine work. It may be because I am ignorant, but I am not inclined to believe that these doctors get the proper training and the proper educational background

in which to place the care and custody of our boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, my judgment constrains me to follow the conclusions just reached and expressed by my colleagues from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. SHAFER]. As we do away with discrimination because of race, creed, color, or state of origin, it does seem that we ought to be able to do away with discrimination because of difference in training in certain professions when it is undisputed that those practicing those professions render a worth-while service to humanity.

If I had my way, and the veterans wanted him, and he was available, I would have old Bob, who presides down here in the gymnasium, aid them, because he has helped many a Member, including myself, when a physician was not at hand or could not or did not relieve us. Not only that, but the medical profession—the American Medical Association—is almost—now, get that word “almost”—under its present leadership, as positive—what can I say?—as self-satisfied, seems as determined to be as monopolistic, as the American Bar Association, and I happen to be a lawyer. They act as though they did not want anybody to practice medicine except a few hand-picked individuals. Now, I do not go along with that attitude. If anybody can help the veterans, I say let them in. If the doctors cannot hold their own, it is just too bad. In my opinion, the medical profession can well stand upon its record of service to humanity. It has nothing to fear unless it be the ill-advised acts of some of the association members. Not only that, but I would say to my doctor friends on this side and to the American Medical Association, I fear you fellows are going to monkey around on legislation like this until you get socialized medicine, and I am against that. Please do not furnish ammunition to the advocates of socialized medicine, make it difficult for your friends to protect you and your profession.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the medical profession. I think I have probably leveled as much criticism at times as any Member of this House against my own profession because of its failure to do a lot of things that people who are sick need. We have usually concentrated too much on organic disease and given too little attention to functional diseases and the emotional disorders and needs of patients. I am not trying to justify or deny the shortcomings of members of my profession. But I am interested, as is every other person here in getting the best care possible for sick veterans. That cannot be done without making the program proposed in this bill one which America's physicians can wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support. I am interested here in only one question—not the relative merits of osteopaths, medical doctors, or what not—but this;

Will we get the highest grade doctors of this country to go into the veterans' hospitals if osteopaths are appointed under this language which makes them eligible for appointment? Of course we will not. Maybe the doctors are wrong. Cuss them all you want to, but their position is based on their long experience at the autopsy table. Many of the very best will not themselves join the staff of a hospital where osteopathy is recognized on a par with their own scientific medicine.

Furthermore, I doubt if there is a grade A medical school in the United States which will approve for residencies veterans' hospitals if its graduates will there be trained or supervised in part by osteopaths. One of the main purposes of this legislation is to improve the standards of practice in veterans' hospitals so that they will be recognized by medical schools and professional societies as qualified for residencies. Do we want to defeat that end?

I am sorry the situation is as it is. I wish very much we doctors had done our job better, and there never would have been occasion for an osteopathic or any other marginal healing philosophy to develop for the care of certain conditions, mostly functional, to which many doctors formerly did not give adequate attention. I admit it, and I know more about the situation, I think, than any one of you who is not a doctor possibly can. But the fact remains, if we want to make sure of the best care possible for the boys, we will adopt this amendment, and then we can get the veterans' hospitals on a professional level which will attract the highest grade doctors in America, and which the medical schools will approve, so the ablest medical graduates will go there for fellowships, residencies, and so forth.

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

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman is suggesting that if the medical doctors do not get their way in this proposition they will boycott the disabled veterans by not working in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. JUDD. No. It is not because they want to boycott veterans or to have their own way; it is because they want to give the veterans the best care possible. The doctors do not need these extra jobs. Any doctor that is any good in the whole United States has a good job today. I am not for this amendment because doctors want or need a sort of closed shop in veterans' hospitals, or want to keep everybody else out just so that they can hold the jobs. You will not be able to get enough high-grade doctors to take these jobs with all the increases in salaries, unless there is also a marked increase in professional standards. Anybody that is any good as a physician today can get half a dozen jobs.

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

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

Mr. KEARNEY. What does the gentleman mean by saying the M. D.'s would

not go into these hospitals if the D. O.'s were there?

Mr. JUDD. Many would hesitate to go into them because they could not afford, as they would regard it, to lower their own professional standards or standing.

Mr. KEARNEY. They did not do that in the Army hospitals in Europe and in the Pacific. I do not think they will boycott the disabled veterans.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think they will boycott the disabled veterans, but they will feel that they cannot afford to lower their professional qualifications. That is one of the major reasons why most doctors have not been willing to work in veterans' hospitals in the past.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman believe the veterans themselves want treatment from the osteopaths?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should not intrude myself into this discussion, but we had a little preview of this in the Committee on Military Affairs.

I am terribly sorry that our doctor friends seem to think they, our M. D.'s, have a monopoly on all the knowledge there is about healing. On other matters they have an unusual detached and intelligent view. I think half of the problem in healing people is to get the patient to have confidence in the man that is treating him.

We all know osteopathy has been in existence now for many, many years. There are thousands and thousands of boys who served in the Army who are used to being treated by osteopaths and want that kind of treatment. The psychology of the provision of the bill providing osteopaths for those veterans wanting that type of training will be excellent. In the Military Affairs Committee we had a bill to give commissions to optometrists. The evidence was that there were thousands of optometrists in the Army, in the enlisted rank, who in civil life had been examining eyes and giving advice on eyes for a long, long time, yet the Medical Department of the Army fought that bill very, very strongly. They would not concede those men had one bit of ability or that they were entitled to any recognition in the way of a commission. I will say that our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], came out in a fine way in support of the bill. The result was that we finally got a law through the House of Representatives to do justice to 60 optometrists by giving them commissions. We thus recognized the great mass of men who knew optometry, who were in the Army, and had not had a chance to use their particular skill to help our soldiers.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. What the gentleman has stated is correct so far as I am concerned except that the bill was supposed to get a rule and be brought up here for discussion. That was my understanding

with the chairman of the committee. But that was not done and when a few people were present it was brought up under unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That may be true, sir, but the bill was reported out of committee by an overwhelming vote of confidence, in fact I do not think there was a dissenting vote. If you had any doubt about the bill, you certainly did not express it by your vote in the committee when the bill was passed out.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly did.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think we should give these boys the kind of treatment they want if it is not harmful to them. These osteopaths are licensed in various States and are very competent. It will militate to the advantage of the veterans to give them this kind of service.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell me what kind of treatment an osteopath can render that cannot be rendered by a qualified physician?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He can render a special kind of treatment in which he is specially skilled over the average medical doctor, and the patient will have more confidence in him, because the patient wants him. I consider the latter very important.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen so many doctors on the floor for some time. My interest in this amendment grows out of several years' experience as a member of the board of directors of a general hospital. I am sorry to have to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from West Virginia. These doctors are loyal. They are loyal to the fight that has been going on for years and years of the doctors trying to maintain a monopoly on doctoring people. In the past this may have been a just fight because there may have been many things that were not of high standard. But let me call to your attention the fact that an osteopath at the present time in many States has to take the same training that a medical doctor does and, further, take 2 or 3 years of special training in osteopathy. They are highly qualified to take care of a great variety of cases. They use a great many electrical gadgets, and so forth, that medical doctors cannot safely use unless they, too, take some osteopathy. Doctors specialize nowadays, and it is getting to be more and more a question of specialization. Osteopathy is one of the specialties that doctoring and medicine need in the hospitals for many types of cases. The doctors' organization, the American Medical Association, judging from the past, certainly would be opposed to this, and the doctors who belong to the organization, I believe, are obliged to fight on that side. I do not think, however, that they should take advantage of their position as Members of Congress to carry on this fight for monopoly. You who do not believe in the closed shop certainly cannot believe in this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Then you believe in it because you believe in a closed shop.

Mr. SAVAGE. Even if I believed in the closed shop I would not be for this amendment.

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

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Does not the gentleman think that the determining factor here should be: Has osteopathy helped the veterans in the past? If it has, we certainly should not discourage that practice of osteopathy in our veterans' hospitals in the future.

Mr. SAVAGE. Why, certainly that is true. May I say that if some States do not require high standards in examinations for getting a license it is not the fault of that particular State and they ought to raise their standards. This is not a doctors' bill; this is a veterans' bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEDRICK) there were—ayes 29, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: On page 4, line 13, before the period, insert "Provided, That doctors of osteopathy may serve in veterans' hospitals in only those States whose laws require doctors of osteopathy to successfully pass the same examinations as doctors of medicine."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, those of you who have so violently upheld States' rights on various pieces of legislation now have the opportunity, through this amendment which is self-explanatory, to continue your position on States' rights.

The great State of Pennsylvania is concerned in this matter. Since the other amendment was rejected, I want to read to you the expressions of the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, through its chairman of the Committee on Public Health Legislation, when he said:

We are informed that there has been inserted over the objections of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration a provision whereby osteopaths are recognized on the same level as doctors of medicine and are eligible to treat our veterans.

1. In Pennsylvania, according to several State supreme court decisions, osteopaths are not permitted to practice medicine and are not physicians legally qualified to practice medicine in Pennsylvania.

2. The board of medical education and licensure has no jurisdiction over the courses in their colleges; therefore, the board of medical education and licensure has no way of determining the educational qualifications of osteopaths in Pennsylvania.

3. Pennsylvania's osteopathic law does not require an internship of at least 1 year in an approved hospital after their preprofessional and professional course before making application for licensure; therefore, osteopathic physicians lack at least 1 year of training which regular doctors of medicine are regularly required to have.

4. If osteopaths desire to do the same work as doctors of medicine, they should conform to the legal educational requirements of doctors of medicine.

5. Osteopaths were not qualified to have commissions in our military forces.

Therefore, by inserting osteopathy into this bill, in our opinion, the Federal Congress will be responsible for lowering the quality of professional services to our veterans.

That is signed by Dr. Palmer, head of the committee on public-health legislation in the State of Pennsylvania.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this House had no way of knowing what the position of General Hawley and General Bradley was on this bill. No hearings have been published.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The hearings are right over there and are available to any Member of the House.

Mr. FENTON. I asked for the hearings and they told me they were not available. I do not know what went on in the committee. I had to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] certain details. He told me that eight States would come under the provisions of my present amendment, in that those States required osteopaths to take the same examinations as physicians.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a fair amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment requires that osteopaths have the same qualifications as physicians and surgeons? They must meet the same standard of practice?

Mr. FENTON. Must pass the same examinations.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If that was done, it should reflect in the interest of the veteran who is going to be served by either the osteopath or the physician.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman is right.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Would the gentleman be in favor of the osteopaths putting a similar amendment in that would refer to the medical men—that would restrict the medical men from practicing medicine unless they were osteopaths?

Mr. FENTON. Of course, I think the gentleman is putting the cart before the horse in that instance.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. There is no State in the United States which bars the practice of medicine, is there?

Mr. FENTON. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. FLOOD. I say, there is no State in the Union which bars the practice of medicine? In reply to my friend's question.

Mr. FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we cannot support this amendment. It would simply mean the concentration in those States where this practice is permitted of those veterans who want this treatment. This is a national law, this is national legislation, and it ought not to be limited to State lines.

I hope the amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 4, line 13, before the period, insert the following: "Provided, That a doctor of osteopathy may serve in veterans' hospitals in only those States in which he is licensed to practice osteopathy."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order that this amendment is similar to the one already voted down.

Mr. JUDD. No; it is quite different.

Mr. RANKIN. It has exactly the same effect.

Mr. JUDD. No, I am sorry, it does not—if I may differ with the gentleman from Mississippi. The other amendment permitted osteopaths to practice in veterans' hospitals in only those States where they have passed the same examinations as passed by the regular physicians. This amendment would allow osteopaths to practice in those States in which they are licensed to practice osteopathy.

The bill as written allows an osteopath to get a license in a State where the standards are the lowest and then go over into some other State whose standards are higher and would not permit him to practice.

In all our country's long history we have always allowed the practice of medicine and the healing arts to be under the control of the States. This bill for the first time to my knowledge takes it out of the hands of the States. I am merely offering this amendment to keep it in the hands of the States. It provides that a doctor of osteopathy be allowed to practice in veterans' hospitals in only those States where he is licensed to practice. Surely that is fair enough. I do not see how the gentleman can object to that. Surely that is in the interest of protecting the veteran.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The Chair is of the opinion that the amendments are not identical.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say on the amendment. To protect both our State laws and our veterans, it seems to me we ought not to take this drastic step. We ought to allow doctors, either of medicine or of osteopathy, to practice in veterans' hospitals only in those States in which they are licensed. Under present laws a doctor can take our examination in the State of Minnesota and be allowed to practice in any other State which has reciprocity with Minnesota. Let us take the case of a man licensed to practice osteopathy in the State of Mississippi. Under my amendment, the State of Missouri will qualify him; he can practice in Missouri, as well as in Mississippi, or in any other State which will accept his Mississippi license. But I do not think we in Congress ought to overrule the laws of a State which does not allow osteopaths to practice, or which will not accept the license granted by some other State.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Assume a case of this kind: Suppose an osteopath were licensed in one of the eight States that were referred to earlier in the day; you would circumscribe his right to the State in which he was licensed, and yet even though he was able to do all the things a doctor of medicine could do he could not go into any other State where a veterans' hospital was located and where he was needed.

Mr. JUDD. Can he go into that other State under present law?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. He could under this bill.

Mr. JUDD. He could if this bill becomes law, but under the laws of the several States as they exist now he can not practice in any State in which he is not licensed to practice. Neither a doctor of osteopathy nor a doctor of medicine can do that. I am recommending that we adhere to our present policy. If a State is willing to qualify a man by licensing him to practice, then he can practice in a veterans' hospital in that State.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a doctor of medicine who is licensed in Arkansas cannot practice in any veterans' hospital in the United States and can practice only in Arkansas?

Mr. JUDD. No. I said I would be perfectly willing to have such legislation. As a matter of fact, it would not make much actual difference in the case of

doctors of medicine, because doctors have labored for years to raise standards so that now almost any State in the Union will accept by reciprocity the medical license that is obtained in almost any other State.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not believe it is necessary now for a doctor practicing in a veterans' hospital to say anything to the State authorities because this is on Federal property and has nothing to do with the State law.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman's amendment would make it possible for an osteopath in those States that recognize osteopathy to go into a veterans' hospital in that State and practice?

Mr. JUDD. That is right, if he gets a license in that State.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. This would only allow a doctor of osteopathy from one State to go to another State and limit his practice there to a veterans' hospital. In other words, it is in a Federal hospital for veterans in which he is limited to practice. This bill would not permit a doctor of osteopathy to go from one State to another and practice in the other State on the civilian population?

Mr. JUDD. No; he would be allowed to practice only in a veterans' hospital.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. It seems to me it would be very unwise and a departure from sound policy to override the rules which the States have set up. This bill gives a man who gets a license to practice in one State the right to go to another State and practice in a veterans' hospital in that State.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman think the Veterans' Administration would be in favor of his amendment?

Mr. JUDD. I think so. I have not inquired, I may say to the gentleman, but I believe it would. I cannot see why anybody should object to this.

Mr. FLOOD. Did I understand the gentleman to say the Veterans' Administration itself was opposed to the inclusion of osteopathy in this bill?

Mr. JUDD. It was so stated here and a letter from the Director has been read here this afternoon saying that he preferred that osteopaths not be given permission to practice in veterans hospitals. The main reason given was a fear of friction and other difficulties with personnel. If this amendment were agreed to that would be alleviated somewhat.

Mr. FLOOD. Under the circumstances, the gentleman's amendment would meet the situation and the Veterans' Administration would be in favor of the amendment now presented?

Mr. JUDD. I think this amendment largely resolves the difficulties and gives

adequate protection everywhere along the line.

Mr. FLOOD. And everybody would be satisfied?

Mr. JUDD. I think so.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not understand why the gentleman says this would establish a new departure. I think he used those words. This does for osteopaths exactly what is done for all physicians now employed in the Veterans' Administration. I do not see why the gentleman says it is a new departure.

Mr. JUDD. There is a good deal of difference. As I said, there are only a very few States now whose medical licenses are not accepted by other States. That is far from true of osteopathic licenses. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] pointed out, there are only eight States which license osteopaths for essentially the same services that doctors are licensed for, giving them the same examination as doctors. He said there are 30 States licensing them to practice surgery. A large majority of the States by reciprocity accepts the licenses of doctors from other States, whereas only a few, I understand, will accept by reciprocity the licenses of osteopaths.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no reciprocity involved so far as medical doctors are concerned. They are practicing in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is subject to the same criticism that the other one was. I repeat what I said a while ago. The recent war was not a State war or a sectional war. It was a national war as was World War I. This amendment would not, in my opinion, be acceptable to the Veterans' Administration, even if they opposed the original proposition.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, this amendment proposes to put into operation a barrier.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Which the governors of all 48 States have been trying to eliminate for years in order to facilitate the economic life of our people. Now we come along here and want to set up a Federal area in a Federal hospital and start creating barriers?

Mr. RANKIN. It would embarrass the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JUDD. The barriers are there now. A man with a license to practice in Missouri cannot go to Minnesota to practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further

reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that amendments be in order to any portion thereof.

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

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, without regard to civil-service requirements.

(b) Such appointments as described in subsection (a) of this section shall be for a probationary period of 3 years and the record of each person serving under such appointment in the Medical, Dental, and Nursing Services shall be reviewed from time to time by a board, appointed in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, and if said board shall find him not fully qualified and satisfactory he shall be separated from the service.

(c) Promotions of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after examination given in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator. Automatic promotions within grade may be made in increments of the minimum pay of the grade in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator.

(d) Doctors, dentists, and nurses in the present Medical Service shall be continued in their present positions until the Administrator shall have determined their qualifications as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

(e) In determining eligibility for reinstatement in Federal civil service of persons appointed to positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, who at the time of appointment shall have a civil-service status, and whose employment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery is terminated, the period of service performed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be included in computing the period of service under Civil Service Rule IX, except that this subsection shall not be construed as authorizing restoration of any position abolished by section 1 of this act.

SEC. 7. (a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in subsection (a) of section 4 of this act shall be as follows:

MEDICAL SERVICE

Chief grade, \$8,750 minimum to \$9,000 maximum.

Senior grade, \$7,175 minimum to \$8,225 maximum.

Intermediate grade, \$6,230 minimum to \$7,070 maximum.

Full grade, \$5,180 minimum to \$6,020 maximum.

Associate grade, \$4,300 minimum to \$5,180 maximum.

Junior grade, \$3,640 minimum to \$4,300 maximum.

DENTAL SERVICE

Senior grade, \$7,175 minimum to \$8,225 maximum.

Intermediate grade, \$6,230 minimum to \$7,070 maximum.

Full grade, \$5,180 minimum to \$6,020 maximum.

Associate grade, \$4,300 minimum to \$5,180 maximum.

Junior grade, \$3,640 minimum to \$4,300 maximum.

NURSE SERVICE

Assistant Director, \$5,180 minimum to \$6,020 maximum.

Senior grade, \$4,300 minimum to \$5,180 maximum.

Full grade, \$3,640 minimum to \$4,300 maximum.

Associate grade, \$2,980 minimum to \$3,640 maximum.

Junior grade, \$2,320 minimum to \$2,980 maximum.

(b) Notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

SEC. 8. (a) Within the restrictions herein imposed, the Chief Medical Director may rate any doctor appointed under subsection (a) of section 4 of this act as a medical or surgical specialist: *Provided*, That no person shall at any one time hold more than one such rating.

(b) No person may be rated as a medical or surgical specialist unless he is certified as a specialist by an American specialty board, recognized by the Administrator where such boards exist; or if no such boards exist, he has been examined and found qualified by a board appointed by the Chief Medical Director from specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery holding ratings in the specialty to which the candidate aspires: *Provided*, That, whenever there are insufficient specialists, rated in the proper specialty, who are readily available to constitute such a board, the Chief Medical Director may substitute consultants with comparable qualifications employed under section 14 of this act.

(c) Any person, rated as a medical or surgical specialist under the provisions of this section shall retain such rating until it shall be withdrawn by the Chief Medical Director: *Provided*, That the Chief Medical Director shall not withdraw any such rating until it shall have been determined by a board of specialists that the person holding such rating is no longer qualified in his specialty.

(d) Any person, rated as a medical or surgical specialist under the provisions of this section, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 25 percent of such pay: *Provided*, That in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed \$11,000 per annum.

SEC. 9. Persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions of and entitled to the benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended (5 U. S. C. 691 and the following).

SEC. 10. (a) The Chief Medical Director, under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, shall from time to time appoint boards to be known as disciplinary boards, each such board to consist of not less than three nor more than five employees, senior in grade, of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, to determine, upon notice and fair hearing, charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of any person employed in a position provided in subsection (a) of section 4 of this act.

(b) The Administrator shall appoint the chairman and secretary of the board, each of whom shall have authority to administer oaths.

(c) The Chief Medical Director may designate or appoint one or more investigators, to assist each disciplinary board in the collection and presentation of evidence. Any person answering to charges before a disciplinary board may be represented by counsel of his own choosing.

(d) A disciplinary board, when in its judgment charges are sustained, shall recommend to the Administrator suitable disciplinary action, within limitations prescribed by the Administrator, which shall include reprimand, suspension without pay, reduction in grade, and discharge from the Department of Medicine and Surgery of such person. The Administrator shall either approve the recommendation of the board, approve such recommendation with modification or exception, approve such recommendation and suspend further action at the time, or disapprove

such recommendation. He shall cause to be executed such action as he approves. The decision of the Administrator shall be final.

SEC. 11. There shall be appointed by the Administrator under civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, such additional employees, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a), of section 4, and those specified in section 14 of this act as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That employees of the Medical Service as at present constituted, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a), of section 4, and section 14 of this act, shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status upon certification of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where such person is presently employed: *And provided further*, That the per annum salary range for hospital attendants shall be \$1,572 minimum to \$1,902 maximum.

SEC. 12. The Administrator shall establish a special medical advisory group composed of members of the medical and allied scientific professions, nominated by the Chief Medical Director, whose duties shall be to advise the Administrator, through the Chief Medical Director, and the Chief Medical Director direct, relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans, and other matters pertinent to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. The special medical advisory group shall conduct regular calendar quarterly meetings. The number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members of such advisory group shall be in accord with existing law and regulations.

SEC. 13. (a) The expenses, except membership fees, of employees described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 of this act detailed by the Chief Medical Director to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical and related sciences are hereby authorized subject to available appropriations.

(b) (1) The Administrator is authorized to place employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 of this act on duty, for a period not to exceed 90 days in a year, in schools, of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service, and in civil institutions of learning, with the consent of the authorities concerned, for the purpose of increasing the professional knowledge or technical training of the personnel of the Department: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the personnel of the Department be placed upon such duty at any one time.

(2) The Administrator is authorized, subject to available appropriations, to pay for tuition, transportation, and educational fees of personnel placed on duty under the provisions of subsection (b) (1) of this section.

(c) Any person authorized to attend a course of training shall be required to reimburse the Veterans' Administration the expenses thereof if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after completion of such course.

SEC. 14. (a) The Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, may employ, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, physicians, dentists, and nurses, on a temporary full-time, part-time, or fee basis; and dietitians, social workers, librarians, and such other professional, clerical, technical, and unskilled personnel, in addition to personnel described in section 3, subsection (a), of section 4, and section 11 of this act, on a temporary full-time or part-time basis at such rates of pay as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no temporary full-time appointment shall be for a period of more than 90 days.

(b) The Administrator shall have authority to establish residencies; to appoint qualified persons to such positions without regard to civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations; and to prescribe the condi-

tions of such employment, including necessary training, and the customary amount and terms of pay during the period of such employment and training.

SEC. 15. The Chief Medical Director with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate all regulations necessary to the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; transportation of household goods and effects, and travel; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

SEC. 16. (a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by the Administrator exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of the activities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery or interagency rules governing its relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted on the same day to the Committee on Finance of the Senate of the United States and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Finance of the Senate or by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the chairmen of such committees. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance.

(b) For the purposes of this section the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress.

SEC. 17. This act shall be effective from the date of its approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 8, line 1, strike out "nurse" and insert "nursing."

Page 9, line 14, strike out the words "per centum" and insert "percent."

Page 11, line 6, strike out the first comma, and on page 11, line 10, strike out the second comma.

Page 13, line 12, strike out the second comma.

Page 14, line 4, strike out "deductions" from pay for quarters and subsistence" and insert "travel", and on page 14, line 5, strike out the words "and travel" and insert "and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to raise a question about section 11. I am not going to offer an amendment to this section, but I want to ask this question: I am just wondering whether, as a matter of fact, the salaries provided in this section, and notably the salaries for attend-

ants in hospitals, are high enough to get the caliber of people that ought to be working in these veterans' facilities. We have had a good deal of difficulty in regard to attendants, particularly in neuropsychiatric hospitals, and I am worried particularly about the attendants' salaries which appear on page 11.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from California. I have visited nine of these hospitals. The doctors are stationed there but a short time—nurses maybe longer. It is especially in the neuropsychiatric hospitals that the attendant is there night and day. If you have only an attendant, that attendant gives the patients barbiturates to put them to sleep. I think the attendant should be an associate of the veteran and he should be a man of high standing. I concur in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman tell me whether there is any suggestion on the part of any member of the committee to increase that amount?

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. May I say to the gentleman that the figure we put in the bill, on page 11, is approximately \$200 on each level above the present salary per annum, and is the figure suggested by General Hawley. We put it in the bill at his suggestion, and if it does not work out, subsequently we will raise it again.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right, I would like to say to the gentleman that that is exactly what I wanted to hear from the committee; in other words, this does represent an increase in the pay now received, No. 1.

In the second place, if we find that this does not get the caliber of people that ought to be in those jobs, the committee will be prepared to come before the Congress with another bill to further increase that compensation. Is that correct?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from California is correct. It may be we will have to increase these salaries later, but for the time being this met with the approval of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. One point I want to make is that I do not believe we ought to be penny-wise and pound-foolish with regard to getting the caliber of people that are needed in some of these jobs where they can minister so much to the needs of our veterans, and where the jobs are difficult at best.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I ask some member of the committee whether there is anything in this bill which gives any right of review to a physician who has been discharged? As I understand, the bill provides that the director can discharge any physician whom he deems incompetent. The question was raised

whether or not such a discharged person would have the right of review by any board or any other person.

Mr. RANKIN. We certainly would not have him put back on the roll by the Court of Claims.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This is not a facetious question. I should like to have an answer.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman will find that in section 10, where the disciplinary boards are established to hear grievances. It begins on page 9 and covers all of page 10.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I see it, it does not say that if a doctor is discharged he has the right of appeal.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. He has the right to appeal to the Board, and the decision of the Administrator is final.

Mr. RANKIN. The decision of the Administrator is final.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is vital to pay these men well in order to get the best types. I am sorry they are not taken in as part of the permanent corps, with retirement benefits that would be a real inducement. Also, I feel that in every hospital there should be a permanent force. This is extremely important. I for one shall vote for an increase in their pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to strike out my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that upon the adoption of this bill there will be a discussion upon important national issues by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], and that the two special orders which are supposed to precede have been canceled.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to leave two observations and make two predictions. I believe making predictions is a rather dangerous business, but I predict that under this bill you will have a much better administration of the Veterans' Administration and a much better group of men in there.

I also predict that about half of the medical men now in the Veterans' Administration will be looking for jobs when the bill does go into effect.

I further predict that it will be impossible to keep from making this a political football unless we have an Administrator that is a hard-headed, straight-jacketed man, because one of these days the medical men, dentists, and nurses are going to appeal to the Members of Congress and say, "Now listen. I supported you in your campaign." If we have a man at the head of the Veterans' Administration such as we have at the head of the Post Office Department, you can expect to make this a political football, which will not react in favor of the veterans of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Nebraska, I call his attention to the fact that General Bradley is a grandson on one side of a Confederate soldier and on the other side of a Federal soldier. I do not think he ever voted in his life. I think this Veterans' Administration will be clear of politics. I know it has been so in the Veterans' Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Of course, General Bradley will not live forever.

Mr. RANKIN. He will be here as long as we will.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska why half of the doctors will be looking for jobs.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If we get a Hannegan here like we have at the post office, you will see a political football being made of this.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER:
On page 14, line 25, strike out the words "or a duly authorized subcommittee of either."
On page 15, lines 11 and 12, strike out "or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof."
On page 15, line 13, after the words "and act" insert "by duly authorized subcommittees" and strike out the word "sessions."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is similar in effect to the two amendments which I had suggested. Therefore, I will not offer those amendments.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have spoken to the gentleman from Texas about this. We were in accord on our ideas but our words did not quite reach the point we had in mind. I accepted Mr. Lanham's suggestion and, therefore, submitted these amendments to this section of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: On page 14, line 9, strike out all of section 16.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment to this section. I would prefer not to offer it until after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is acted upon. But will I be out of order in offering it afterward in case the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is not adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. After the gentleman from Tennessee consumes the time allotted to him for debate, the gentleman from California can offer his perfecting amendment. His perfecting amendment will then be voted upon. After that, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be in order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 64, noes 25.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PRIEST. Does all of this come out of my time, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It does.

Mr. PRIEST. I cannot yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing the amendment to strike out section 16, I would like to express my appreciation to the committee for bringing this bill before the House.

On February 19, last, I introduced H. R. 2253, to set up a medical commission corps in the Veterans' Administration. I am happy that this bill has been brought to the House.

With reference to section 16, without regard to the amendment that was agreed to a few minutes ago, I feel that the adoption of this provision in this bill would be a very dangerous departure for the legislative branch of the Government. Our functions are very well set out under the Constitution. We are a legislative body. We have a judicial branch and an administrative branch of the Government. The effect of section 16, very briefly, it seems to me, would place the Congress or one committee of the House or the Senate in the position of assuming and exercising not only semi-administrative responsibilities but judicial responsibilities as well. They would then be in the position of interpreting the law that has been passed, and passing on administrative regulations for the administration of that law by the agency.

The distinguished chairman of this committee, in discussing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] stated this afternoon, and I quote his words:

We have to trust somebody, and if we cannot trust the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, then we should remove him.

I would say to the gentleman and to members of the committee, that that substantially is the way I feel about this section. We do have to trust somebody. If we cannot trust the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, without submitting the regulation to a congressional committee for their approval, then we should remove him and put someone there that we can trust.

In my opinion this is not only an unworkable provision but in my opinion it is unconstitutional.

It is a further encroachment by the legislative branch of the Government on the judicial and administrative branches of Government. In my opinion, it is entirely unworkable.

I tried all day to get some fuller interpretation of the first few lines of the provision, and I cannot understand yet what sort of rules and regulations or proposed rules and regulations the provision applies to. "Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by the Administrator exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of the activities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery," and so on through some language that I have not been able to get clear. I think the effect of the amendment would be to considerably hamper and retard the administration of Veterans' Affairs, and I hope it will be voted down, because it is unworkable, and I believe unconstitutional and a dangerous departure for the legislative branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California:

On page 14, line 23, strike out the words "or disapproved"; and on page 15, line 1, strike out the period and insert "; or such committees or subcommittees may present to either the House of Representatives or the Senate, a resolution disapproving such regulation or order."

On page 15, line 7, strike out the word "Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "the House of Representatives or the Senate."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry; I cannot yield in 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, briefly, would be to permit the Committee to approve a regulation, but it would not give the Committee the power to disapprove one. It would say that if the Committee saw fit to try to disapprove a regulation it would have to bring in a resolution to the House of Representatives, and the latter body would have to disapprove the matter.

It does not seem to me that the power to disapprove a regulation of this kind ought to be lodged in the Committee. It seems to me if it is going to be lodged

anywhere it should be lodged in the entire body of the House. That is all there is to my amendment.

I now yield for a parliamentary inquiry if the gentleman wishes to make one.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I merely wanted to inquire whether or not the 15-minute limitation of debate applied to the previous amendment or to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi was that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to say in conclusion that unless this amendment is adopted I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. For how long?

The CHAIRMAN. For a little short of 2 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Members would read section 16. To my mind it is a very, very serious proposition to give any committee of this House the power of veto over any proposed regulation issued by an administrative agency. It is a radical departure from any legislation Congress has ever passed, that has come to my knowledge. I think it absolutely is without doubt an encroachment upon the prerogatives of the executive agencies of the Government. It would give a small committee of this House an absolute power over the administration of the medical department of the Veterans' Administration. It would be unwise in every respect. I doubt whether any agency of this Government which would agree to such a proposition would be entitled to any confidence. If we have confidence in an agency of this Government why compel it to come up here with every regulation and order it issues, and as the committee wants it, have a subcommittee, possibly a subcommittee of one member as the committee originally had it, disapprove it?

Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous type of legislation, and I hope the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I had intended to offer and about which I spoke a few minutes ago.

Do not forget that we struck out of a bill which was brought before this House relating to OPA a similar provision. The same argument was made against that provision that is being made against this one. The section should, of course, be stricken from the bill. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], said, this sets up these two committees, the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Veterans' Legislation as judges, and makes them virtually a legislative body too, it seems to me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It makes them a judicial body.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is what I meant when I said it would make them judges.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to section 16. When shall I offer it?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is now pending to strike out the section; a perfecting amendment is also pending which will have to be disposed of first.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is agreed to, what, then, is the parliamentary situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The question will then recur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to strike out the section.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That would strike out the section, notwithstanding the clarifying amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman states the situation correctly.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Has all the allotted time been consumed on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not. The gentleman from South Carolina is on the list after the gentleman from California.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the committee on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated on this floor time after time during the last several years that the executive branch of the Government was trespassing on the rights and privileges of the legislative branch by constantly reading matters and increased powers into legislation that were not contemplated by the Congress. That is, the executive branch of the Government was reading into the enforcement of the law things that were not embodied or even implied in the act.

As I understand it, this amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] means that when an executive or administrative officer undertakes to enforce this act and issues regulations and orders, before such orders or regulations go into effect they must first be submitted to the committee from which the bill was reported in the first place. If the committee feels that it is an order or regulation not contemplated in the law, then that committee has the right to bring it to the attention of the House and we will then decide whether the orders or regulations reflect the intention of the Congress at the time the law was originally enacted.

If they do not express the intention of the Congress then we can disapprove such orders and regulations and thereby prevent the executive branch from enlarging its powers and trespassing on the rights of the legislative branch. If the Congress really wants to put a curb on what is so frequently referred to as bureaucracy the amendment offered by the gentleman from California should be adopted, and a similar provision should hereafter be inserted in all legislative bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided; and there were—ayes 99, noes 11.

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much the undue haste with which we are disposing of this final important section of the bill. I have only this much to say that section 16, as it now stands, makes it possible for a subcommittee of one or two members, sitting during a recess or during an adjourned period of Congress to pass upon congressional policy by vetoing rules or orders or regulations which the administrative section of government, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, exercises or promulgates. We are adopting a policy here of allowing two men to set up or obstruct the policy of an administrator. A subcommittee of a committee of either House of Congress can obstruct the administrative functions of the Veterans' Administration. Therefore, I ask you to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to strike out section 16.

I am heartily in favor of this bill, which will give General Bradley the necessary powers to correct the abuses which have accumulated during the administration of General Hines. The fact that such a bill is now necessary speaks more eloquently than words of the deplorable condition that we seek to correct. The responsibility for such conditions lies either at the door of the former Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, General Hines, or at the door of the World War Veterans Committee of Congress. It probably is the result of inefficient administration and in sufficient legislation and therefore a joint responsibility.

Attempts to whitewash the former Administrator or excuse the Veterans' Committee for their lack of diligence in advocating corrective legislation does not impress the thinking Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] for just this simple reason: A vote by this

Committee in support of Mr. PRIEST'S amendment I interpret as a vote of confidence in General Bradley. A vote against the Priest amendment I think General Bradley can interpret very clearly as a vote of lack of confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California changes the situation very much. I fully appreciate the efforts of the veterans' committee on behalf of the veteran, but the provisions is really vicious. It strikes at the very heart of our system of three branches of government in our country and it will give undue power to two or three men of a congressional committee probably at a time when Congress is not in session, maybe in an election year when there are probably few Representatives in Washington to listen to the protests of the Veterans' Administrator, and it diminishes the confidence which we should have in General Bradley as the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. I hope that the House will not put these restrictions upon him at the outset of his career as Veterans' Administrator. It will not be in the interest of the war veteran to retain this provision, in what is otherwise a very fine piece of work on the part of the World War Veterans' Committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOYLE: Page 15, line 8, after the word "issuance", section 16 (a) of said bill, add the following language: "Provided, That no such disapproval of such regulation or rule by the Administrator shall be of any force or effect unless said disapproval by the committee making the same shall be in writing and shall clearly set forth their reasons therefor."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the purport of my proposed amendment, as just read to you by the Clerk, goes to this important point in this section 16 (a), which I believe to be poor legislation. I hope the whole section will be stricken out when the opportunity to do so is given this Committee.

But as it now provides, it permits the disapproval of a proposed rule or regulation as determined upon by the Administrator as being in the interests of the veteran, by two or more members of this Committee who might happen to be functioning as a subcommittee, to stop the proposal of the Administrator. And, furthermore, they do not have to even send him written notice of such disapproval or give him any statement of their reasons for their disapproval. This sort of authority vested thus could easily result in a sort of functioning by too few Members over the destinies of the whole Department of Medicine for the veterans and its entire personnel.

Remember you have exempted much of this personnel from civil-service protection.

My amendment will require a record made and reasons given for such committee disapproval. We certainly want to know by what reasoning our committee determines its course of important differences with the Veterans' Administration. I doubt the sufficiency of a committee of Congress trying to qualify as experts as to the internal workings of a complicated problem like this to such extent as this paragraph 16 (a) would require to be impartially helpful.

Furthermore, I do not want to have a committee of so few as a subcommittee is, determine for me what my interest and spirit is about any given legislation affecting the veterans, unless I have had opportunity to make clear just what my intent and spirit may be. No committee of Congress can announce my intention upon a matter about which I have had no express opportunity to declare my intent. Yet, at lines 19 and 20 on page 14 this right is given such subcommittee. This is too much power. It is neither necessary nor sound nor safe legislation.

I am surprised that with all the noise and confusion there is and the reasonableness of my amendment, that the committee does not accept same. I submitted it to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the committee chairman. He read it but said he could not accept it.

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

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As far as we are concerned, there is no objection to this amendment. That is probably the way disapproval would be expressed anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. We accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired except the time allotted to the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas for a question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Chair stated that all time had expired, and all time had expired because the gentleman from Mississippi took his seat thereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that all time had expired except the time allotted to the committee.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I should like in this brief moment just to observe that this section 16 was merely one of those amendments to regulate the regulators, and that neither General Hines, when he was the Administrator, nor General Bradley, now that he is the Administrator, offered any objection to an amendment of this kind.

There has been a great deal of complaint at various times that we were abrogating our own legislative power and delegating it to these various departments. This section 16 merely does one thing, and that is to see that the regulations that are written are in conformity with the spirit and intent and letter and purpose of this law as passed, and that no unusual uses are made of the powers herein granted.

There have been many times when Members of this House have cried long and loud about the usurpation of powers by these various bureaus. This sort of regulation, which is not a new departure, was adopted in the amendment to the Readjustment Act of 1944 last summer just prior to the recess.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Mississippi because two speeches have been made since my amendment to this section was adopted. In view of the adoption of my amendment those speeches are in error, because in those speeches it was said that a subcommittee could still express disapproval and cause one of these regulations not to go into effect; but under my amendment that becomes impossible. The whole House of Representatives is the only body or the entire Senate is the only body that could disapprove a regulation and cause it not to go into effect under the amendment and under the section as now amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCRIVNER) there were—ayes 107, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 13, line 16, after the word "days", strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided also, That after any veteran has been duly examined by the Administration and a condition has been diagnosed which entitles such veteran to treatment, such veteran shall have the right to select any physician and/or hospital in the community where he or she resides to care for such condition, and the Administration shall enter into an agreement with such physician or hospital to pay the costs of treatment."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not in order. The amendment is not germane.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order for the moment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, do we really want to do something to help cure the sick veteran? If the veteran is taken care of by his home physician and hospital, he already has obtained a substantial portion of the cure for his affliction. The mental comfort this would give him would go a long way toward helping him to get well. There is no question about that. It would be pleasing to him and to his family. I would like to know if we want to give the sick veteran the best treatment available, and if we do, then we should let him choose his own doctor. I wager that if this proposition were put up to the veterans of this country, they would vote overwhelmingly for this amendment, because they would like to be taken care of in their own communities where they know their doctors and hospitals and where they could be with their wives and friends.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The Chair is ready to rule.

Section 14 relates to the appointment and pay of employees by the Administrator. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio undertakes to direct the type of medical treatment, the selection of physicians, hospitals, and so forth, by veterans examined by the Administrator and diagnosed as requiring such treatment, which is beyond the scope of section 14. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, 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. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, pursuant to House Resolution 427, 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 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. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 206, noes 0.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is

no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty Members are present; a quorum. So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the House Military Affairs Committee today by the Chief of Chaplains of the United States Army on the subject of universal military training.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Wooster (Ohio) Record.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Elsworth Huntington.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the special order granted me to address the House today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S LABOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

STRIKES AND LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, public indignation, approaching anger; the probability of violence and rioting if the widespread strikes continued to increase, lighted the path of wisdom and induced President Truman to loosen the shackles with which the Roosevelt administration, for 10 years or more, in behalf of its political allies, has prevented Congress from enacting remedial legislation designed to lessen labor disputes and prevent strikes.

Only the coming days will disclose whether the administration will permit the adoption of just, workable, effective legislation; whether Congress will legislate intelligently and effectively.

The President made certain recommendations and today the House Labor Committee, of which I am a member and which has been dormant for 10 years,

begins consideration of his recommendations, embodied in H. R. 4908.

Briefly, it provides that, whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that Government agencies charged with the functions of mediation and conciliation of a labor dispute have been unable to bring the parties to an agreement or to voluntarily submit to arbitration, and also finds that a stoppage of work seriously affects the national public interest and interstate or foreign commerce, the Secretary shall certify his findings to the President.

Thereupon the President may appoint a board to investigate the dispute, and to, within 20 days, make a report of its findings and recommendations.

The board or any of its agencies, under the bill, will have authority to examine the books and records of any party to a labor dispute; to compel "from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any place designated by such agent," the attendance of and the giving of testimony by any individual it desires to examine.

If, for 5 minutes, or preferably for an hour, you will examine the statement just made, which is accurate and can be verified by an examination of section 3 (b), line 24, page 3, and lines 1 to 8, inclusive, page 4, of H. R. 4908, you will arrive at the inescapable conclusion that the legislation requested is arbitrary, unjust; designed, whatever the intent, to add to rather than diminish the causes of labor disputes.

The bill provides that, while the Board is functioning, unless the parties otherwise agree, the status quo shall be maintained and that it shall be unlawful for any person to coerce or encourage, or conspire to coerce or encourage, any person to interfere with the operation of the industrial plan affected by the dispute. No penalty for a violation of this provision is provided for by the bill.

While the Board is required to make its report of its findings and its recommendations to the President, no further action, unless it be the publication of the report, is contemplated by the bill.

When the committee—biased or unbiased—and its employees have finished their inquisitions, its conclusions as to the merit or lack of merit of the claims of the parties to the dispute are, through the President, given to the public, and labor and management are then, because of public sentiment created by the report, presumed to settle the pending dispute in accordance with the recommendations.

The proposed legislation, if advanced as a remedy for the prevention of strikes, for the settlement of labor disputes, is a straw man, which will be either blown away or go up in the smoke of the first real industrial dispute.

A REMEDY

Do I hear you ask, If I don't like it, what have I to offer? Here is my answer:

Amend the National Labor Relations Act, which, once regarded as labor's magna carta, has been vigorously criticized by every responsible union leader as well as by employers. Such constructive amendments have been offered by me.

It is an unjust, unworkable law, designed to aid in the persecution of employees and employers who refused to accept the domination of a union. It promoted, rather than diminished, the causes of labor disputes.

It should be amended so as to protect the employees, as well as the union; so as to impose equal and reciprocal duties and penalties upon unions, members of unions, and employers.

Where a labor dispute occurs in a public utility, whose operations are controlled by the Federal Government, provide first for voluntary arbitration; that failing, settlement through a court award.

Pass the so-called Hobbs bill, which would end the practice of the teamsters' unions in levying tribute upon every trucker and truck driver who uses the public highway. The Senate has prevented the enactment of that law for more than 2 years.

Fourth, and more important than anything else, insist upon the enforcement of laws designed to prevent coercion, violence, and rioting.

Those things accomplished, labor disputes and strikes will gradually diminish in number and intensity.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the first of next week, or the middle of next week, one of the most publicized measures that we have been discussing this year will be brought to the floor of the House, the full-employment bill. In my remarks today I want to discuss some statements that have been made by various religious leaders of all faiths and denominations in which they express their hope that this House will pass this full-employment bill in its strengthened, forceful form.

Continually, in recent months, I have been asking myself, what is the essential meaning of democracy, and how is it related to basic human rights and to freedom?

I am very much concerned with this issue, because so many strange things have been said of late, in these congressional Halls, in committee hearings, in the press, and on the radio, all in the name of democracy.

I was under the impression that those of us who have lived through two terrible world conflicts, both of which were fought to preserve democracy, were pretty well agreed as to the meaning of the term. But when I listen to so much persistent and apparently sincere oratory directed against the right to work as undemocratic—when I am repeatedly told that if this country undertakes to plan against unemployment and depression, we shall lose our freedom—well, I begin to wonder whether we really understand this democratic system with which we are blessed.

The tenor and theme of my remarks today has been aptly summed up by Secretary Vinson who told the Committee

on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

It is a false dilemma which gives us the choice between full employment and free society * * * those who tell us that depressions are the price we pay for freedom are doing no favor to the cause of freedom.

Most of the opposition to the full-employment bill has been based on this false distinction which places democracy and freedom on one side and full employment on the other. Let me illustrate with some of the more recent remarks made on this floor.

Recently the chairman of the committee considering this bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] told us:

I think if this bill is passed in its present form it would wreck our system of private enterprise * * * it will enslave the workmen of this country.

And another member of this same committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] stated:

I think this bill as written * * * would be just about as dangerous as the atomic bomb. * * * It would probably eliminate the Congress within a very few years. * * * Full employment, if at all possible, is possible only with a completely regimented economy * * * only under some form of totalitarianism. * * * Most of the opponents of this bill would prefer going hungry in the future than seeing American democracy sold down the river for a mess of pottage.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that last sentence: "Most of the opponents of this bill would prefer going hungry in the future than seeing American democracy sold down the river for a mess of pottage."

I want to concur with Mr. GOSSETT in that statement. So, in fact, would not most, but all of the sponsors of the full-employment bill. But the issue I want to raise with you today is this—How long do you think American democracy will survive if large segments of the population are allowed to go hungry?

I am trying to be realistic about this democracy of ours. And it is when I am most hardheaded and realistic that I come to the conclusion that democracy is not compatible with mass unemployment. Full employment is a major requirement of democracy.

This is true in a double sense. Economically it is true because our democratic system of private enterprise depends upon markets and profits. And unless there is full employment there will not be enough purchasing power to support profits and markets, producers will have to turn to the Government or to monopoly controls, and the free competitive system will collapse. Much of the debate over the bill has been in these economic terms, and I do not need to elaborate the point here.

But it is also true in the much more fundamental human terms in which I am talking today that we cannot preserve our democracy if we allow millions of our citizens to go without means of livelihood, dignity, and self-respect.

Since none can speak so eloquently of these human values than those who have devoted their lives to working with men as individuals, I am going to talk today

largely through the mouths of church leaders. The men of the church, indeed, have been among the most ardent supporters of the full employment bill. The measure has been officially endorsed by the major Protestant denominations represented by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Synagogue Council of America, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the United Council of Church Women, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, and the Methodist Federation for Social Service.

In addition, the most persuasive testimony we have had in the Senate and House committee hearings has been that of men like Bishop G. Bromly Oxnam; Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago and founder of the Catholic Youth Organization; the Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady; the Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio; Rabbi Abram Opher; Rabbi Stephen Wise; and Reinhold Niebuhr.

Typical of resolutions adopted by religious leaders is that of the Presbytery of this city of Washington on November 12, 1945. Because of its straightforward expression, I quote it here in full:

Whereas the Senate has passed the full-employment bill with some amendments (S. 380);

Whereas the House of Representatives, through its Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is considering the full-employment bill (H. R. 2202); and

Whereas the bill has suffered unfortunate and slow treatment: Be it

Resolved, That we, the Presbytery of Washington City, express our concern as Christian ministers and laymen:

(1) That the opportunity for work be afforded every able-bodied man, which is his God-given right;

(2) That Government take its responsible place with industry and labor in the provision of jobs; and

(3) That the committee report out the bill with a strong vote, free of encumbering amendments.

Be it further known that we shall support, individually and collectively, this bill, which we consider to be a cornerstone in the building of a stronger and better world.

Why should the church be interested in anything so mundane as jobs or the economics of full employment? How does its concern with moral and spiritual values reach over into the field of national budgeting to prevent unemployment?

Simply because the right to earn a living is a prerequisite for both the Christian and the democratic way of life. Both are built around the concept of individualism. If Christianity is the moral framework for true individualism, democracy is no less the institutional framework for true individualism.

The emphasis is all on that word "individualism," a term that implies the right of every individual to realize his potentialities. It means equal opportunity for every man to make the most of himself.

Without preaching a sermon I believe I could show you that the underlying theme in Christ's teaching is a recognition and justification of the individualism which is at the very center of moral life. Jesus taught individualism in var-

ious ways. In pleading for love and forgiveness He was asserting the duty of every man to recognize and respect with all his heart as well as his intellect the values of every other man. In the realization that one's own values have no priority over another's, one acquires humility and tolerance. At the same time there is the positive revelation that each man's purposes are equally important with all others, that each individual is responsible before God for his own highest self-fulfillment. From this flows a sense of sincerity, integrity, and a restless striving toward the ideal that is at once duty and privilege. Finally to realize that all men have the same responsibility of self-development, and thus stand in the same relationship to the ideal, culminates in a feeling of universal brotherhood. The one unchanging necessity of Christian living is the ceaseless unfolding of every personality. To this demand all moral precepts must conform.

Democracy, likewise, is a way of life—a way of life that encompasses all that we do and are and think. It is social, educational, and economic as well as political. Democracy means respect for the rights of the individual. It means that each person, regardless of his sex, his color, his religion, or his national background has certain inalienable rights which cannot be taken away from him by any human power. Moreover it contemplates that there should be equality of opportunity to develop those talents, abilities, and capacities which he has been endowed with by an Almighty Creator. This does not mean any gross equality. It does not mean \$70 every Saturday for everybody. It does not mean a tearing down of our economic structure and an arbitrary division of income and wealth. It does not mean a college education for all. It means exactly what I said—namely, equality of opportunity without barriers.

Let me state this thesis in the simple words of some of the church leaders:

RABBI OPHER. It was the faith of the American people, both on the battle front and on the home front that this was a struggle for the preservation of democracy; it was our faith in human worth and dignity which produced the almost miraculous turn of the tide of the war and frustrated the Nazi pagan conspiracy against the moral foundation of our civilization.

Bishop SHEIL. In the economic system, it is the human person, as God created him, who is the key, the measure. There is only one standard by which to judge a given economic system.

Bishop OXNAM. Christianity believes that men and not things are the goal of social living. It believes in the solidarity of the human family, and seeks to put the common good first. It believes in equal rights for all, and understands that we progress insofar as we learn how to work together. It finds in love and good will the cohesive factor essential to social unity. Democracy likewise insists upon the worth of the human being, and recognizes the dignity of man. Speaking therefore as a Christian and an American, I regard the right to work as fundamental.

We hear a lot about the "natural rights of men," or "basic human rights." These are phrases that have become so trite, we seldom think about what they really mean. Yet we should think about them

a great deal—because they have a profound significance, and a real bearing upon all of the important issues which come before this Congress.

In this modern world of ours the concept of the rights of men does not derive its significance from some obscure philosophy of natural law. Nor does it stem from the abstract doctrine of divine revelation. There is nothing obscure or abstract about the idea, because it flows directly from the ethical principle which I have described as the basis of both Christianity and democracy—the necessity that each individual should have the opportunity to realize his potentialities.

As a matter of fact, opportunity, freedom, human rights—all amount to just the same thing. It is that bundle of rights which we regard as fundamental which constitutes freedom. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom to associate, freedom of elections, freedom from fear, equal opportunity to education and economic security, equality before the law, freedom of competition—all of these are considered inherent natural rights—and together they add up to democracy.

Now of all these inherent natural rights of man, the most fundamental is the right to work. I say this without hesitation. And I say it without involving myself in a classification of human rights in the order of their importance because I do not claim that it is more important for man to work than for him to worship freely, or speak freely, or have a representative government, education, and so forth. But I do claim that without the right to work, these other rights lose their meaning. And without the right to work man does not have the opportunity to develop his potentialities. Without the right to work man is not free. Again let us listen to our religious leaders on this point:

If man has the right to life, then he has the right to the means of life. To admit the right to an end and at the same time to deny the right to the only means whereby the end can be attained is sheer folly. In the society in which we live, or in any other organized community life we can conceive, men live and can live only by their work; then it follows that man has a natural, inherent right to work. In the words of Leo XIII: "Each man has the right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure what is required in order to live in no other way than by work and wages." (Bishop Sheil.)

There is no use in implementing (the individual's) rights if we overlook this basic right. The citizen has a right to the things that are necessary for life. For the ordinary wage earner this means a full-time job. (Monsignor O'Grady.)

The (bill's) framers realize that freedom to engage in free competitive enterprise is, in the long run, dependent upon another aspect of freedom; namely, the right of the individual worker to a job. A man who cannot get a job is not free. (Bishop Oxnam.)

It is clear enough in a society where the great majority of people support themselves from earned incomes that employment is essential to the means of life. From this it follows that for most of us the only alternative to a job is poverty and the dole. I do not have to describe what this involves in physical terms—in terms of hunger and disease

and stunted development and broken bodies and lack of adequate shelter and clothing. These are too obvious for comment.

But what concerns me even more are the many ways in which unemployment chains not only the bodies but the spirit of men. As Rabbi Stephen Wise has said:

The main evils of unemployment are not material in nature * * * unemployment mean(s) spiritual serfdom. * * * No boon or dole under whatever form or name can free men from the humiliation and corruption which idleness inevitably causes.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, this is not too obvious for comment. One of the principal arguments made by the opponents of the full employment bill is that the guaranty of the right to work would undermine men's characters. This argument was skillfully phrased by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] when he said:

Were it possible to guarantee every person a job, to guarantee everyone security from hunger and want, would such be desirable? Would not such guaranteed security rob the average American of his finest attributes: initiative, thrift, resourcefulness, self-reliance, pride in achievement? To empty a man's backbone, even if you fill his stomach, is to do him an irreparable injury. Moral and spiritual values are, after all, our greatest source of strength and security.

Mr. Speaker, it is precisely because I am so concerned with these moral and spiritual values that I am talking to you so earnestly today. Therefore, I ask you to consider with me what unemployment really does to some of these values. And again I speak with the words of some of America's greatest spiritual leaders:

Unemployment makes men useless, not wanted. (Bishop Shell.)

The bruised knuckles that have knocked at door after door seeking a job may heal, but the hurt in the heart of a self-respecting man who is denied the opportunity to earn his own living with his own hands and brain seldom heals. (Bishop Oxnham.)

(Unemployment) is a threat to morality and character. It creates despair and resentment among the old, postpones marriage and family life among the young, breeds delinquency and crime, encourages antisocial attitudes, and fosters racial and religious prejudice. (Rabbi Opher.)

Unemployment * * * reaches in its corroding effects far beyond the circle of * * * immediate victims. It menaces the texture and fabric of society and threatens its prime basis, the home and the family. Wives and children have no respect for a husband and father who does not have a real job while others do. (Rabbi Wise.)

Unemployment makes men live in fear and, ultimately, hate. While mass unemployment endures men are in desperate competition with each other. (Bishop Shell.)

Those who are not employed hate those who are. Those who have work do not enjoy the fruit of their labor because they fear the hatred of the jobless of today and know that they themselves may be among the jobless of tomorrow. The cancer of unemployment generates contempt, hatred, and fear. However unreasonably, it incites class against class, people against people, race against race, creed against creed, one generation against another. It destroys the national cultural capital, which must be transmitted by education or perish. It throws its dark shadow upon generations to come and gnaws at a country's life core. (Rabbi Wise.)

Economic want militates against human well-being and fills man with harassing preoccupations and anxieties. It seriously hampers his efforts toward achieving his union with God. There are exceptions, but for the majority of men the consequences of material want are stunted lives and stunted souls. The continual fear and uncertainty of those whose daily bread is insecure impede the growth of the soul. The most searing and crippling effects of economic insecurity are not in the bodies but in the souls of men. (Bishop Shell.)

These last seven paragraphs, Mr. Speaker, are not my words. They are the words of the men who know the most about those moral and spiritual values previously mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]. To me, they are the answer to the expressed fear that the guaranty of a job and of security from hunger and want would destroy the finest attributes of the average American.

I believe that the great mass of the American people are in accord, when the question of freedom is put in this way. But the real issue is, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to travel that well-known road that is paved with good intentions?

I am not being facetious when I ask this. Again, I am trying to be realistic. Too often in this country our difficulties have been due not to bad intentions, but to inertia. Too often things go wrong because of inaction, rather than mistaken action. That is why I cannot stress too strongly that we should take steps now to prevent unemployment. It is not enough to recognize our basic needs and values, or to prate about freedom; we must never cease in our efforts to translate these goals into concrete social action and to make freedom real. As Bishop Shell has said:

It is not enough to hold sound principles; they must be applied to the living, pressing issues which confront human beings.

Failure to do so would result in what Rabbi Opher has aptly termed "moral inflation." I quote:

We think of economic inflation in terms of inflated values and worthless currency. Moral inflation would be a high-sounding slogan without meaning or implementation. It was this type of moral inflation that produced the period of debunking and cynicism between the last war and this war, which was the basis of the Nazi claim of the decadence of democracy. The repeated use of high-sounding words and slogans which are a necessary concomitant of war, when they are not translated into action is bound to bring about again the same kind of disillusionment and break-down of the moral system which we witnessed in the 1920's and early 1930's. During the war we heard a great deal about the "four freedoms," and the claim on the part of our statesmen and leaders in every walk of life that this was not just another war, it was a war as between paganism and religion. That will have to be translated into action if we are not to break faith with the American people.

And Bishop Oxnham underscores the same point by stating:

The churches recognize that it is not enough to proclaim religious ideals. The ethical ideals of religion must be translated into the realities of world law and order, economic justice, and racial brotherhood. Nor is it enough for us, as citizens, to enunciate

democratic ideals. They, too, must come alive in concrete measures that give them reality. Ideals thus become meaningful for the common man.

Unfortunately, one of the most serious obstacles to constructive social action to prevent unemployment is the belief of a small but influential minority that it cannot be done in a democracy. There have been several who have echoed the conviction of Mr. William Kleitz, vice president of the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, who told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that depressions are inevitable under the free enterprise system.

Indeed, even in our own ranks—in this congressional body, whose very function is to take deliberate social action in the interest of the common welfare—there are some who have admitted to a defeatist philosophy which, if it had any validity, would make the law-making process itself completely superfluous and futile. One Member has told us:

Full employment * * * if at all possible, is possible only within a completely regimented economy * * * only under some form of totalitarianism.

Another has followed up with the question:

Throughout the history of the universe, does the gentleman know of any countries which have ever made a success out of full employment?

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to elaborate for you what I think on this score. You already know that I heartily concur with that great majority of economists who have become increasingly aware that depressions are man-made, and who have learned so much about its causes and its remedies, that they proclaim without hesitation that unemployment can be eliminated through bold, coordinated and intelligent economic statesmanship.

Those are the experts on economic relationships. But depressions are social as well as economic. They are caused by immorality and greed and lust for power as well as by economic mistakes. For that reason I am very glad to note that the experts on social relationships—the leaders of the church—have not despaired of mankind. They are not convinced that depressions are inevitable any more than they are willing to believe that wars are inevitable. They have faith that man is a master of his own fate, and they are willing to humble our freedom, our democracy, and even our Christianity upon that faith. Only they do not consider it a gamble, because they realize that unless we solve our economic problems we are in danger of losing these other things too.

This point has been especially well stated by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches:

An influential part of our commercial and industrial world still insists that successive booms and depressions, the so-called business cycle, are inevitable. Our Congregational Christian Council for Social Action holds that this belief is an insult to the intelligence of America and an affront to the Christian conscience. We must continue to insist that depressions can be prevented until that belief gains acceptance.

Bishop Sheil reemphasizes this same point:

I believe that full employment is possible in America. I believe unemployment is unnecessary. I have no patience with that school of thought which maintains that business depressions and mass unemployment are inevitable. They are inevitable only because stupidity and greed and fear have made them so. Depressions and mass unemployment are not acts of God. They are produced by us through our inhuman economic practices.

One thing is certain, however. We shall not solve our economic problems unless we plan to solve them. We shall never abolish depression until we take deliberate preventive action to that end. As the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches said in an official statement, "History shows that our speculative booms and succeeding depressions are the direct results of lack of planning and controls."

This raises the issue as to whose responsibility it is to plan for full employment. To this question the answer is equally clear. Planning must be the responsibility of the Government for two reasons—one, because there is no other group in a position to take such a responsibility, and two, because planning for freedom is one of the primary functions for which government was organized in the first place.

It is hardly necessary to belabor the point that neither laborers, nor consumers, nor businessmen, nor farmers can undertake to prevent depression or to plan for full employment. After all, each of these groups is itself a victim of depression, and each is dependent upon the markets or the incomes generated by full employment. In the absence of such markets or incomes, each group has no choice but to restrict its operations—that is, its producing or its buying.

At the same time it is obvious, as Secretary Vinson has pointed out, that "somewhere there must be a responsibility on unemployment. There can be no vacuum, no void of responsibility on the most important domestic problem confronting the American people."

I realize that a great many people are afraid of Government planning. I also realize that this is because they confuse planning with totalitarianism. They forget that both dictatorship and democracies involve planning by the State, and that all depends upon who participates in that planning, and toward what goals that planning is directed. They fail to recognize the vital distinction between planning for slavery and planning for freedom—between planning imposed from above and planning that derives from a cooperative partnership of the various groups in the economy.

It is not to lose our freedom to use our heads to solve the problems that must be solved if freedom is to endure. There are some who insist that to plan is to enslave. That, to me, is nonsense. When this Republic was founded we thought in terms of freedom, and sought to establish governmental forms best calculated to maintain and extend freedom. There is no reason why we cannot face the economic problems of our day and find solution in terms of freedom. (Bishop Oxnam.)

It appears to me that S. 380 preserves the essential partnership of Government and in-

dustry, preserving freedom for enterprise, but responsibility for planning and prevention of break-down rather than picking up the pieces after the catastrophe. (Rev. Ray Gibbons, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches.)

For these reasons I want to emphasize exactly what it is that the original full-employment bill undertakes to accomplish. In the first place, that bill enunciates the principle that so far as possible jobs should be provided by private enterprise, and that Government policies should be directed toward stimulating private production. To this end the bill provides measures to promote the confidence necessary for private risk-taking. In the words of President Truman, it provides assurance—

Assurance that all the facts about full employment and opportunity will be gathered periodically for the use of all.

Assurance of stability and consistency in public policy, so that enterprise can plan better by knowing what the Government intends to do.

Assurance that every governmental policy and program will be pointed to promote maximum production and employment in private enterprise.

Assurances that priority will be given to doing those things first which stimulate normal employment most.

Mr. Speaker, I think that enough attention has not been given to the very significant fact that under the full-employment bill, direct governmental action to create jobs would be undertaken only if and when private enterprises fail to provide full employment. Those who feel that free private enterprise is equal to the task will have full opportunity and every encouragement to demonstrate this to be the truth; they have nothing to fear from Government intervention.

But suppose that private production does not measure up? Suppose there are certain deep-seated imbalances and maladjustments in our economic structure which make it impossible for the economic mechanism automatically to keep going in high gear? It is only in such a case that the full employment proposes Government action. And such Government action would take the form, not of edicts from above, but of policies decided upon by the people through the democratic process of lawmaking.

This is why the language of the bill is devoted, not to spelling out the specific steps that should be taken, but rather to outlining a procedure for making that lawmaking process more effective—effective in the sense of reflecting more adequately the will of the people.

The will of the people, expressed through their freely elected representatives, can hardly be termed totalitarianism. Actually the most striking aspect of the bill is its reliance upon constitutional processes to plan for the Nation's welfare. (Bishop Sheil.)

You have only to read the bill to see how it concentrates upon these "constitutional processes." It is directed primarily at more effective legislative procedures, and more intelligent and coordinated congressional programing. It establishes machinery for setting national goals, collecting all relevant information, appraising the toolkit of Fed-

eral policies for influencing the economy, and knitting all of these together into an integrated national economic policy. In so doing it throws the spotlight of responsibility upon Congress as the representatives of the people.

And it is important that the finger of responsibility should be thus openly pointed, because there is so much at stake. I repeat what I said before, that it is not only the vital right to work which is at stake, but also all of our freedoms, and our democratic system.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gossett] has wisely admonished this House in these words:

Let us work to preserve in peace the things we fought to preserve in war. * * * Let us examine with care any proposed legislation that would make revolutionary changes in the American way of life. Otherwise, gentlemen, we will wake up one sad morning to find that American democracy was just a glorious experiment.

I would supplement these excellent words, however, with the reminder that society is always changing, and that the essence of democracy is not to stand still, but to ensure an orderly process of change. It is precisely because we want to avoid revolution that we must take constructive advance action to avoid these catastrophes that lead to revolution. And of all the forces making for revolution, none is more potent than mass unemployment.

Again the words of the church leaders are pertinent:

Given full employment, and assuming the maintenance of civil liberties, there is no reason why the American may not pass through this day of fundamental transition without violence and with full respect for the orderly processes of democracy. (Bishop Oxnam.)

This bill is not, as some of its critics charge, a step in the direction of collectivism. It is, on the contrary, the kind of measure which will insure that our free economy will function in the direction of security for all of our citizens. It will, therefore, help to avoid the kind of economic crises out of which collectivism emerges. (Rheinhold Niebuhr, Union Theological Seminary.)

This country need never fear communism as long as it provides a decent living for the people. Communism does not flourish, it is not even desired, where justice and charity prevail in the social order.

A nation that is ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed in any considerable part is a fertile ground for the curse of totalitarianism. People bound down by misery and want; people weighted down by grinding poverty and harrowing fear are easy prey for the widely advertised security of totalitarianism. * * * If this Nation is ever destroyed it will not be by foreign enemies, but by poverty and wretchedness within. (Bishop Sheil.)

A man who cannot get a job is not free * * *. The bitterness in his soul soon becomes resentment, and the easily phrased economic panacea of the demagogue becomes attractive. It is in such souls that the seeds of revolution find warm soil. (Bishop Oxnam.)

The working classes, informed and articulate, will no longer endure the economic servitude to which many were subjected in the past. If capitalism in a republic does not permit them to work, they will sacrifice private ownership for state tyranny and trade liberty for bread.

Strangely enough, those who most heartily fear and hate socialism are the very ones who, by the injustices of their reactionary pol-

icles, drive the people to the desperation of the all-powerful state. (Archbishop Lucey.)

Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States originally requested that we pass full-employment legislation, this country was at war. However, even then the need for action was apparent. Now, with reconversion upon us and with the rolls of the unemployed mounting daily, that need has become acute. We cannot afford to wait, to wait until our streets are filled with sellers of apples, our freight trains thronged with transients, our local relief agencies wilting under their loads. From every standpoint, economic, social, moral, we must enact strong, forceful legislation designed to bring about conditions of full employment in this democracy of ours. Our economists have told us of the need—now our religious leaders tell us of that same need. Let us not be drawn into passing half-way or quarter-way measures. Let us give hope for the future to the American people by overwhelmingly enacting a decent, strong, full-employment bill.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN CHINA

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have an affectionate regard for the gentlewoman from Connecticut. We like to look at her on those rare occasions when she graces this body with her presence. We admire her easy carriage, we like to listen to her clear diction, and her choice application of epithets. I think perhaps the finest, most admirable thing about her is the political dexterity with which she contrives to voice the principles of Herbert Hoover and to maintain the unswerving political support of the Bridgeport Socialists. Those attributes insure her retaining the seat which she graces in this Congress.

We all know that the gentlewoman is something of a world traveler. Out on the west coast it is not regarded as any particular mark of distinction if someone goes to the Orient. In the speech which the gentlewoman from Connecticut made in which she referred to me rather unkindly, I think she said she had gotten to China, and until she mentioned it in her speech it seemed so little a virtue that I had not thought it worth while mentioning the fact that like many other men from the west coast I have been there too; in fact, I was there four times.

I rather imagine that the character of the associations the gentlewoman from Connecticut made in China colored her views just as I believe the conditions I observed and the people I talked to may have influenced mine.

I was not, of course, invited to dinner with the generalissimo, nor did I dine with the Ambassador, nor with any of the substantial big shots in China. I simply walked around, and looked, and talked to people. And perhaps the fact that I was there in 1927 just following the bloody suppression of the trade-union movement in Shanghai by the gangsters hired by Chiang Kai-shek might have colored my views of him too.

I was always rather susceptible in these respects.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut is in the corner carrying the towel for General Hurley. It seems to me we ought to look a little bit into who General Hurley is. We all know, of course, his association with oil, his relationship to one of the major oil companies in this country. In addition to that, a Washington newspaper has done the country considerable service to again remind us of Mr. Hurley's famous plan when he was Secretary of War in the Hoover Cabinet of providing relief for the unemployed. It was the "garbage for unemployed plan" which Mr. Hurley endorsed, according to the Evening Star in an article published yesterday here under the headline "Lo the poor."

This magnificent plan for the relief of underprivileged Americans out of work through no fault of their own was to put in each restaurant a garbage can, four of them in fact, plainly marked for "meat," "potatoes," and other stuff. There was to be a sign that customers having enough money to eat in those days should not flick ashes into the food so that the leavings would be sanitary for the unemployed. Now, do not get the idea this was charity. The unemployed under this plan were to cut wood before they could get this garbage. I do not see how a man who initialed this document could be suspected of having any sympathy with the common man in China.

It is very little wonder that Mr. Hurley, when he first landed over there, promptly began to reverse the policies that President Roosevelt and Ambassador Gauss had carried out. Of course, it is no accident that some of the Members on the other side of the aisle maintain an interest in north China, because many years ago that is where Mr. Hoover got his wealth and affluence. The records of a British court, which I have not the time to quote now, will show how his intimidations and slick practices would have been successful had it not been for British law which interfered with his doing the Chinese out of millions of dollars of mining properties in that area. So, as I say, Mr. Hurley, and his former boss, Mr. Hoover, have a long-sustained interest in the economic resources of northern China.

May I say that the gentlewoman from Connecticut in her remarks about my speech the other day failed to meet the basic issues which I raised at that time. My chief contention was that Hurley had done more than any other single individual to bring about the Chinese civil war.

Let us see on what that contention was based. I have here the "Communist-fed" paper, the Washington Post, from which I quote an article by Marquis Childs in which he states:

The easiest way to dispose of your opposition, if you are not too sure of your argument, is to yell "Communist."

That was what Patrick J. Hurley did when he resigned as American Ambassador to China.

What makes Hurley's outburst more difficult to understand is the fact that in China he has had his own way almost entirely. Those same foreign-service officers about whom he complains so bitterly were sent out of Chungking at his request. He would take no advice from them.

Then he speaks of Hurley's instructions from the President.

The editorial continues:

While these were Hurley's instructions, he seems to have swung quickly into the nationalist orbit and increasingly resented the advice of younger men in the Embassy who urged him to bargain with Chiang in order to try to bring the two factions together. Stubbornly holding to his own viewpoint, Hurley drew closer to Chiang, who was naturally gratified to find that he was not required to make major concessions to the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote secondly from another Communist-fed organ, using the terminology of the gentlewoman from Connecticut, the Herald Tribune, of New York, which, on October 30, wrote an editorial entitled "The Catastrophe in China":

As a result of the policies which have been followed during * * * incumbency of Patrick J. Hurley as American Ambassador at Chungking, there is grave danger that American troops will become involved in the fighting. Ambassador Hurley's all-out support of the Kuomintang (Chungking) government, has created a situation in which Americans are giving aid to one Chinese faction in its quarrel with another.

Then there is the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Wednesday, November 28, which had this comment to make:

General Hurley threw all his weight and all of the prestige of the United States Government behind Chiang Kai-shek. This encouraged the generalissimo to intensify his opposition to the Yen an group and to grant few, if any, real concessions to it. A rift which our diplomacy might have narrowed was, instead, widened.

The same Communist-fed journal, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, stated:

The witches' broth in China, in which our soldiers are now involved, was stirred by General Hurley himself. American policy is assuredly subject to criticism, but it is strange indeed to find our chief policy maker in China opening himself up to an exposure of his own failure.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is pretty fair evidence, and if the gentlewoman from Connecticut had perhaps not spent so much time in traveling and a little more time reading the American press, she might not have thought my speech was so full of errors as she previously indicated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I decline to yield at this point. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if she wishes.

Then I would like to come to a second issue which I raised the other day and which the gentlewoman failed to meet. That is the question: Did Hurley actually invoke a censorship which deprived the United States of valuable information from China?

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. I will not ask the gentleman to yield further, because when I spoke on the floor of the House the other day he was not present to ask me to yield, for which reason I shall let him continue uninterrupted.

Mr. DE LACY. The gentlewoman is quite courteous. She, as you know, did not notify me of her intention. But she may ask me questions at any time if she cares to in the course of my presentation here today.

I charged in my speech that Hurley had encouraged censorship and was otherwise responsible for closing the borders of North China to further investigation by American newsmen. This Communist-fed paper, the Chicago Daily News, in an article by Edwin A. Lahey, said:

Since the death of President Roosevelt, our Ambassador at Chungking, Patrick J. Hurley, has tortured American policy in China to fit the assumption that our only alternatives were to deal exclusively with the government of Chiang Kai-shek or with the Communist government at Yen-an, described by Hurley as an "armed political party."

In the private view of many Americans in China, whose opinions are suppressed by strictly military orders against political discussion, or by the creeping Chinese censorship encouraged by Hurley himself—

May I emphasize: "creeping Chinese censorship encouraged by Hurley himself."

The article continues—

the real alternatives in China are either to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to set up a democratic coalition government or to produce a civil war.

There is a great deal more evidence on this which could be presented. I would particularly like to invite the gentlewoman's attention to this letter addressed to that distinguished leader, distinguished American, the head of the great Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas. This letter is signed by five distinguished press correspondents, all of whom have had long and distinguished service in China. The letter states:

The men—

Referring to the far eastern experts—the career men in our State Department—who Hurley has so unmercifully attacked—

accused are unable to speak for themselves. We feel, therefore, that as witnesses sent to China by the American press we should announce our belief that the American Embassy in Chungking, upon Ambassador Hurley's assumption of office, was staffed by a good, honest cross-section of Americans. Some were liberals, others conservatives. They had in common only one quality—that all were reporting the truth to the American Government as they saw it.

As journalists, we should indeed be interested in seeing the publication of the dispatches of our trained specialists, side by side with Mr Hurley's official reporting in the past year.

The men whom Mr. Hurley attacks are people who have endured years of hardship in China, in pestilence and bombing, serving Americans' interests. We have met these men in famine areas, in air raid shelters, at the war fronts. They served as nobly and disinterestedly in the cause of our Republic as any soldier in uniform.

Mr. Hurley disagreed with them and got rid of them. By so doing he deprived himself and the State Department of American sources of information that his predecessors had found both valuable and objective.

Respectfully yours,

This statement to the Senator is signed, among others, by one of the most

distinguished correspondents in the business, a gentleman who represents those outstanding American publications Time, Life, and Fortune, Mr. Theodore H. White. It is also signed by Richard Watts, former head of the OWI News Bureau in the Far East and previously with the Herald Tribune; Eric Severeid, famous radio commentator, and Annalee Jacoby and Jack Beiden, outstanding correspondents in their own right.

I submit for the record that this is also perhaps part of that great Communist conspiracy to undermine our American policy in China of which we heard something on the floor the other day.

Now, on another issue—I raised, with which the gentlewoman took issue—she did not bother to avoid this one, she took some issue with it—as to what General Stilwell and Ambassador Gauss did do in China, I have here another Communist source, an outstanding Communist source, the St. Louis Star-Times, which says:

There may be some validity to Hurley's charge that "we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism," but considering the way he has been playing Chiang's game, he forgets the old rule that a man should come into court with clean hands. His predecessor, Ambassador Gauss, had worked hard to forge a solid front of the Chungking and the Yen-an Chinese against the Japanese. So had "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, but after Hurley appeared on the scene Stilwell was recalled, probably at the request of Chiang Kai-shek.

I have other information here which I am not going to quote in detail. This news writer, Mr. Brooks Atkinson, of the New York Times, another distinguished Communist paper in the country, as of October 31, 1941, said:

The decision to relieve General Stilwell has the most profound implications for China as well as American policy toward China and the Allied war effort in the Far East. * * * Inside China it represents the political triumph of a moribund anti-democratic regime that is more concerned with maintaining its political supremacy than in driving the Japanese out of China. America is now committed at least passively to supporting a regime that has become increasingly unpopular and distrusted in China, that maintains three secret police services and concentration camps for political prisoners, that stifles free speech and resists democratic forces.

May I emphasize the next paragraph—

The fundamental difference between the Generalissimo and General Stilwell has been that the latter has been eager to fight the Japanese in China without delay and the Generalissimo has hoped that he would not have to. * * *

Relieving General Stilwell and appointing a successor has the effect of making us acquiesce in an unenlightened, cold-hearted autocratic political regime.

This is submitted on the general role of Stilwell and Gauss in China. I said the other day on the House floor that their policy was the Roosevelt policy, the policy America should follow, the policy of trying to get the contending factions in China together, of not favoring either side, of getting Chungking and Yen-an and the intermediate groups, the Democratic League parties, together in a

coalition government which would look towards free elections and necessary internal democratic reforms.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut said on the floor, I think rather imprudently, that that north China government to which I made reference was no government at all. She likewise made the point that the northern forces helped some against the Japanese, but in no considerable fashion. Of course, we have to acknowledge at this point that the gentlewoman from Connecticut did say that they did all the common people could. They were just guerrillas, and they did all the fighting they could. But let us see exactly the extent of this fighting.

It was said on the floor that part of the Communist lie, or whatever the language was, misrepresentation, I believe, was that there was very little fighting by Chungking and a very great deal in the north. The gentlewoman from Connecticut did not meet the figures which are incorporated in my speech the other day. I do not believe she can meet this.

This book is *The Challenge of Red China*, by Gunther Stein, who was the former correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor* and the *Manchester Guardian*. I do not believe I need to labor the point that those are hardly Red periodicals. In this book recently published—and Mr. Stein was one of those who spent 3 months in north China, in that first group of correspondents who went up there—on page 327 he states:

In north China, 84 percent of the 14 Japanese divisions with 220,000 men engage the Communist-led Eighth Route Army. Only 16 percent face the remnants of the once very large Kuomintang-controlled armies at the fringes of this vast war theater which was overrun by the Japanese early in the war.

Then it gives the figures for central China and south China. I said in my speech that 64 percent of the Japanese forces in China were pinned down by the action of these northern guerilla fighters whom America did not arm and whom the Chungking government cut off through a vigorous blockade from any source of internal supply. That was based on an averaging of the 84 percent, the 59.5 percent, and the 22 percent that obtained in the relationships of these various portions of China. The figures are here for anyone to see. I do not want to take more of the time of the House in calculating them.

In addition to that, of course, the Japanese gave lively testimony of what they thought of the effectiveness of the Communist-led forces in the north. One of the paragraphs on page 396 quoting from Japanese statements, is as follows:

From the figures on the results of the Imperial Chinese Army action against the Chungking and Communist armies in December 1941, it is clear that the major hindrance to peace in eastern Asia is no longer the Chungking Government but the Chinese Communist Party. The stubbornness of the Communist troops has far surpassed that of the Chungking troops.

Now, friends and Members, that might not prove anything—it is Japanese propaganda perhaps, but it indicates they respected their enemy and at least thought they were getting a fight out of them.

The gentlewoman also said there was no government in the north of China. I have here a book by another distinguished American correspondent, Harrison Forman, called *Report From Red China*. He likewise went into north China and in his work he has a chapter called *Village Democracy*. I will not take the time to read from it but it shows the program that these peasants were trying to work out. It shows they had free elections in this little village and in other villages like it, across that resistance area which was mobilized behind the Chinese lines to fight for the freedom of the country. It shows that the Communists up there had limited themselves to one-third of the elected officials in each of the levels. I do not believe neither my party nor the party of the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut would submit ourselves voluntarily to a rule under which we would occupy only one-third of the seats in this House or any other body. Its purpose, as I stated the other day, was to draw all sections of the people into government in village democracies—not a highly complicated industrial democracy like ours—but village democracy. From these villages, delegates—representatives of the people—were elected to serve in governing councils for entire regions. Yet the gentlewoman denies that north China had government.

I now have some remarks to make upon the lack of democracy under Chiang Kai-shek—that which I called the pretension of the Kuomintang to a one-party dictatorship. The lady from Connecticut did not like that very well either. I have here a number of statements which bear that out. One of them is the words, of course, of Chiang Kai-shek himself. It is very odd that his book, which is the *Mein Kampf* of China, called *China's Destiny*, has never been permitted by him to have a single English translation nor has his strict censorship permitted any copy of any translation to come out of that country. It is very odd that no correspondent has ever been authorized to quote a single line from Chiang Kai-shek's book.

Some of us wondered why and we asked the Secretary of State to give us a copy—the State Department copy because they made a translation. The Secretary of State just smiled and said he thought at this moment it might not be wise to make it available. Mr. Speaker, if the chiefs of foreign policy of two governments think this book is dynamite, I am willing to take their word for it. I need not rely upon the *Daily Worker* or some other alleged Communist source.

I have additional evidence here of Chiang's kind of "democracy" in China:

Today the Nationalist Party is dominated by a corrupt political clique that combines some of the worst features of Tammany Hall and the Spanish Inquisition. Two silent and mysterious brothers, Ch'en Li-fu and Ch'en Kuo-fu, known to all the foreigners of Chungking as the CC clique (from the initials of their family name), practically control the thought of the nation through a combination of patronage, secret police, espionage, and administrative authority.

Now this comes from that outstanding publication, *Life* magazine of May 1, 1944. I think it is evident that the gen-

tlewoman from Connecticut did not take time to read *Time* nor to understand *Life*.

In addition, I call attention to a significant clipping from the *Shanghai Post and Mercury*, dated November 30, 1945, which has been mailed to my office under recent date, by that outstanding student of China, Agnes Smedley. This article and Miss Smedley's letter tell how Chiang Kai-shek has just sent back to Shanghai as his representative, a Mr. Tu Yueh-sen.

This Mr. Tu Yueh-sen was a notorious racketeer in Shanghai. He is the man who, in 1923, led the gangsters who broke up the Chinese trade-unions that had just begun to flourish in that great city. He was the king of the opium traffic, king of prostitution, king of the notorious evils that I could see a part of with my own eyes when I was in Shanghai. He was and is the Al Capone of China. Now he is sent back to Shanghai by the great exponent of democracy, Chiang Kai-shek, to whom we are giving our munitions and to whom we offer the lives of Americans in khaki and in marine green to sacrifice in suppressing the aspirations of the people of China for the right to vote and the right to simple agrarian reforms.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I will yield, since the gentleman was so kind earlier in the day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct in understanding that Chiang Kai-shek represents one of the five great powers in the United Nations Organization?

Mr. DE LACY. I would say not. He represents a great party in China. If all the parties in China could be gotten together in a unified party, we could see progress there, see a market open for the great industries of your section and the shipping of my section.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is he not the accredited representative of China?

Mr. DE LACY. Accredited by what power?

Mr. HOFFMAN. By the Organization, by the United States, by Russia, and by Great Britain?

Mr. DE LACY. He is recognized, and his Government is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would you have us deny aid to him?

Mr. DE LACY. I would deny aid to him for the purpose of prosecuting a civil war in his own country, to eradicate the beginnings of democracy there and the beginnings of limited social progress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. Not at this time.

Another question I raised on the floor of this House was that General Hurley's reversal of the Roosevelt-Gauss policies was costing us friendship in China.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. DE LACY. I prefer not to, but if you insist, I will.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has constantly referred to the Roosevelt-Gauss policy. I simply want to say, when the War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations was in China, in Chungking, in September we had a meeting with General Hurley and members of his staff and all the representatives of the United States they could

get together. General Hurley at that time made the flat statement that he was not sent to China with instructions to support the central government if he thought it would succeed, or that he was not sent there to support the central government if he thought that was the best thing to do, but that his instructions by Mr. Roosevelt were to support the central government—period.

Mr. DE LACY. He placed that interpretation upon it. That is what caused the civil war.

Mr. JUDD. Did not Mr. Roosevelt send General Hurley back to China?

Mr. DE LACY. You know, there is an old fable about the old gentleman who was walking down the street and he saw a viper lying in the dirt, stung by the frost. He picked this viper up and put it in his bosom to warm it. The warmth of his body did warm the viper, but we all know the moral of that fable. The viper bit the bosom of the man who so befriended him.

Mr. JUDD. Did not Mr. Byrnes again urge Mr. Hurley to go back?

Mr. DE LACY. I prefer not to yield further at this time.

My charge on the House floor was that there had been armed intervention in China, and that we were not there primarily for the purpose of disarming the Japanese. On that point I quote another Communist source, *Time* magazine, for October 22, 1945, which described the effect of our armed intervention:

Time and the full might of the United States in China were working against Mao Tse-tung and for the unification of Chiang's China.

In the heart of Communist China, the ancient Manchu capital, Peiping, was smartly seized by Chiang's Ninety-second and Ninety-fifth Armies, flown from Hankow and Shanghai by the United States Tenth Air Force. Into Shanghai itself, surrounded by the chagrined Communist new Fourth Army, United States planes had borne Chiang's Ninety-fourth Army. Later the United States forces transferred its China theater headquarters into the city. Nanking was firmly held by Chiang's airborne new Sixth Army, Canton by his foot-slugging, United States-trained new First Army.

On the China coast the Communist Eighth Route Army held a solitary port, Chefoo. But a strong United States naval force cruised offshore. At strategic Tientsin and Tsingtao, United States marines landed and nonchalantly took over. Later they would hand the cities to the Nationalist Government. Other marine contingents had raised their standards in Peiping and Chinwangtao.

The United States was underpinning its energetic diplomacy with the sword, and the Communists were powerless to prevent it.

I should like to also quote another outstanding Communist source, the *Christian Science Monitor*, which gives a very brilliant explanation of the effect of what our intervention is accomplishing there in China. This is an article by Gordon Walker, staff correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*:

UNITED STATES ROLE TO EXPAND IN CHINA'S CIVIL WAR?—JAP "REFORMS" BARED—MARINES' TASK AID TO CHIANG

(By Gordon Walker)

CHINESE NATIONALIST ARMY HEADQUARTERS, MANCHURIA, December 5.—The American part in China's undeclared civil war appears almost certain to increase rather than taper off in the future.

This is the impression an observer receives after making a survey of the critical north-eastern area of China, where American land and naval forces ostensibly are remaining behind to help demobilize Japanese armies.

Looking at the problem realistically, some 50,000 marines, together with the United States Seventh Fleet, are at present doing very little to demobilize and repatriate the Japanese here. A few Japanese are being rounded up and shipped home each week, but they are only a drop in the bucket compared to the numbers which could be moved out if the job were undertaken wholeheartedly.

AID NATIONALIST EFFORTS

The fact is that American military forces are here at the request of the Chinese Nationalist Government. Regardless of what operational duties the Marines and Navy may be undertaking, the main effect of their presence here is to bolster the Chinese Nationalist Army in its dual effort to halt Chinese Communist opposition and complete the job of reoccupying Manchuria.

On land, the United States marines' action is much like that of a "fleet in being"—the marines' presence is more of a threat to the Chinese Communists than are their actual movements. Marines are located at Tientsin and Peking, and are supplied over the same railroad connection with the sea that furnished much of the supplies to Chinese nationalist armies in southern Manchuria. And if in guarding their own supply line the marines also are guarding that of the Chinese Nationalists, it is put down officially as a coincidence.

At the important port of Tsingtao, on the Shantung Peninsula, United States marines are helping Chinese Nationalists occupy the town ostensibly to demobilize some 7,000 Japanese troops. If in the process of fulfilling this task the marines, in effect, are helping to prevent Chinese Communists from capturing the city and its vital network of heavy industries, that, too, is something officially "unexpected."

A similar situation prevails in the case of the Seventh Fleet, which landed marines in China last month and which also recently landed Chinese Nationalist troops at points in the Liaotung Gulf. The official reason for the presence of the Seventh Fleet is to implement the Japanese surrender and repatriation. If in the process the fleet units land Chinese Nationalist troops where they can outflank or attack Chinese Communist forces, that is something which did not appear on official operational plans.

PURPOSE VEILED

It does not take an observer here long to realize that United States forces are actively aiding the Chinese Nationalists more than they are demobilizing the Japanese. The actual sentiments of American military authorities here, moreover, were no more clearly indicated than over the past week end when Vice Admiral Daniel E. Barbey, new Commander of the United States Seventh Fleet, visited Gen. Tu Yuming, Commander of Chinese Nationalist armies in southern Manchuria.

The visit had very little to do with the question of getting the Japanese out of China. It was simply that the United States unofficially is very much interested in the progress of the Nationalist armies, and Admiral Barbey happens to be one of the most competent and most impartial observers in the China area.

Regardless of what these sentiments may be, the fact remains that American military commanders—unsupported by any clear definition of American policy toward China—seem for 1 to play a sort of politico-military subterfuge.

It leaves such men as Admiral Barbey and Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer at a distinct disadvantage, both in the field and at home where their role is not understood.

The situation which confronts them here is roughly this:

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist armies just are not strong enough to do the job they are attempting. The Thirteenth and Fifty-second Nationalist Armies here are part of the Twentieth Division trained and equipped by Americans during the war. But they still lack equipment and they fail to exercise sufficient military control to guard their own lines of communications.

Their supply lines into north China and Manchuria already are overextended, and as the advance continues, they become even more tenuous and open to sabotage. This leaves the Chinese Nationalists in the position of being unable to carry any weight as a potential or actual military power in north China. And at the same time it deprives them of the advantage of the military power with which to back up political negotiations with Communists at Chungking.

Putting it simply, Chinese Nationalist armies just do not have what it takes to establish their control over China's vast reaches. Even what de facto support is being lent by the presence of American land and sea forces there is not enough to establish this control.

The urgent question, therefore, which hangs over this bleak corner of the world is whether the United States intends to quit China entirely or openly give the Nationalists enough support to force some sort of decision. Unless this question is decided soon, the situation here could deteriorate to a point of threatening the peace in the entire Far East.

Greater aid to Chinese Nationalists does not necessarily spell taking sides incontrovertibly against the Chinese Communists here. Some quarters here, including most capable observers, point out that the first step would be to give China some of the military supplies which presently are rotting in supply dumps in New Guinea and the Philippines. These supplies could be regulated in such a fashion as to give the Nationalists just enough support to force a compromise with the Communists but not enough to give the Nationalists an overwhelming upper hand.

Such a compromise might result in a sort of loose position with the Communists controlling certain provinces but paying allegiance to the Central Government. But even that much of a compromise, it is pointed out, might be preferable to having China rent asunder by civil war as would undoubtedly be the case if the country should be left to its own devices.

Does this policy of armed intervention in China win friends for the United States in China? I do not think it does. I think that it wins enemies there; and what is the good of a foreign policy that brings us enemies when we intend them to be friends? The Chinese liberals charge that General Wedemeyer—and these are the liberals, not the Communists or the Comintern people—in their magazine, *Democracy*, volume 2, No. 9, September 6, 1945, say:

It is fortunate that Lieutenant General Wedemeyer is not fond of making statements to the public because when he does make public statements they often arouse anxiety and uneasiness. This is because what he does, as well as what he says, closely affects the interests of the Chinese people, and if we are to judge from his careless and irresponsible attitude when he does talk, it seems to us that General Wedemeyer has never realized the influential position that he holds on China today.

As Chinese citizens maintaining an equally impartial attitude toward the Kuomintang, the Communist Party, and the Democratic League we wish to ask General Wedemeyer

and other American political and military officials in China not to jeopardize the lasting friendship between the United States of America and China.

As to our landings in north China, let us see what the five Democratic League Parties in China had to say. In a national congress held in Chungking in October they formulated a platform which was most critical of our intervention and warned Chiang not to depend "on a certain foreign power for temporary comfort."

These are not the 100,000,000 people whom we help to suppress in north China, these are people over which Chiang already maintains his rule—the liberals and democratic groups in Chungking, China.

To offer further proof, I turn again to the Herald Tribune and to that Communist-fed news service, the Associated Press, which reported:

UNITED STATES LANDINGS IN NORTH CHINA

CHUNGKING, October 1.—A Chinese political middle-ground spokesman said today he fears that United States marine landings in north China may "complicate the internal problems of China" at a time when the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists are trying to work out details for a single Chinese Government.

Dr. Lo Lung-chi, one of the leaders of the China Democratic League, said that central government troops would follow the marines to Tientsin and Peiping and possibly clash with Communist troops stationed outside those cities.

Dr. Lo said that "we welcome American help in disarming the Japanese but we hope it does not complicate the internal situation."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the policy of Hurley in China does not win friends and cannot win them no matter how the gentlewoman from Connecticut tortures our foreign policy. She tortures it as does General Hurley. To believe them would be to believe that Hoover and Roosevelt were counterparts and that despite all the proof I have here offered to this House—proof of General Hurley's perfidy and lack of candor—proof that he carried out not a policy of diplomacy but a policy of diplomacy; that despite all this proof, Hurley was really in China trying to unite that unhappy land by saying to Chiang Kai-shek that if he rid himself of all who did not agree with him, the United States would back him to the hilt.

I am not accusing the gentlewoman of lack of candor. At least for her part, she believes and says she believes in intervention—armed intervention, since no other interpretation can be put upon that word in view of recent circumstances. She believes in United States troops and supplies and equipment being utilized in China to put down the people's demand for democracy and for simple reforms.

From all General Hurley has said—and he has bespoke himself at great length and with what he calls much "emphasis"—and from the statements of his great admirer and defender, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, one can draw but a single conclusion. They do not believe in democracy in China. They do not agree that the United States should seek by peaceful means to unite that great

land across the Pacific under a coalition government. Such a policy of bringing democracy to other nations is sound for our former enemies. The people of these lands can have democracy, but we would deny it to our friends. We will not help give it to China's people.

There is the nub of the difference between the armed interventionists and those who beg for peace and democracy, between the gentlewoman from Connecticut and myself, between General Hurley and the late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Roosevelt advocated until his death a policy which would bring into a united coalition the forces of Chiang and the liberal elements within Chiang's own party—now virtual prisoners of Chiang; the five Democratic League Parties of China, now outlawed by Chiang; the Communist Party of China, now the victims of armed onslaught; and the non-party groups in China—whose very right to speak their minds is now oppressed by Chiang.

This is not a dispute in China between Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists. This, as Roosevelt saw it, is a dispute between Chiang and every other group in China. Only through a coalition can democracy be assured in China, for only such a coalition government can offer the people of China a free election. Chiang promises an election to China only after he has suppressed all opposition. That is the policy of a Hitler.

Whether or not Hurley saw to what end his own private policy—or, if you prefer, his own private method of distorting the policy of Roosevelt; whether or not he saw to what end that would carry him I do not know.

But for the gentlewoman from Connecticut to attempt to wrap the cloak of Roosevelt around General Hurley and thus protect him, is to distort history and to attempt to destroy the memory of one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever known.

I humbly suggest a course to the gentlewoman. Whether or not she agrees with me or with a single one of the authorities I have quoted here today; and whether or not she does sincerely believe that there is a Communist conspiracy so broad it engulfs the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, the Chicago Daily News, the St. Louis Star-Times, and even Time and Life and Fortune; whether or not she believes that General Hurley and President Roosevelt were twins; that regardless of these differences, I believe she owes it to the position she now takes to stand up in her own committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and demand a hearing on the resolution which six Members of this House introduced when I first took the floor here on China.

If she is so sure of her ground, then let us present our evidence; let us have our day in court. Let us hear not alone from General Hurley, but let the story of China be told by those who know it well—by General Stilwell and by former Ambassador Gauss, by correspondents who are begging now to tell the story of what they saw and what they know—of China, of businessmen recently returned from across the Pacific.

Let us hear from those who know. I confess my own knowledge of the present situation in China is not original. I point to the sources. Let the gentlewoman do the same.

The people of this Nation are entitled to have this debate raised from the level of name calling to the level of intelligent presentation of the facts.

If she is as sure of her ground as I, she will not hesitate a moment to accept my challenge to use her influence which is so great upon the colleagues of her own party in her own committee to see that a full and public hearing be given this question on House Resolution 408.

The people of this Nation are entitled to the facts.

When they learn them, they will little care what the gentlewoman from Connecticut thinks of me or my opinions, nor what I think of her.

For when the American people are given the truth—which it is within the power of the gentlewoman as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to help bring out—when the people know the facts, I have no doubt they will insist on a return to the policies of peace across the Pacific, of democracy in China.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

INCLUSION OF ELECTIVE OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES AND HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS IN THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 452, Rept. No. 1344), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately 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. 4199) to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same 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.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN CHINA—THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND CHINA

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of General Hurley, as sensational as his resignation in protest against pro-Communist intrigue in the State Department, is letting some light into the dark corners of our wartime diplomacy, but we have yet to discover from that testimony the extent of the pressure put upon the generalissimo by the Roosevelt administration to conclude the Russo-Chinese treaty, signed on August 14, which gave Russia a naval base at Port Arthur and joint control over the South Manchurian Railway, and other concessions. But if such pressure was put, let those who now cry so vehemently against American intervention in Chinese domestic affairs by this administration deny that that pressure was also intervention by a previous one.

But it seems to me it is unrealistic to talk of intervention or nonintervention in this one world, in which the United States of America is the leading power. Whether we fail to exert diplomatic pressure, or whether we exert it, we are still intervening. For example, our failure to intervene in Spain in effect supports Franco. Our failure to intervene in support of Chiang Kai-shek now would support, in effect, the Chinese Communists and encourage civil war in China.

Now, all of the points just made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] concerning the so-called abandonment by General Hurley of the Roosevelt policy in China were fully met and answered this afternoon by Secretary of State Byrnes in a statement which he read before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary Byrnes said:

To achieve this longer-range goal (of a strong, united, and democratic China) it is essential that the Central Government of China as well as the various dissident elements approach the settlement of their differences with a genuine willingness to compromise. We believe, as we have long believed and consistently demonstrated, that the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek affords the most satisfactory base for a developing democracy.

He then went on to add:

If I understand correctly what Ambassador Hurley has stated to me, and subsequently to the press and to this committee, he entertains no disagreement with this conception of our policy. Moreover, he has indicated to me and to this committee that he has been unflinchingly supported by two Presidents and three Secretaries of State in his effort to execute this policy.

The able gentleman [Mr. DE LACY] will now have to transfer his attack on Ambassador Hurley to Secretary Byrnes, the previous Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, and the late President who, according to Secretary Byrnes' understanding, all supported and were supported by Mr. Hurley in a commonly held policy in China.

The question is not should we intervene or should we not intervene anywhere in the world, since our great diplomatic power and weight are bound to be heavily exercised, whether as withdrawal or as intercession. The question before us in the Far East, as in all quarters of the globe, is: In whose interest should we intervene? I have no difficulty answering that question for myself. I do not believe that many other Members of this House have any difficulty in answering it either. Our intervention must always be in America's interest and in the interest of a peaceful world.

I do not question the right of the gentleman from Washington to define America's interests as he claims to see America's interest, on the floor of this House. I will defend his right to do so to the death, but I am equally within my rights in saying that I think that his policies, if put into effect, would not result in any benefit to this Nation, nor in the extension of freedom and the preservation of peace throughout the world.

I deeply mistrust his point of view on all foreign affairs for one reason which to me seems sufficient. The gentleman from Washington is beloved, long beloved, and deeply cherished by the Communist Party of America; and the Communist Party of America, like the Communist Party in every nation in the world, is a house organ, an extension, an adjunct, a tool of the foreign policy of the Kremlin. This is a fact that no politically astute man disputes.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Daily Worker of December 2. Its headline reads:

Protests forcing show-down on intervention in China. Representative DE LACY speaks up for an aroused nation.

The rest is a panegyric to the gentleman from Washington's attack on this administration's policy of supporting our ally, China, and its established government in order to encompass the complete surrender of Japanese troops, and to restore the territorial integrity of China.

That headline in the Daily Worker which suggests that the gentleman from Washington is leading an aroused America to a contrary point of view to that of Secretary Byrnes and the President is rather overly optimistic, as matters are developing before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Now, one embrace from the Daily Worker does not necessarily make any Member of this House or any citizen of our Nation a Communist. Not even two or three such embraces will succeed in making Communists of Mark Childs, the editors of the Washington Post, the Christian Science Monitor, nor, I dare to hope, the Herald Tribune. There are very few public-opinion molders who, while advocating some policy that was currently being advocated by the Kremlin, have not felt themselves momentarily suffocated by the hot, moist, eager, humiliating embrace of the Daily Worker. But when there has been a long-time, tender, mutual embrace between the Communist Party and any citizen of our Nation from the time of Munich until now, we may be pardoned for reaching the conclusion that that citizen is, to

put it mildly, attracted, if not wedded, to the Communist Party.

Every elected officeholder's public political record is open, or should be, at all times to the public for review. The able and courteous gentleman has made some glancing and facetious references to my own political record, by mentioning what he labeled my Hooverism, and the Socialist support he claims that I have found in the city of Bridgeport.

Now, since he has seen fit to comment on my political record and to mention where he thinks I derive my electoral and popular support, it is pardonable for me to do likewise. So let us review the political record of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] admitting that as the architect of it, he may have built it with the greatest faith, with the utmost zealously, in the belief that some of the ways or perhaps all of the ways of the Soviet Union are good ways for the United States of America. I give this record, I assure you, for no other reason than to lend his persuasive and able arguments the weight they may deserve and in order that due consideration in the future may be given to the ideas of the gentleman [Mr. DE LACY] on the subject of American foreign policy. If the word "communism" appears with rather monotonous frequency in that record, it has appeared with equal frequency in the gentleman's previous remarks this afternoon.

In 1938 the gentleman from Washington was president of the Washington Commonwealth Federation, was vice president of the American Federation of Teachers at the time the federation was headed by Jerome Davis, a leading pro-Communist. At that time, 1938, Doney A. Wilkerson of Howard University—Negro—was also a vice president of the federation. Later—in 1944—Wilkerson was head of the Communist Political Association in the District of Columbia and Maryland.

The gentleman from Washington protested the barring of the Communist Party from the ballot in the State of Washington—Sunday Worker, October 13, 1940. He was a signer of an appeal to dismiss the charges against the Russian-born Communist of long standing, Sam Dardeck, alias Sam Darcy, who was an official of the Communist Party in California and Pennsylvania. At one time, Darcy was head of the eastern Pennsylvania section of the party—Daily Worker, December 19, 1940, page 5. In 1941 the gentleman was a member of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, west coast Australian Communist and CIO organizer, who was ordered deported by the Federal Government as a result of his radical activities.

The gentleman was chairman of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born. According to the testimony of the late Anna Damon, for years and until her recent death the national secretary of the International Labor Defense—Communist—the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born is an affiliate of the ILLD, the legal arm of the Communist Party.

In April 1941, the gentleman signed the call for the American people's meeting which resulted in the organization

of the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House during the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact—1939-41.

The gentleman was an endorser of the International Workers' Order—Communist—plan for plenty—Daily Worker, January 20, 1941, page 3. He was a signer of the statement issued by the Committee for Citizenship Rights in Defense of William Schneiderman in 1941. Schneiderman was head of the Communist Party in California. The gentleman was a member of the executive board of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in 1942, which Attorney General Biddle classified as a Communist front. The gentleman also signed an open letter to President Roosevelt in behalf of Harry Bridges, 1942. This letter was sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

In 1943, the gentleman was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, successor to the Friends of the Soviet Union, which was declared a Communist movement in the final opinion of Judge Sears of the Department of Justice in the Bridges case.

The gentleman was elected to the City Council of Seattle in 1937 on the Commonwealth Federation ticket. He was defeated by over 20,000 votes in the 1940 Seattle elections. He was supported by the Young Communist League—see YCI Year Book for 1937, page 5.

The gentleman was a signer of a letter condemning the war powers bill—Daily Worker, February 18, 1941. He sent a telegram to the ILLD dinner in 1942—Daily Worker, October 11, 1942, page 3.

In 1941, the gentleman was a member of the Schappes' defense committee. Schappes was a Communist professor in New York, admittedly a member of the Communist Party for 7 years. He was convicted and served part of a prison sentence for perjury in testifying before the Coudert-Rapp committee.

As president of the Washington Commonwealth Federation in 1940, the gentleman signed a paid advertisement which appeared in leading newspapers throughout the country, headed: "Defeat conscription at the polls today!" In this statement, the federation, which was devoting all its energies to fighting war and conscription, deplored "the shocking surrender of Congressman Mon C. Wallgren, a candidate for the United States Senate, and Charles H. Leavy, now seeking reelection, who cast their votes last Saturday for conscription and the military dictatorship."

In another statement which appeared in the newspapers in 1940, the gentleman said in part:

The WCF urges the defeat of all who voted for or who advocate conscripting Americans for military service in foreign lands.

The gentleman was ousted from the faculty of the University of Washington in 1937 as a result of his political activity. His activities were vociferously defended by all the Communists in the State of Washington.

On May 11, 1941, the gentleman, in his position as acting national chairman of the American Committee for the Protec-

tion of Foreign Born, sent a letter of protest to Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, charging that the arrest of German and Italian seamen who had overstayed their leave in this country promoted war hysteria and incited unjustified suspicion against foreign-born residents. He declared unalterable opposition to the passage of a law which would result in the establishment of concentration camps in the United States, and he said that the arrests were "carried out with a view to influencing the actions of the United States Congress and attempting to pressure Congress into immediate enactment of a concentration camp bill."

The Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, of which the gentleman was a member, was organized in 1941.

The Washington Commonwealth Federation and the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, both of which were headed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY], issued a broadside on April 19, 1941, attacking the Department of Justice for the arrest and detention of Ernest Fox, a German Communist Party member who was organizer for the CIO in the State of Washington in 1937 and organizer of Local 7 and the Alaska local of UCAPAW, CIO.

The gentleman was a member of the Working Conference for Peace, American Peace Mobilization. Their slogans were: Get Out and Stay Out of World War II, Fight Every Step of War, Regain and Strengthen Our Democracy, and Defend the Rights of Labor.

The gentleman is a member of the national Committee of International Labor Defense—Communist. The I.L.D. defended the Oklahoma Communist Party leaders who were indicted for sedition in 1942.

The International Labor Defense, of which the gentleman is a member, is the American section of the International Red Aid, of Moscow, according to its own constitution. Its purpose is to advance the cause of communism, to defend Communists against imprisonment and deportation, to give them legal aid and pay their court expenses, to aid their families if they are imprisoned, and to carry on organized agitation against their conviction or deportation and for their release. The I.L.D. has fought the enactment of sedition laws, the registration of foreign agents and anti-Communist legislation.

The American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born has a program similar to that of the I.L.D. of which it is an affiliate. Its national president is Stanley Novak, of Detroit, an alien-born Communist, arrested and indicted for perjury by the Department of Justice in connection with withholding information regarding his membership in the Communist Party when he took his citizenship oath. At the present time Novak is also Michigan chairman of the International Workers' Order, another avowed Communist movement. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] was national chairman of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born from 1941 through 1943.

The Daily Worker of March 31, 1941, page 4, contained a picture of the gentleman from Washington with an accom-

panying article dealing with his election as president of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

These references will establish the fact that the gentleman [Mr. DE LACY] has, to put it gently, a definite Communist bias. I repeat, I do not challenge his right to continue these connections and zealously to follow the philosophy of government dictated by them. But it is against the background of such a predisposition to communism, which seems somewhat stronger than a mere idle flirtation with leftist ideology, that we must all view all the gentleman's remarks on democracy in China, examine his predilection for the Chinese Communists, and evaluate his passionate desire to see that American foreign policy is formed according to the interests of China's armed Communist Party.

Now, the gentleman has implied, as though it were to be held somehow against me, that I am subject to the influence of my husband. I do not dispute it. I am proud of it.

We enjoy the fullest exchange of ideas and opinions on political subjects, and the mutual confidence natural to husband and wife. In no subject are we in greater accord than on China. The gentleman also seems to feel that I should consider myself soundly ticked off and smeared by being called an exponent of Hooverism. I have no idea what he may mean by Hooverism as applied to my record of conviction in foreign policy. But I would like to take this opportunity, late in the evening though it is, and asking the indulgence of the patient Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, to restate, once again, the few simple tenets of foreign policy to which I have—I hope—as consistently adhered since 1939 as the gentleman has adhered to his communism.

I believed in 1938 and 1939, and I believe now, that fascism must be scotched, uprooted, and destroyed, everywhere in this world, north, east, south, and west, in all continents and in both hemispheres. I still believe in the Atlantic Charter, and I would fain keep all the sorely betrayed promises which that Charter made to the Poles and the people of Central Europe and the Balkans.

I believe that India should have her independence; and that we should do all in our diplomatic power to exert pressure upon our allies to see that there is a far greater measure of self-government in Indonesia. For at home and abroad, among nations, and among citizens, I am zealously set against racial discrimination, and "white superiority."

I believe in protection and sanctuary for all the non-Fascist stateless people of Europe who have no country of their own, or who are afraid, for their very lives, to return to the country they have, lest they be persecuted, sent to concentration camps, or murdered for their political convictions.

I believe in housing and feeding and clothing all the starving peoples of Europe, the Germans who are innocent of war crimes included.

I believe that to the utmost of our ability as a Nation to finance such a program, we should succor all starving and suffering people.

I believe that this country should seek world disarmament, using wherever possible in this matter, and in all international matters, the United Nations Organization.

Above all, I believe in freedom of the ballot, freedom of speech, and freedom of worship in all lands. Let those who will worship the god of materialism. Let those who will bow the knee before that soulless leviathan, the omniscent, omnipotent, omniverous state. I believe that the source and condition of American power is what it has been since the foundation of our Nation—our ancient trust in God.

Mr. Speaker, forgive this slight diversion, for I wish to speak about a resolution which I introduced on November 20. I did so for my own peace and my clarity of mind, and not until today have I called it to the attention of any Member of this House. But, somehow, today it seems germane to the subtle, unnamed dispute between me and the gentleman from Washington, and of all men of a like-minded philosophy. It is germane to that dispute because it touches on a fundamental divergence between the philosophy to which the vast majority of the Members of this House owe devout allegiance, and the philosophy of communism—at home, abroad, anywhere.

House Joint Resolution 277

Joint resolution concerning the source and condition of American power

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby reaffirms the faith of its founding fathers to the people of the United States, to all other governments, nations, and peoples, namely: That the inalienable rights of man, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and his birth in equality, are the endowment not of governments or men, but of the Creator: Wherefore, our Government, relying on the divine protection of Providence, shall continue to seek all national and international solutions in the belief that the only proper guide and sanction for the laws and actions of men are the laws and authority of God.

That sentence, gentlemen, lest any think it too mystic or remote from the historic political traditions of our beloved country, is a paraphrase of the opening and closing sentences of the Declaration of Independence; for the founding fathers had no such doubts concerning whence comes the light of freedom as afflicts many a man today, including the gentleman from Washington.

In passing, may I say that this resolution on the authority of God over our Government was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This perplexing circumstance leads me to add to my political credo that I do not believe that God should be a foreigner to our shores, nor to the shores and valleys, mountains, or rivers of any nation on this earth. For where God is a foreigner, where He is exiled from the shores of any nation, then His handmaidens Stern Truth, Clear Conscience, and Sweet Liberty go into exile with Him. No ideology which does not believe in freedom under law and law under God offers any hope to the Members of this House, nor can the adherents of a materialistic and godless

ideology sell us or this Nation on the worth of their foreign policy, whether it be for China or Timbuktu.

Now, if this be socialism, if this be Hooverism, if this be reactionarism, or if this is imperialism, then the gentleman from Washington will have to make the most of it.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ARE WE SAFEGUARDING OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that is clearly demonstrated by the current Pearl Harbor investigation, it is that we have been woefully lacking in safeguarding our national security through the establishment of adequate intelligence services.

We were caught off base in the days of demolition and incendiary bombs and for that mistake we paid a heavy penalty in human life and costly matériel. Already these weapons, it seems, have become outmoded by the atomic bomb, which scientists assure us will soon be universally available. Therefore, in the future an assault upon nations will take only a matter of minutes, and its effects promise to be far more devastating than Pearl Harbor.

Common sense and reasonable foresight demand the perfection of our intelligence agencies in proportion to the advances made by modern science in the field of destruction.

What are we actually doing about it? Instead of strengthening the functions of government, we are undermining and destroying the inadequate agencies that we have. We are sapping the morale of thousands of men and women trained in the special art of detecting subversive activity. We have rendered these agencies futile in the face of danger far more serious than any in our country's history.

To say that all nations are desirous of peace and friendship with us, if only we would mend the evil of our ways, and that the millenium has arrived through the portals of the United Nations Organization, is only soothing sirup.

Picketing of the State Department, slanderous attacks upon American representatives in our armed forces and diplomatic services, contemptuous disregard of diplomatic notes, political strikes on land and sea, conducted by individuals obviously sympathetic with a foreign ideology of government, both at home and abroad, are not symbols of peace but of undeclared war.

Have we fallen so low in our national self-respect that we dare not exercise the firmness and courage to set our own house in order?

On October 10, in addressing this House, I called attention to the fact that six individuals, some of them important officials of the State Department, had been indicted by our efficient and systematic Federal Bureau of Investigation for purloining certain secret and highly confidential documents of our Government.

I called attention to the fact that, for some unexplained reason, these cases had been disposed of lightly, perhaps through some influence not yet made known.

Subsequently, on November 28, last week, I called the attention of the House to the fact that among these documents were important items involving this Nation's very security, which were apparently made available to agents of a foreign power, and that the purpose of these transactions was inimical to the established policies of the American Government.

I introduced a resolution asking that a searching investigation be made of these cases. Beyond that, nothing has been done, to my knowledge, to remedy this situation, and conditions are going from bad to worse.

Gen. Otto Nelson, who was chiefly responsible for an order to all Army theaters of war to destroy all subversive files, and whose record with our military intelligence service is far below par, has been appointed to reorganize similar services in the State Department.

Associated with him in this effort is Col. Alfred McCormack, whose record is equally dubious, and who was foremost in the effort to commission Communists in the armed forces of the United States. These Communist officers are now attacking the policies of the American Government.

As a vicious climax comes the news, published in the New York Journal-American of December 3, 1945, that the FBI has for 2 years been trailing a Russian secret-service agent who entered our country illegally and is here under a false passport, actively engaged in securing through numerous other undercover agents confidential data regarding the atomic bomb.

Hundreds of FBI agents have been engaged in this exciting chase, which has covered a continent, and yet our splendid FBI appears stymied and powerless to bring this man and his accomplices before the bar of justice.

I am placing this account in the RECORD to show the futility of the efforts of our intelligence agencies in dealing with those people who are undermining and who intend to destroy our Government.

There has been in this country for a number of years a notorious Comintern agent named Gerhard Eisler, alias Hansberger, who has been openly and actively engaged in attacking General MacArthur, General Patton, and the foreign policy of the United States. He is permitted to carry on his activities unmo-
lested.

There is at the present time a case before the United States Supreme Court, in which the United Federal Workers of America, a Communist controlled union, is seeking to invalidate the Hatch Act, which bars Communists from Federal employment. Strangely enough, the Department of Justice has selected none other than Ralph F. Fuchs, a well-known left-wing attorney, to defend our Government's position.

I respectfully suggest that the House Committee on Military Affairs call in Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, our efficient chief of the FBI, to tell the country frankly and openly the threat facing our national security from Communist agents who are running fast and loose, to what extent his efforts have been frustrated, if any, by other agencies, and what remedial measures he would recommend.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; and

S. J. Res. 110. A joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code; and sections 361, 265, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will have an executive meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings to begin at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 4779) to enable debtor railroad corporations whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

855. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

856. A letter from the Surplus Property Administrator, transmitting a report on magnesium plants; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

857. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1944; the number of pieces procured; the estimated mailings; the balance on hand June 30, 1945; and the estimated cost, by departments and agencies, for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4199. A bill to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 452. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4199 to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4921. A bill to amend the Employees Pay Act of 1945 to provide for payment of twice the regular basic rate of compensation for work performed on holidays; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4922. A bill to incorporate the American Field Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 4927. A bill to promote the safety of railroad employees and travelers on railroads, and to promote efficiency of railroad operation by providing for the inspection and investigation of conditions under which train-dispatching service may be performed, and for the promulgation of rules and regulations governing such conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4928. A bill to extend the servicemen's free mailing privilege to include air mail and to provide for the free issuance to servicemen of postal money orders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4929. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for more nearly equalizing public elementary and public secondary school opportunities among and within the States and Territories; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4930. A bill to provide for a Department of National Defense, Secretary of National Defense, Under Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 285. Joint Resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that election day be observed as a legal holiday in every State of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. Res. 450. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to conduct an investigation to ascertain the amount of surplus Government building material suitable for the construction and repair of dwellings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Res. 451. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the disposition, in foreign countries, of property under the jurisdiction of the armed forces; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JAMES J. DELANEY:

H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Theresa Nespole; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 4925. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Maj. Fred S. Poorman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4926. A bill for the relief of the estates of Mary Louise Laine, Joan C. Laine, Constance Laine, Arline Laine, and of the legal guardian of Rita Laine, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1386. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 95 citizens living at or near New Wilmington, Pa., protesting against any action on the part of Congress to establish a system of compulsory military training for the young men and boys of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1387. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis., urging the immediate passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1388. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lucile Barry, Omaha, Nebr., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to abolishing the Rankin House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

1389. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Civic Association of Ensenada, Guanica, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the message of the President of the United States on the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

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

Rev. Ralph C. John, S. T. M., assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou before whose throne of omnipotence the pageant of history is enacted, in these days of momentous decision, we entreat Thy presence with a new realization of dependence upon divine guidance. The vision of Thy Kingdom is ever before us; Thou hast quickened our minds to envisage a world founded upon truth and lighted by love. With an earnestness whose companion is humility, we pray that Thou wilt bring to submission our wills that we may enter the land of everlasting promise in sensitiveness to imperishable values, as these have been made manifest in the life and ministry of Jesus Christ our Lord. Make us judicious in the affairs of state, that our beloved land may commend itself in the council of nations. In personal life we would be irreproachable before Thee and before those who have entrusted their sacred destiny to our keeping.

We rejoice and are grateful that these mercies we may know under the ministry of Thy Spirit. Hear us in the blessed Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 7, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 7, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; and