

780
Vol. 1

The United States Senate

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Committee on Finance

WORLD WAR PENSIONS

ORIGINAL

November 28, 1944

Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL

NATIONAL { 4266
4267
4268

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
1762 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

C O N T E N T S

<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
SULLIVAN, Francis M. National Legislative Director, American Legion	3
ODOM, Edward E. Solicitor, Veterans Administration	5
RICE, Millard W. National Service Director, Disabled American Veterans	40

- - - - -

Attig
AJF

WORLD WAR PENSIONS

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1944

United States Senate,
Committee on Finance,
Washington, D. C.

The Committee met in executive session at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to call, in room 310 Senate Office Building, Hon. Walter F. George, Chairman, presiding.

Present: Senators George (Chairman), Walsh, Connally, Clark, Guffey, La Follette, Davis, Taft, and Butler.

The Chairman. The committee will come to order.

We shall be very glad to hear from Mr. Odom. First of all, Mr. Odom, I suppose you have heard from the veterans' organizations, or have you discussed this matter with the organizations?

Mr. Odom. Only informally, sir, and I am not in a position to speak for them.

The Chairman. We have heard from three or four.

Mr. Odom. Yes. Their representatives, I believe, are in the anteroom now, in case you should desire to call them.

The Chairman. Well, perhaps the quickest way is to get their views, so let us call them. Would you want to wait until we call them?

Mr. Odom. Of course, contingent upon the desire of the committee, I think it would be very desirable, from my

standpoint, if they were here.

The Chairman. To have them come in and testify before you testify? Would you want to wait?

Mr. Odom. No, sir; I would just as soon go ahead. I should like to have them hear what I have to say, if that is agreeable to the committee.

The Chairman. Oh, yes; that is quite agreeable. We have a written statement here in each instance -- that is, from the larger organizations.

Senator Walsh. Do the veterans' organizations agree that the so-called Hines bill is better than the House bill on the whole, if you know?

Mr. Odom. I think so, Senator, although, as I say, I have talked only informally with them, and I am not in a position to commit them.

The Chairman. They do as a whole. One of the organizations raises a question of the advisability of loading down the rolls. They point out the old economy legislation and say that they have some misapprehension.

(Representatives of veterans' organizations entered the committee room.)

The Chairman. Gentlemen, please be seated. We want to go into these bills as rapidly and as informally as possible.

Senator Walsh. Mr. Chairman, if the veterans' organizations indicate that they prefer the so-called Hines bill to

the House bill, could we not limit the hearing to the differences that are in the Hines bill?

The Chairman. I think so.

I notice Mr. Sullivan is present. We have your letter, but perhaps you can briefly state your position without going into detail at this time.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director,
American Legion

Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the American Legion approves H. R. 1744 amended to include any necessary administrative or penal clauses. I think that that, in brief, would start it off.

We object to the definition of "widow" in here; rather, we do not like the definition of "widow" in section 3, and we object to section 6, which reveals the benefits to World War II veterans in the Veterans Administration substitute.

The Chairman. I see. Now, are there representatives from the other organizations?

Mr. Sullivan. We three are from the legislative division. This is Mr. Crowley, and this is Mr. Stevens.

The Chairman. Are there no other organizations represented here?

Mr. Sullivan. No. I understand that Mr. Ketchum, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, is out of town.

The Chairman. He has sent a letter.

4

Senator Walsh. Have you conferred together?

Mr. Sullivan. No, sir. I tried to get in touch with Mr. Ketchum, but I was advised that he is out of town and will not be back until Monday.

The Chairman. You have furnished us with a memorandum or a letter?

Mr. Sullivan. Yes, sir.

Senator Walsh. I take it that the three organizations would prefer the committee to report out the Hines bill with the changes you would like to have made rather than the House-approved bill?

Mr. Sullivan. No, Senator Walsh; we would prefer the House bill amended to include any necessary penal or administrative clauses that they might suggest.

Senator Guffey. Do you prefer the compensation provided in the House bill to that proposed in the Hines bill?

Mr. Sullivan. We do not prefer it, but those were the rates in effect when the bill was reported from the House, and there is a difference between the rates for service connection which H. R. 1744 provides and the compensation paid to a service-connected veteran who dies of a service-connected cause as provided under Public 484 as amended. We think they are two different types.

The Chairman. I shall read from these letters that have been received by the committee. This need not be included in

the record.

(The Chairman read from letters of Mr. Ketchum, Mr. Haley and Mr. Rice.)

Senator Connally. May I ask what is the date of the marriage in the bill?

The Chairman. Senator Connally, I should think we might proceed now with Mr. Odom, and you may ask him that question, sir.

Senator Connally. All right.

Mr. Odom. Do you want me to answer that?

Senator Connally. Go ahead in your own way.

Mr. Odom. Thank you, Senator Connally.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD E. ODOM,
Solicitor,
Veterans Administration.

Mr. Odom. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: This, of course, is the pension bill for World War I. Heretofore there have been many pension bills proposed and introduced to provide for pensions for World War I widows and children.

To perhaps forestall action on an outright pension bill, and for other reasons, of course, Congress enacted legislation beginning several years ago, prescribing certain pension rates for widows and children of deceased World War veterans whose death was not due to service disability but who had at the time of death a service disability, the first enactment requiring a 30-percent service-connected disability at the time of death.

That was reduced to 20 percent, then to 10 percent, and at the present time it is no percent; or putting it another way, if there be any disability whatsoever due to service in the World War which, if it were of degree sufficient to be rated, would be rated at 10 percent, it entitles the widow and children to a pension.

Now, those provisions are very difficult administratively to apply. H. R. 1744, the bill that passed the House, would be an independent enactment. It would leave those Public 484 provisions in effect, but it would place on top of them a straight pension for a widow or a minor child of any veteran who served in the World War in the prescribed time who was honorably discharged after service of 90 days or more, or if within less than that time was discharged for a line-of-duty disability.

The rates prescribed in H. R. 1744 are lower than the present rates under Public 484 as amended. Those rates, however, were raised -- that is, the Public 484 rates were raised -- during this Congress, as were the regular service-connected pension rates in Public 144, 78th Congress, in line with the 15-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation rates.

Now, when we approach this bill -- and incidentally, as it was pending in the House, it was -- the report on the bill H.R. 1744 was -- unfavorable, and the Budget Bureau informed at that

time that it would not be in accordance with the program of the President. It was felt then that the time had not yet arrived for a general pension act for widows and children of World War I, and this committee will recall, I am sure, the tables which General Hines has brought before you, projecting these matters into the future, showing what such bills would cost in the fifties and sixties. It runs into big amounts.

However, it was concluded that probably the time has arrived when a general pension bill should receive consideration, and the Veterans Administration and General Hines approach this from the standpoint of some permanent legislation that would not be requiring patchwork from time to time to make it workable. We felt and we feel, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that because of the tremendous load that has already been placed upon the Veterans Administration, and which will grow, perhaps double or quadruple, in the next three or four years, every step that can be taken toward simplification, not only for the benefit of the Veterans Administration in meeting these problems, but also from the standpoint of the beneficiaries concerned knowing what they may be entitled to is desirable, and we approached this problem from that point of view.

If we had to administer, if we had to adjudicate, every case that is filed with the Veterans Administration under four different acts, as might readily occur if H. R. 1744 were enacted without amending Public 484, that would be a tremendous

5

job, and there is no assurance that mistakes will not be made and that someone would be deprived of benefits to which she or he might otherwise be entitled. So we felt that you might very well go along with us on the desire to enact provisions which would apply to all widows of World War I veterans who die of a non-service-connected disability.

In order to do that, we repeal the provisions of Public 484 and substitute uniform provisions, so that it would not be necessary to inquire what degree of disability any veteran had at the time he died. It would not make any difference whether he had disability or did not have service-connected; the widow and children would get the benefit.

We felt, too, that it was desirable to have only one set of rates. After all, why, because a veteran at the time of his death has a disability of less than one percent due to service, should his wife receive more money, looking at it from the standpoint of practicality, than the widow of a veteran who never has been able to show that he has one percent or any percent of service disability, but who may well have without having been able to prove it? We feel that the rates, not only for administrative reasons but in simple justice, ought to be the same.

It so happens that these rates are a little higher than the bill which the House passed provides and will cost a little more money, but we feel that not only are these rates

justifiable in these days, and probably in the post-war conditions, considering the cost of living, and everything of that sort, but they are highly desirable administratively and will save the Government money in the adjudication of cases.

We feel also that there is no need of carrying forward those technical and highly difficult provisions of Public 484, which has been amended three or four different times, because the people concerned are at a loss to know whether they come under one act or another; and our adjudicators -- many of them are new and have to be indoctrinated and trained -- find it an almost impossible task to apply all of these very complex situations. A simple bill like this, which would place them all on the same basis, would enable quicker adjudication and would, in the long run, save money from the administrative point of view.

We do provide saving clauses, so that no one, who has filed a claim and would be entitled to it, under these provisions which are being repealed would lose anything thereby. Their claims can still be adjudicated, and they will be placed on the roll just the same as though that part of the act had not been repealed and supplanted by this.

Now, there would be very few cases of that sort, the difference between the two acts being this: That under the Public 484 system the entitlements were based very largely upon criteria growing out of the World War Veterans Act, and

since it required at least some type of service-connected disability, although it might not be a ratable one, there is no 90-day or other service period stated in the law. Now, in all the pension acts a 90-day period or else discharge for disability within the 90-day period is required, so by substituting a service period requirement for a disability requirement there will be some cases -- very few -- where they could meet the one and could not meet the other. We have taken care of that in this so that no one will lose any benefit by reason of that change in the standard. Those standards, incidentally, are the same as in all the pension acts.

With respect to the objection which was voiced by Mr. Sullivan to the definition of "widow," the Veterans Administration has presented to this and to other committees of the Congress from time to time arguments, if you want to call them that, in favor of uniform provisions with respect to marriage and things of that nature. There already has been enacted with respect to Indian War veterans such a provision, and a bill passed by the Senate yesterday will continue the same provision with respect to Civil War veterans that we have in this section 3.

I think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you will recall that General Hines on more than one occasion in appearing before this committee suggested that as to marriage dates a great deal could be said for a widow who was married to the veteran

at the time of his service. It has never been found possible to adhere to that, so we have recommended, in place of just moving the marriage date up from time to time, as has been the practice in connection with all the wars, that a uniform provision be enacted. As I say, that already is in the law with respect to several of the other wars. It simply is that if a woman was married to the veteran for ten years and there was continuous cohabitation, except for his fault, no fault on her part, she will be entitled. The cut-off date for widows of World War I veterans at the present time is, as I recall it, May 13, 1938. We did bring that up approximately five years, so as to sort of even up as between those who were married and those who are required to be married at least ten years. We even it up as well as we can, although there would be no particular objection to bringing it up to the effective date of this act, should this bill be enacted. We do think, however, that the ten-year rule is a good one.

There are some other provisions in there that are very desirable. For example, there is one that might be considered minor, but we have found, for example, very touching cases, where people are married in sufficient time to come within the statute, but something goes wrong, and they become divorced or separated, and then they remarry subsequent to the statutory date. Well, it is hard, Mr. Chairman, to throw those cases out; but, under the law, we have to do it. We have taken care

of them here by providing that if they married within the statutory time and are married at the time of his death, the widow is entitled.

There are several things of that nature that are contained in this definition in section 3 which will apply to all of the acts administered by the Veterans Administration for World War I benefits service connected as well as pension benefits not service connected. We feel that they are highly desirable and that they will make for uniformity of administration.

We will apply exactly the same rule with respect to such definitions to the case of a widow where the man died of a service-connected disability as we will to the case of a widow of a man whose death was not connected with the service. When you consider the number of cases that are going to be involved in this in the next 25 years -- I should say somewhere between two and three million cases -- it is a very large item. I want to urgently impress that upon you, if I may.

No objection has been taken to any other feature of this, I believe, except section 6, which would repeal section 4 of Public 312 of the present Congress.

Because Public Law 312 -- the bill as it was passed by the Congress -- would extend the Public 484 benefits to widows of World War II veterans dying of non-service-connected disabilities -- I think I may as well say this -- it was seriously considered whether that enactment should not be vetoed. As a

matter of fact, the report showed that it was contrary to the program of the President. However, that bill did a very desirable thing, in that it raised the Public 484 rates in consonance with the increase in rates which had been provided generally for other benefits. It seemed that that was a very desirable thing to have go into effect at the time and that the defect of providing a pension for widows of veterans before the end of the war, and before the Congress could possibly consider what it meant in the long run, could be taken care of at least by consideration given to subsequent legislation, and that is why we suggest in this bill that that particular section be repealed. I do not know whether there has been any cases granted pensions under that provision.

The Chairman. Exactly what is that section?

Mr. Odom. Well, it simply provides that the benefits of Public 484 as amended shall be extended to the widows of veterans of World War II.

The Chairman. Where there is no service-connected disability?

Mr. Odom. It reads:

"The benefits of Public Law Numbered 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, are hereby extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war, as defined in existing law * * * ."

That means that if the veteran of the present war dies of

a non-service-connected disability -- a disability having nothing to do with his service -- but if he has at the time of his death any disability due to service which if rated would amount to 10 percent, then his widow and children will be entitled to benefits.

Well, there will not be so many of them during the first year, of course, or during the next few succeeding years; but it is absolutely impossible at the present time to estimate what it might mean in the long run; and never before in the history of this country has legislation of that sort been enacted prior to the end of the war. Of course, there can always be the first time -- that is appreciated -- but it does not seem that we could very well comprehend its extent.

The Chairman. The repeal of this section 4 would not affect the service-connected case?

Mr. Odom. No, sir; and we should have a saving clause in here, so that anyone who has been put on the roll under it would not be taken off the roll; but it simply would not permit anybody else to be put on until the whole matter could be reexamined by the Congress and it had been determined just what, if any, provisions of that sort should be provided for widows of World War II veterans.

At the present time, as you know, the widows and dependents, including children and dependent parents, of World War II veterans who die in the war of service-connected disabilities

are on absolute parity with the veterans of World War I.

Senator Taft. Let me see if I understand this. Under Public Law 312, if a discharged veteran is run over by an automobile and is killed, and he had at that time a 10-percent disability ---

Mr. Odom. If he had a no percent disability, but which if rated could be rated at 10 percent -- if he had any disability due to service ---

Senator Taft. At that time the widow would get a pension; but if he had none, she would not get a pension?

Mr. Odom. That is right.

Senator Taft. Although he is killed by an automobile.

Mr. Odom. That is the difference between H. R. 1744 and Public 484. Under our bill, we just combine those all into a straight payment, without any requirement of service-connected disability whatsoever.

The other provisions we have put into this bill are desirable from this standpoint, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Public 484 as it was originally enacted was neither a part of the Public No. 2 system of pensions nor of any other system of pensions; it stood by itself. It is very desirable to have as few systems as possible, because, if you do not have, then there are a number of uniform matters that the Congress has passed on from time to time and found desirable. I can mention a few. One is the question of whether an attorney or other

claim agent may charge a fee; and, if so, how much? Others are the guardianship provisions and payments under the guardianship statute, Public 262 as amended. There is also the question of exemption on claims from creditors and exemptions from taxation. There is the question of apportioning pensions and the question of penalties for fraud. All those matters are contained in uniform statutes which the Congress has enacted from time to time and amended from time to time, and they are applicable to all payments under the Public No. 2 system and the World War Veterans Act system as amended. They are not applicable to Public 484 nor to H. R. 1744 unless made so.

This bill, which the Administrator has recommended to you for consideration in lieu of H. R. 1744, would correct all those deficiencies and would make it a part of the Public No. 2 system of pensions, with all those matters applicable, so that you do not have to consider putting in here those various things -- penalties, and everything of that nature.

Unless there would be some questions, Mr. Chairman, I think that is about all that I could say in explanation of the bill.

In General Hines' report, we point out exactly what it will do, and we also point out the estimated cost. The estimated cost of H. R. 1744 would be slightly less than the cost of the bill which we recommend. On page 5 of the report, we estimate that the first-year cost of H. R. 1744 would be

\$31,958,000 -- in round numbers, \$32,000,000. For the bill which the Administrator recommended, the cost would be thirty-seven million dollars plus -- approximately, in round numbers, thirty-seven and one-half million dollars for the first year.

There would be approximately 81,650 widows or dependents of World War I veterans brought onto the rolls under H. R. 1744, and approximately 81,521 under our bill.

We point out on page 6 that in 25 years those costs would increase to an annual estimated amount of \$264,000,000 under H. R. 1744, and approximately \$308,000,000 under the proposed substitute. The difference in the number of cases estimated is 30,000, being ---

Senator Taft. What were those first figures, please?

Mr. Odom. \$264,000,000 under H. R. 1744; \$308,000,000 under the substitute.

Senator Taft. When would that be?

Mr. Odom. In 25 years.

Senator Taft. Twenty-five years from this time?

Mr. Odom. Yes.

The Chairman. It would go up to that at that period, and you estimate that that would be the approximate cost?

Mr. Odom. Yes. The figure of \$264,000,000 under H. R. 1744 does not, of course, take into consideration the cost of providing pensions under Public Law 484 as amended by Public Law 312 for World War II cases. We simply could not figure

that.

So, while these figures show that the proposed bill would cost more than H. R. 1744, if the last section in there, repealing that provision with respect to World War II veterans, is enacted, then, of course, very probably the cost would be less, because we are not able to figure what it would cost to extend, as Public Law 312 did, the provisions of Public Law 484 to World War II cases. Unquestionably no one can say that it would be a very large cost. I suppose one could take the average number of those in the active service and reach some sort of estimate based upon World War I experience. That might not be fair, because we do not know yet whether the proportion of casualties and injuries in World War II is going to be anything like World War I. The chances are that they will be much greater. So all these things would be more or less guesses, I would say.

Senator Taft. In the first place, what is the present attitude of the Budget Bureau toward H. R. 1744 and toward your bill?

Mr. Odom. We have clearance on our bill.

Senator Taft. What was the report on H. R. 1744?

Mr. Odom. It was adverse originally.

Senator Taft. You do not know what it would be if it were put up again?

Mr. Odom. No, sir; I could not say.

Senator Taft. After the election?

Mr. Odom. This was quite a while before.

Senator Taft. There is another question I want to ask.

I am not very familiar with the laws regarding the Regular Army, but what is the status of the widow of a Regular Army officer? I am speaking of a case where a man develops Parkinson's disease after he retires from the Army. While he claimed it went back to his service in World War I, it cannot be proved. Parkinson's disease is a very slow developing disease. It took practically all of his money and left his widow with practically nothing.

Mr. Odom. Under H. R. 1744, if he served in World War I -- I assume he did?

Senator Taft. Yes, he did.

Mr. Odom. Under H. R. 1744, the widow would get \$30; under this bill, she would get \$35.

Senator Taft. What is the general status? There is no general pension for widows of retired Army officers? The reduced pay is not carried on?

Mr. Odom. I want to say this off the record.

The Chairman. Very well. This will be off the record.

(Mr. Odom made a statement which was not recorded.)

Senator Taft. It seems to me, after all, that in private life a veteran can get out, work, and build up an annuity.

Mr. Odom. You are correct; and that matter will receive

attention in due course of time.

Senator Walsh. Would this bill apply to widows of retired officers who did not serve in either World War I or World War II?

Mr. Odom. No, sir, it would not. Anyone who served in the Regular Army can receive a pension only for service connected disability or death in the service.

I have a few amendments, Mr. Chairman, that I should like to bring to your attention, in case there are no more questions.

Senator Clark. Mr. Odom, the Veterans Administration heretofore has uniformly reported against all widows and orphans pensions for the veterans of World War I?

Mr. Odom. That is right.

Senator Clark. In spite of the fact that it has been the established policy of the United States after the lapse of a certain amount of time to have widows and orphans pensions? We had them after the Civil War and after the Spanish-American War, in one case, I think, after 23 years, and in the other case, after 24 years.

Mr. Odom. It usually was some period of time.

Senator Clark. It was around 25 years. It is now 26 years since the First World War. The Veterans Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have uniformly reported, heretofore, against any such measures as that; is not that correct?

Mr. Odom. That is correct.

Senator Clark. So when the pressure got strong enough to make it imminent, the Veterans Administration and the Bureau of the Budget between them -- I do not know which did it ---

Mr. Odom. Give us the blame, if you want to.

Senator Clark. Very well. You went to work and introduced a measure which was simply designed to whittle down the benefits to the widows and orphans of the First World War?

Mr. Odom. No, sir; I do not agree with the Senator.

Senator Clark. Does not General Hines' statement undertake to put the onus on people who are interested in doing justice to the widows and orphans of the veterans of World War I by making it appear that it is going to be at the expense of doing justice to the widows and orphans of World War II?

Mr. Odom. We certainly have no such intention.

Senator Clark. I have great admiration and affection for General Hines, but the impression, it seems to me, that would naturally be made upon the country is that the whole expense of doing justice to the widows and orphans of the veterans of World War I would beat the expense of doing justice to the veterans of World War II. That has not been the experience of this country in the past, I think.

Mr. Odom. No, we have no such intention as that.

Senator Clark. I understand that the estimate of the expense of, not the Veterans Administration substitute bill, but of the original bill, H. R. 1744, which I understand has

not been cleared through the Budget ---

Mr. Odom. H. R. 1744 was not cleared.

Senator Clark (continuing). -- is \$31,958,500 for the first year.

Mr. Odom. That is right.

Senator Clark. Would you happen to have the figures on what we are appropriating this year to provide for veterans and dependents as compared with what we are appropriating for the benefit of people in some of the other countries of the world, some of whom are not even our allies?

Mr. Odom. I have not made a comparison. I know what our estimates are for the next year.

Senator Clark. My recollection is that it runs into a couple of billion dollars a year at the present time. It does seem to me that the least we ought to do is to provide living support for our veterans' dependents. In many cases widows and orphans of the First World War are absolutely destitute.

It does seem to me that we ought to pay our own obligations at the same time, at least, that we are being generous toward people of other nations, and that it ought not be left in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget or of the Veterans Administration to try to whittle down on the benefits that the dependents of veterans of the First World War are entitled to.

Mr. Odom: Our bill, if I may so characterize it, would cost \$37,000,000.

Senator Clark: I understand that it was suggested by the Veterans Administration and cleared through the Budget, while the other bill was not.

Mr. Odom: That is correct; but it would cost five and one-half million dollars more than the House bill. In other words, it would bring greater benefits to the beneficiaries of World War I than the House bill would.

Senator Taft: It seems to me that the principle difference is contained in the argument in favor of making the benefits the same as between those who have service-connected disabilities and those who have not. Otherwise, it seems to me, the bill, in trying to consolidate the whole thing, does not whittle down anything. It makes it somewhat more generous and eliminates the distinction which seems to me to be without reason.

Mr. Odom: I think, Senator Taft, that the difference of

five million dollars might even be absorbed in the administrative cost that would be saved. I know that it would be tremendously easier to check the several thousand claims we have under this bill than it would under the other.

Senator Clark: That is the argument for a straight service pension, which has been the whole principle of veterans' legislation since the last war. I can remember when they changed the policy with regard to the Civil War pension and the bothersome distinction between service-connected and straight service pensions. I do not think personally that the time has come, after the first World War, to abolish all distinction between service-connected and straight service pensions.

Senator Taft: But after that time, what is the use of keeping the distinction alive as to widows, if we are going to grant pensions to widows anyway? There is no reason for keeping that distinction alive as to widows.

Mr. Odom: This would not affect the service-connected widow; she would still be entitled to \$50.

The Chairman: Let me ask you about the definition of "widow," which seems to be a controversial point. As you define "widow," it is applicable to all widows who are pensionable?

Mr. Odom: For World War I and World War II, yes, sir.

The Chairman: This becomes a uniform rule?

Mr. Odom: That is right.

The Chairman: If this is enacted. You define "widow of a World War I veteran" to mean one who was married to a person who served ten or more years prior to his death?

Mr. Odom: That is right.

The Chairman: If he died within the seventh year after his discharge, she would not get a pension?

Mr. Odom: She would not, unless the marriage was prior to the statutory cut-off date, which at the present time for World War I is May 13, 1938. This Act would extend that. This would provide for one year prior to the effective date of this Act. You could just as well make it the effective date of this Act, but it is just a matter of choice.

By taking one year prior to the effective date of the Act, we calculated that it would extend the World War I marriage date approximately five years.

The Chairman: Let me ask a practical question. Would this definition cut off any widow now?

Mr. Odom: No, sir. We have a saving clause there that no one's pension will be reduced or discontinued by virtue of the enactment of this Act.

Senator Connally: You mean that has already been adjudicated?

Mr. Odom: That is right.

The Chairman: Not where there is mere application.

Mr. Odom: By changing the marriage date, it would not cut off anyone, Senator George. At the present time they must have been married prior to May 13, 1938.

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Odom: Now, this would bring that down five years later and also would provide that if they had been married at any time for ten years -- for example, if they married after the effective date of this Act, and that marriage, as long as it is for ten years -- that widow will be entitled.

Senator Taft: I take it the general purpose of these restrictions is to prevent a woman from marrying a man for his pension.

Mr. Odom: That is right.

Senator Clark: What is the present law, again, Mr. Odom, as to the veterans of World War I?

Mr. Odom: The Act of May 13, 1938, was the Act that provided that for World War I veterans.

Senator Clark: You mean that sets the date?

Mr. Odom: Yes.

Senator Clark: Without regard to the length of time they had been married?

Mr. Odom: That is right. In the case of the Spanish-American War, it was September, 1922, and that was recently brought up to January 1, 1938, for Spanish War widows by a bill that was passed in this present session of Congress.

Senator Taft: At the present time, if they marry after

1938, is there any way by which they can secure that?

Mr. Odom: Not as to the Spanish War.

Senator Taft: No, as to World War I.

Mr. Odom: No. This bill proposes to do for World War I--

Senator Taft: Then, does this liberalize it in every way?

Mr. Odom: Yes. We propose to do by this bill for World War I what Congress has already done for the Civil War and Indian Wars.

Senator Taft: Is there any widow of a World War veteran who would get a pension under existing law but who will not get it under this law?

Mr. Odom: No, sir.

Senator Taft: Then, what is the objection to it?

Mr. Sullivan: There is plenty of objection to that. May
8 I call upon Mr. Charles Stevens to explain it?

The Chairman: Yes. .

STATEMENT OF CHARLES STEVENS,
AMERICAN LEGION.

Mr. Stevens: It has not been pointed out, I believe, sufficiently clearly that this affects, as to marriage dates, service-connected as well as nonservice-connected deaths.

Mr. Odom: That is right.

Mr. Stevens: For example, it would be required as to deaths of World War II veterans, in whom we are also interested, that there be a period of ten years of marriage before the

widow would have an entitlement to benefits.

Mr. Odom: That is one of the amendments I was going to propose.

Mr. Stevens: It would be a necessary amendment.

Mr. Odom: There is no question about that.

The Chairman: Let us hear the two amendments. You did say you had two amendments to propose.

Mr. Odom: That is right.

The Chairman: Point those out to us now; that may shorten things.

Mr. Odom: That is an essential amendment, because obviously one who is married to a soldier who is killed in this present war may not have been married for ten years. She may have been married after the effective date of this Act. So that amendment could come in section 3.

Senator Taft: What is the amendment? Do you have it?

Mr. Odom: I have not the exact language worked out, but I will hand it to you a little later.

The other amendment is in section 1, on page 1. The present language is -- and it is the same language as in H. R. 1744 -- "who was honorably discharged."

Well, I am sure I do not have to call to the attention of this committee the controversy that arose in the G.I. bill over "honorably discharged." Public Law 346 provides as a prerequisite to entitlement a discharge or release from active

service under conditions other than dishonorable. So this bill should conform to what you did in that Act and should be changed to read "under conditions other than dishonorable." I do not have the exact language under this other change.

Senator Connally: Does this Act contain that old prohibition against cases that were on account of their willful misconduct?

Mr. Odom: No, sir.

The Chairman: That applies only to service-connected compensation?

Mr. Odom: That applies only to service-connected benefits.

Senator Connally: It does not apply to the Spanish War?

Mr. Odom: No, sir.

Senator Clark: Let us come back to the first amendment you were talking about, because I think that is the crux of the whole controversy. You state that certainly the widow of a man who is killed in the war is entitled to the benefits of this Act. Take the case of a man who was not killed, who was not married, but who comes home from the Army, marries, has an accident, and becomes disabled or invalided, and before ten years have elapsed -- and certainly after the date you have set -- dies. Suppose that in the meantime he has had a couple of children. Do you not believe that his widow and orphans are entitled to compensation?

Mr. Odom: I may have been a little bit misleading there.

Senator Clark: I understand you do not have the amendment here, but I am just making this suggestion by way of what ought to be included in the amendment.

Senator Taft: This definition is clear. It applies to widows of World War I.

Mr. Odom: That is right.

Senator Taft: Is it in some way extended to the widows of World War II veterans by other terms?

Mr. Odom: No, sir.

Mr. Sullivan: If you amend Public Law 484, you extend it to World War II widows.

Mr. Odom: You do if you do not repeal section 4 of Public Law 312.

Senator Taft: The definition does not cover the widows of World War II veterans, only those of World War I.

Mr. Odom: If you should enact the bill which General Hines has recommended and strike out section 6 on page 3, then you would have to amend this section 3, the definition of "widow."

Senator Clark: You are applying the definition to World War II widows the same as to those of World War I?

Mr. Odom: Only in the event you leave section 6 of Public Law 312 in. If you repeal that, then this has no effect on the widows of World War II veterans.

Senator Taft: I was very much opposed to Public Law 312,

but I do not think we can very well repeal it right away. Whatever we do with General Hines' bill, we will have to leave section 6 in. I do not think we can enact a law, have an election, and then repeal it right after the election.

Mr. Odom: The only necessity for that first amendment to this section 3 will arise in the event section 6 on page 3 is stricken. If it is, then there is a very essential amendment necessary to section 3.

As applied to World War I, it does not make any difference, because anyone who died within ten years after World War I comes in under the general statutory limitation anyway. Does that answer your question?

Senator Clark: Yes.

Senator Walsh: You were about to state the estimate of appropriation for veterans' benefits for next year?

Mr. Odom: No, sir, I do not want to state that; I said I was familiar with it.

There is one other very technical amendment on page 3 of our proposed bill. Senator LaFollette may smile at me when I say this.

In section 5, the third line, there should be a comma after the word "regulations." If that is not placed there, the "as now or hereafter amended" refers only to "regulations," whereas it should refer to Public Law No. 2. That is just a typographical omission.

The Chairman: Are there any further questions of Mr. Odom?

Now, Mr. Sullivan, we shall be glad to hear from you.

Mr. Sullivan: Mr. Stevens would like to continue with his statement.

The Chairman: Very well.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the repealing of section 4 of Public Law 312 of the Seventy-Eighth Congress, I believe it was stated that Public Law No. 484 was enacted by the Seventy-Third Congress on June 28, 1934, and the six subsequent amendments were enacted to forestall general pension legislation affecting World War I widows. I do not believe that was the intent of Congress. It appears to me that Congress recognized that there were widows and children of men who had highly disabling service-connected conditions who died not as the result of service, and they wanted to provide benefits for those widows and children. For instance, men might have gun-shot wounds 75 percent disabling, and yet it was 15 years after the Armistice before his widow and children were entitled to benefits.

Now, as to the repeal of section 4 of Public No. 312, a man could be wounded severely or incur a tropical disease in World War II who would die of other than those conditions shortly after the war and leave a widow and children surviving him. Might it be another 15 years after World War II before

that widow and the children, who would be destitute, would be cared for through congressional enactment? It would appear that it would be if the repealer in the Veterans Administration-sponsored bill were approved. I do believe this: that it was upon the assumption that that would be repealed by the Congress, even though it was enacted but seven months ago, that the limiting date was set as to the marriages of World War I veterans.

I am told in the Veterans Administration that the reason why the 10-year clause was inserted there was that they wanted to stabilize the requirements as to the Civil War, Indian Wars, Spanish-American War, and World War I. Why, then, would it not apply to World War II as well as to World War I?

Senator Clark: If you set up a rule of thumb, it will apply to World War II.

Mr. Stevens: It will, Senator Clark. It will be brought right on through. A man could be married after the enactment of this Act, his wife could bear him a child, and he could later be killed in the Southwest Pacific, say, but because he had not lived with her for ten years, she would not be his widow. The child, of course, would take.

Senator Taft: Do we not get back to the argument as to whether that ten years affects the World War II veterans?

Mr. Stevens: It is not so stated there. However, it is the intent of the Veterans Administration - - I believe their

officials will tell you -- to obtain uniformity of legislation; and they have obtained such legislation as pertains to the Civil War and Indian Wars, and now they have a bill introduced which applies to the Spanish-American War.

Senator Taft: That may be, but I am asking why this bill in any way affects World War II veterans on that question.

Mr. Stevens: It does not now.

Mr. Sullivan: The proposed substitute of the Veterans Administration amends Public Law 484, or proposes to amend Public Law 484, under which Public Law 312 of this Congress brought World War II veterans. That is how the definition affects World War II veterans as well as those of World War I.

10

Senator Taft: I do not see how you can take the language that says widows of World War I to mean the widows of World War II veterans.

Mr. Sullivan: Section 3 says:

"On and after the date of enactment of this Act for the purpose of payment of compensation or pension under the laws administered by the Veterans Administration * * *."

That is any law, applying to any pension.

Senator Taft: I know, but the definition is: "the term 'widow of a World War I veteran,'" not a World War II veteran. That is an entirely different term.

Mr. Odom: There is a technical basis for what Mr. Sullivan is saying. It was an oversight on the part of the drafters.

In Public Law 312, the very last proviso says:

"That the definition of 'widow' -- that is, for World War II veterans' widows -- "shall be that contained in section 6 of Public Law Numbered 144, Seventy-Eighth Congress, July 13, 1943."

Now, section 6 of Public Law 144, Seventy-Eighth Congress, reads:

"Paragraph V of Veterans Regulation Numbered 10, as amended, is hereby amended," to define widow: "'of a World War II veteran -- who was married to the veteran prior to the expiration of ten years subsequent to the termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress.'"

That is section 6 of Public Law 144, approved July 13, 1943.

What would happen if section 4 were repealed, as is provided in section 6 of our bill, would be to take out that definition of widow of World War II veteran. It was never intended to do that. That was just an oversight. That definition should stand. It is in Public Law 144 and is designed to mean that a widow is one who married a veteran prior to the expiration of ten years.

Senator Taft: I do not quite see. Even under H. R. 1744, passed by the House, the bill states that:

"The term 'widow' shall mean a person who was married

prior to the date of enactment of this Act * * * ."

Mr. Odom: H. R. 1744 applies only to World War I cases.

Senator Taft: Oh, I see.

The Chairman: All right. Is there anything further, Mr. Stevens?

Mr. Sullivan: There is nothing further on the part of the American Legion. Thank you, Senator George.

Senator Taft: What sort of amendment would take out this provision if we took out section 6?

Senator Clark: Section 6 of which bill? The Veterans Administration bill?

Senator Taft: Yes.

Mr. Odom: Then, World War II will not be affected one way or the other.

Senator Taft: Do you agree to that, Mr. Sullivan, or will it be necessary to amend section 3 further?

Mr. Sullivan: You would still have your definition of widow of World War I in section 3.

Mr. Odom: My statement was that it would not affect World War II veterans.

Mr. Sullivan: By repealing, or rather taking out, section 6 of your proposed bill, would that bring World War II widows and children under service connection?

Mr. Odom: No, sir.

Senator Taft: They would have the pensions they get under

Public Law 484 whether or not they die as a result of service connection.

Mr. Sullivan: You then have not reduced your machinery.

Mr. Odom: Yes, we have a complication there, in that you have supplanted the particular section on which that would be based by another section which could not possibly be applicable to World War II. In other words, if you took out section 6, you would have to save the rights of World War II widows by another enactment. In other words, that would have to be adjudicated under the old Public Law 484 system.

Senator Connally: Why not insert in this bill the applicable provisions, so that we can have them all in one place, in order to remove any doubt?

Mr. Odom: That could be done.

Mr. Connally: I know it could be done. Why not?

Senator Taft: It seems to me that we are trying to do too much if we are attempting to make uniform laws for World War I and World War II. It seems to me that we have to keep them separate, and probably shall have to for a number of years. I do not think we could very successfully consolidate those two.

Mr. Sullivan: Mr. Odom says that the passage of H. R. 1744 would be difficult of administration. We look at it in another light. We think the requirements are very simply outlined in the bill. The lower-paid personnel down in the Veterans Administration could decide this. They would not

11

need either an expensive appeals procedure or anything else. The lower-paid personnel could take an application and see if the widow fits within these four simple requirements, and that would be all there would be to it.

Senator Taft: As a matter of fact, the Veterans Administration bill is more generous to widows of veterans of World War I than H. R. 1744.

Mr. Sullivan: At the moment, Senator Taft; but establishing a new definition of "widow" --

Senator Taft: I mean under H. R. 1744 the widow has to be married at the time of the enactment of the Act.

Mr. Sullivan: Yes, sir.

Senator Taft: If she marries after that time, she can live for 10 or 20 years and still not get a pension, whereas if she lives for 9 years, under the Veterans Administration bill, she gets a pension.

Mr. Sullivan: That is correct, although it has been the custom to set the effective date back and then later on amend it.

Mr. Odom: I did not speak about other objections to H. R. 1744. There is one very serious objection. That is, it would continue the pension of a child beyond the 21st birthday, so long as the child remained in school. That has never been done before in any legislation.

There are other objections to H. R. 1744. I do not touch

upon those but just simply touch upon the principal benefits that would flow from the Administration's bill.

The Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Odom.

The Chairman: Mr. Rice, we shall be glad to hear you.

STATEMENT OF MILLARD W. RICE, NATIONAL SERVICE
DIRECTOR, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS.

Mr. Rice: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Unfortunately because the report of the Veterans Administration concerning H. R. 1744 only came to my attention at the last part of the week, I did not have adequate opportunity to study it and to study the substitute bill; but on quick perusal of the first part of it, I gathered that the Veterans Administration was endeavoring to try to bring about greater uniformity as to the administrative practices, and that we are in favor of.

Because of not having had an opportunity to read it carefully, my letter dictated last night under stress of pressure did not take into consideration all the factors that are involved, and I should like to have it withdrawn.

May I call your attention to the fact that H. R. 1744 will in effect provide more generous benefits for the dependents of disabled veterans of World War I in some respects than is provided for the dependents of decedent veterans of World War I who at the time of death were suffering with service-connected disability?

It seems to me, as Senator Clark has indicated, that Congress has always made a distinction in favor of the service-connected cases and in favor of their dependents.

H. R. 1744 would take away some of those distinctions

favorable to the dependents of the service-connected disabled veterans. It would change the marriage date requirement and make it effective as of the date of the Act, whereas the dependents of World War I, who at the time of death suffered service-connected, would have the marriage requirement remain as May 13, 1938. That would not be fair.

If we take the Veterans Administration substitute, we find also that some of the potential benefits for World War I and World War II, to which they are now entitled and would remain entitled under present law, would also be taken away from them. Both bills infringe upon what has already been done by Congress in favor of service-connected dependents of service-connected disabled veterans. The substitute bill by the Veterans Administration would take away benefits potentially available for the dependents of deceased veterans of World War II who at the time of death were suffering with service-connected disabilities. It does not seem to me that Congress would want to do that.

It also changes the definition of "widow," to take away the benefits to which that same class would be potentially entitled, although not now entitled, because there are now no such widows. It does not seem to us that any benefits to which the dependents of deceased veterans who at the time of death were suffering from service-connected disabilities should be taken away from them.

The substitute bill proposed by the Veterans Administration would provide the same amount of pensions to the dependent widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I who at the time of death were not suffering with any service-connected disability as is now provided for the dependent widows and orphans of deceased veterans of World War I who at the time of death were suffering with service-connected disability.

Under that basis of law, we would find this situation. A disabled veteran of World War I who is totally disabled and who will eventually die by reason of that disability, but who is intercepted in his life by an automobile accident and is killed by an automobile, gets benefits under Public Law 484. I mean his widow gets benefits under Public Law 484, so that she will receive \$35 a month, the same as would be payable to the dependent widow of a deceased veteran of World War I who did not have any service-connected disability at all.

12 That does not seem to be a fair comparison. Although I do not know anything about Einstein's theory of relativity, it seems to me that the theory of relativity ought to be applied when it comes to legislation affecting veterans. The first consideration ought to be for the veterans who suffer with service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities, after the benefits for those who die by reason of military service or by reason of service-connected disabilities.

Senator Clark: The theory of that is this. The difference

between the theory based on service-connected disability and a straight service pension, which you usually come to when the veterans of the war have reached a certain age, where they are all relatively disabled, is that the man with service-connected disability is probably likely to have his life shortened and thus render his ability to support his wife and family much less than that of a man who has no service-connected disability.

Mr. Rice: That is true; but there is something much more important than that. That is, that Congress believes that a man with service-connected disability has in effect earned compensation under the theory of the workmen's compensation act. He incurred his disability in the most hazardous employment of the Federal Government, and he is, therefore, given workmen's compensation in the form of pension by the Federal Government.

On that basis, because, as you state, he is supposedly in the dependent class, having a handicapping disability which would prevent him from accumulating an estate to take care of his dependents, there was an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to take care of his dependents. That theory is not equally applicable to the man who did not incur disability by reason of employment in the armed forces of the United States.

Senator Taft: I agree to the distinction as long as you do not pay any service pension; but once you begin to adopt the

principle of a service pension, to pay one \$35 and the other \$30 is foolish. I agree to your general principle, but once you begin to pay \$30 as a service pension, I think the attempt to keep the distinction alive is rather unsound.

Mr. Rice: We have not yet adopted a service pension as to World War I.

Senator Taft: But we are proposing a service pension for widows. We are departing entirely from the principle of service-connected disability as a basis for compensation.

Mr. Rice: The Disabled American Veterans is not advocating that legislation. Our organization did not adopt any resolution in favor of this, and we are very apprehensive that it might, as indicated by the proposed substitute from the Veterans Administration, infringe upon the principles previously established by Congress on the basis of service-incurred disability, and we think that that distinction should be maintained.

Since there is no service pension legislation at the present time, either as to the veterans of the World War or as to their dependents, we still have it in our power to retain the distinction, and it ought to be retained. Certainly the widow and children of the man who at the time of death has a service-connected disability have a greater obligation coming from the Federal Government than the widow and children of the veteran who did not have any service-connected disability. That distinction

would be wiped out by this so-called substitute bill.

Senator Taft: The \$5 that is left seems to be a rather insignificant distinction.

Mr. Rice: I may state that we are not on record in favor of H. R. 1744 either, as far as that is concerned, because it does too much infringing upon that principle at the present time.

Senator Clark: Well, I have always had a deep sympathy for the bona fide service-connected dependents. Many of them have been left rather thin.

Mr. Rice: But when we find that we are arriving at a situation where the typical widow and children of a war veteran who is disabled physically gets the same amount and no more than the widow and children of a veteran who had no physical disability traceable to his military service, then it seems to me we are getting far away from the fundamental principles that we have always had, and this bill would do just that.

We believe that there is other legislation before this committee and before Congress of infinitely greater importance, in conformance with these principles, to the men who have suffered service-incurred disability, and to their dependents. We provide the widows of war veterans who die by reason of service-connected disability \$50 a month. Canada provides its widows with \$60 a month, and the cost of living is less there

than it is here. If we feel that we should be generous to widows, we ought especially to take care of those whose husbands have died by reason of service-connected disability.

The Chairman: We have not that bill before us; we have these bills before us.

Mr. Rice: I know, but frequently when the committee decides to take favorable action as to one proposed piece of legislation, the cost of that legislation prevents it thereafter from taking favorable action as to other legislation.

The Chairman: That may be so. We appreciate your argument on principle; but, at the same time, we do not have it before us right now.

Mr. Rice: But this is related, as I indicated, on the theory of relativity.

I call attention further to the fact that disabled veterans of this war do not get any dependent allowances. They are disillusioned when they find that they get very much less for their dependents than the dependents are getting while he is in the military service. That needs correction.

Senator Clark: Of course, Canada is not a very good example. Canada is under lend-lease, and it can afford that.

Mr. Rice: Nevertheless, its veterans and their dependents are more generously treated than we treat ours. Let us divert some of the lend-lease money to our veterans and their dependents.

I just want to call to the attention of the committee the fact that I am not directly opposing this legislation, because I am neither authorized to approve it nor to oppose it on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans. However, I do think that Congress owes prior consideration to the men who are coming back with service-connected disabilities.

Imagine, if you will, a man in the military service whose wife and four children get \$140 a month. If while he is in the service he acquires multiple gun-shot wounds, multiple neuroses, duodenum ulcers, or malaria, he is declared unfit for military service. His pay ceases the day he comes out of the service.

When the Veterans Administration gets around to it, if the veteran puts in an application, they will award the veteran not exceeding \$115 a month for himself, his wife, and his children, or \$25 less per month than he was getting for himself, his wife, and his children while he was in the service. That is a situation that ought to be corrected soon.

I trust that if the committee or the Congress decides to take favorable action as to this legislation, which is potentially expensive, it will not therefore feel that it cannot afford to take adequate care of the service-connected veterans and their dependents.

The Chairman: All right. Is there anything else you gentlemen have to suggest with respect to the substitute bill

as compared with H. R. 1744?

Mr. Sullivan: If we could only see Mr. Odom's proposed amendment, it might change the picture somewhat.

Mr. Odom: I will not be able to suggest an amendment, Senator George, until I know what the will of the committee is with respect to section 6. I assume you will want to see the Administration's draft in the light of H. R. 1744, and I would have to know what you would want to do with respect to section 6 before I could propose anything along the line Mr. Sullivan has in mind. If you should adopt the Administration's bill in toto, there would be no such amendment necessary.

Senator Clark: It seems to me that we ought to have the Administration's bill before us before we undertake to substitute it for another bill.

The Chairman: We have that here.

Senator Clark: As far as I am concerned, I am not in favor of adopting the principle of the Administration's substitute, in the first place.

Senator La Follette: It seems to me that we are up against a practical question, so far as this Congress is concerned. If there is to be any legislation on this subject, it seems to me it is not possible within the time left to this Congress to work out a revision of the definition of "widow" or to project that into the future so far as veterans of World War II are concerned.

Furthermore -- and I do not know and am not asking for any

answer to this question -- I am just wondering to what extent the clearance of the Bureau of the Budget on General Hines' bill is predicated upon the fact that it is designed, in effect, to repeal the action of Congress earlier this year and to postpone the question of service pensions for the widows of veterans of World War II. Therefore, we are not in a position to assume that if we take this bill and try to bring it more in line with H. R. 1744, it will meet with any more favor if it is passed than H. R. 1744 itself might meet with.

Furthermore, as I say, it seems to me that we could not hope to adopt some far-reaching legislation, get it to conference, have it ironed out, get it back in the form of a conference report, and have it adopted before this Congress expires.

It seems to me that the first thing this committee has got to decide is whether it wants action on this question of pensions for nonservice-connected disability to widows and especially children of World War I veterans. If it does, then it seems to me we have to confine our consideration to that one question. As far as I am concerned, I should like to see action at this session.

Mr. Sullivan: Insofar as the American Legion is concerned, we are hopeful that H. R. 1744 will be reported amended to include any administrative or penal clauses that have been established by law or regulation and which may be recommended by the Veterans Administration. In that way, I think the House

will accept the bill, and we can then get it to the President before the end of this Congress.

Senator Taft: I think you can get the bill through if you want to, but I do not think you can if you leave section 6 in. I do not think the House is going to take that in a long controversy. It seems to me that if you decide to eliminate section 6 of the Administration bill, these gentlemen might get together today on something which might simplify everything, in which case the House would take it. I do think there is a good deal of complication in it.

As far as its being a far-reaching measure is concerned, it is a most far-reaching measure. \$250,000,000 twenty years from now is a far-reaching measure no matter what we do.

Senator La Follette: I simply meant that if you were going to try to deal with this question of widows and dependent children of veterans of World War II, you would get into a field where it might be impossible to get together with the House of Representatives.

Mr. Sullivan: The Administrator's report says that the Veterans Administration has no objection to a service pension for widows and orphans.

The Chairman: Is there anything else you gentlemen wish to say to us before we decide what we are going to do?

Mr. Sullivan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for giving us this opportunity to appear.

The Chairman: We thank you, gentlemen.

The committee will now meet in an executive session.

(At 12:05 p.m., the hearing was concluded, and the committee held an executive session which, by direction of the chairman, was not reported.)