

# Speeches on veterans - military pay

Senator Hiram L. Fong Papers

Public Relations, Speeches, statements, and messages, Box PR29, Folder 46

<https://hdl.handle.net/10524/86850>

---

Items in eVols are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

*UHM Library Digital Collections Disclaimer and Copyright Information*

Statement of Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii)  
On Support of H. R. 11049, Federal Salary Act of 1964  
July 1, 1964

Mr. President:

H. R. 11049, the measure presently before this body is one which I fully support. As a Member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I know from first experience the hard work and long hours the Committee spent to bring to the floor of the Senate as equitable a bill as was possible.

I commend the Committee Chairman, Senator Olin D. Johnston, and the minority leader on the Committee, Senator Frank Carlson for their effective leadership and patience in hammering out a bill acceptable to all Members of the Committee.

It is only fair and equitable that the Congress pass the Federal Salary Act of 1964 at this time. In fact, it is overdue. In the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962 the Congress wrote into law for the first time what is commonly referred to as the comparability principle. This provision meant that Federal salaries should be comparable to those being paid for similar work in private industry.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics was directed to make annual reviews of private industry salaries and report to the President its findings and comparison of Federal salaries with those prevailing in private industry.

H. R. 11049 is the first step since the comparability principle was written into law in which Congress is asked to keep faith with the provision it approved in 1962.

The Committee held extensive hearings over a period of approximately eight months on Federal pay. Upon completion of the hearings the Committee met in executive sessions for over two months in an effort to write a fair, equitable and just salary act.

H. R. 11049 covers the full scope of Federal salaries -- from executives to clerks. It is a comprehensive measure which, while bringing most Federal salaries into comparability with those in private industry, also corrects certain inequities in the Federal pay structure.

The average salary increase for Federal employees under the Classification Act is approximately 4.2% and under the Postal Field Schedule 5.6%.

In the higher pay levels the Committee admits that comparability cannot be followed, and in other levels the Federal pay scale continues to lag two or three years behind private industry pay. However, H. R. 11049 is as equitable a bill as can now be written. It is a good bill and will assist greatly in retaining highly trained and qualified personnel in the Federal service.

I strongly urge the passage of this measure.

July 7, 1964

The Honorable Richard B. Russell  
Chairman  
Senate Armed Services Committee  
United States Senate  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am advised that the Department of Defense has recommended legislation in this session of Congress to increase the pay of military personnel.

As indicated in your hearings of last year on H. R. 5555, there is a great disparity between remuneration of persons working in private industry and the Federal Civil Service as compared with those serving in our Armed Forces. This disparity has caused vast numbers of our highly trained military specialists to leave the Armed Forces for civilian jobs.

The military pay act of 1963 was a step in the right direction and to a limited degree I am sure slowed the loss of military personnel to the civilian segment of our population. However, military pay continues to lag behind that of other Federal pay scales and private industry.

The Senate Armed Services Committee in its report on H. R. 5555 last year recognized the need for a continual review of the military pay scale and assured the Defense Department that Congress would give due consideration to military pay recommendations of the Executive Branch.

July 7, 1964

The Senate last week passed H. R. 11049, a pay increase bill for Federal classified, postal and executive employees. This means that if no action is taken to increase military pay, the present disparity between military and civilian pay scales will become more severe.

I urge that your Committee move to the consideration of the military pay recommendations submitted to the Congress earlier this year by the Defense Department.

I know we share the view that our military personnel are performing a very important job in defense of freedom throughout the world. They should be paid salaries comparable with their responsibilities and with their fellow citizens in civilian vocations.

Your favorable action on a military pay bill this year would be consonant with the Senate Armed Services Committee's report language on H. R. 5555 and would bolster the faith, confidence, and morale of our men and women in our Armed Forces.

With warmest personal regards and aloha,

Sincerely yours,

Hiram L. Fong

Statement on Military Pay (S. 3001)  
By U. S. Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii)  
In the United States Senate  
July 20, 1964

Mr. President: I shall give my wholehearted support to the pending bill granting pay raises to nearly two million men and women in military service.

I supported the military pay raise bill last year as a "must" -- to bring military pay more in line with that of Federal, civilian and private industrial workers doing similar tasks.

Until last year, pay scales for military personnel had not been increased since 1958, although the cost of living had gone up five and one-half per cent.

Last year's pay bill was a major overhaul of military pay designed to bring greater equity in pay for America's men and women in uniform.

The pending bill is a relatively simple, but very important, across-the-board increase intended to keep military pay reasonably in pace with the increases recently voted by the House and Senate for Federal civilian employees.

I am very pleased that the Senate Armed Services Committee provided an 8.5 per cent increase in basic pay for officers and warrant officers with less than 2 years service. Basic pay for

this group has not been increased since 1952, while other pay brackets were increased in 1955, 1958, and 1963.

I would say an increase for commissioned personnel with less than 2 years' service is long overdue. Last year I cited the failure to give a pay boost to these service personnel as a defect of the pay bill of 1963. I am glad that the defect is being remedied.

I commend the Members of the Armed Services Committee for recommending an 8.5 per cent increase, compared with the 3 per cent increase requested by the Department of Defense.

About 44,600 persons will benefit from this provision.

The pending bill also provides an increase of 2.5 per cent in basic pay for all personnel -- officers and enlisted men alike -- with more than two years of service. About 1,788,000 military personnel will benefit from this increase.

I am happy that the bill also provides pay increases for those entitled to drill pay -- the reservists of the various services and National Guardsmen. The Department of Defense proposal would have excluded these persons.

I agree with the Armed Services Committee report that "Today, the Active Reserves, especially those in a drill pay

status, constitute a vital part of our national defense." Therefore, they should be included in this pay raise bill.

What I have said before in support of adequate pay for military persons deserves repetition. There are more than two and a half million military personnel on active duty in our Armed Forces.

We depend on them to defend us.

The least we can do is give them fair and decent pay on a par with civilian Government workers and employees in private industry.

I support the pending bill as another step toward fair and decent pay for America's service men and women.

---o0o---

FEDERAL PAY INCREASES  
BENEFIT HAWAII ECONOMY

WASHINGTON, August 10, 1964--Senator Hiram L. Fong, R-Hawaii, reported pay increases just voted by Congress for classified, postal and military personnel would amount to approximately \$7,777,000 more a year to Hawaii's economy.

The senior Hawaii Senator was advised that \$3.5 million can be attributed to the military pay increase; \$482,000 to postal employees in direct gross payments to employees plus 15 per cent cost-of-living allowance (COLA) but without computation of other fringe benefits, and about \$3,795,000 for classified and other Federal employees in base pay increases plus the 15 per cent COLA but no other fringe benefits computed.

The figures are based on rough estimates as full computation of payrolls would not be available for some time, Senator Fong said.

Statement in Support of Cold War GI Bill (S. 9)  
By U. S. Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii)  
For Delivery in Senate  
July 19, 1965

As a cosponsor of this measure, I give my wholehearted support to the Cold War Veterans GI Bill.

It was my privilege to cosponsor the predecessor bill, S. 5, of the last Congress, which was reported favorably to the Senate in July 1963. I deeply regret that the 88th Congress, which compiled an excellent record of enactment in the field of education, did not enact S. 5.

I am delighted that S. 9 has been called up for Senate consideration so soon in this session of Congress.

I hope the Senate will approve this legislation, which is so long overdue.

Before proceeding with my statement, I should like to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Texas, who beginning with the 86th Congress has steadfastly and tirelessly led the struggle for enactment of this vital program.

I commend him for his foresight, for his faith, and for his perseverance.

I would like to add that I, too, am more convinced than ever of the great need for, and the great value of, this program.

Cold War Service

Since the Korean Armistice was signed July 27, 1953, our country has been technically at peace, a peace so hazardous and uncertain that it is called the Cold War.

American GIs serve all over the globe -- in the frigid Arctic, in the steaming jungles of Viet-Nam, elsewhere in Asia, at the wall in Berlin, in the Dominican Republic, on the seven seas, and in the air.

Our Cold War GIs are the Minute Men of our times, on the alert to protect our Nation and to fulfill America's worldwide commitment to peace.

Those who conclude their service in this capacity should be aided in readjusting to civilian life, so that they may qualify for jobs, pursue their vocations and support their families.

As the senior Senator from Texas pointed out last January, 44 per cent of the draft-eligible young men serve in the Armed Forces, sacrificing two to four years of their lives at a crucial age.

Meantime, the other 56 per cent of their contemporaries are using this period to further their education and careers. Our Nation should recognize the disadvantage suffered by the 44 per cent who serve in uniform. We should help them get over the

hump as they return to civilian life to begin a career or to resume a career interrupted.

Senate bill 9 will do this by providing educational assistance and home and farm loan assistance for some 5 million veterans of the Cold War.

#### S. 9 Opponents Mistaken

There are some who oppose S. 9 under the mistaken impression that the benefits provided for so-called peacetime veterans are what were provided to veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

This bill, however, recognizes that Congress traditionally has made a distinction between wartime service and peacetime service in providing veterans' programs.

This is why S. 9 doubles the number of active-duty days of service to 180 days as a minimum. World War II and Korean war veterans were permitted GI bill benefits after only 90 days of active duty service.

This is why S. 9 does not contain any mustering-out payments to Cold War veterans.

This is why S. 9 does not provide a program of business and insured loans as were provided for veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

Under S. 9, loans for Cold War veterans could only be made or guaranteed for their homes or their farms. Moreover, under S. 9 Cold War veterans would be required to pay a loan guarantee fee of one-half of one per cent of the amount of the loan.

This fee was not required of World War II and Korean war veterans. Under those programs, the Federal Government pays the losses. But under S. 9, Cold War veterans themselves would in effect be paying for any losses under the home and farm loan program.

"Area of Hostility" Amendment Too Restrictive

There are some who contend that the education and training benefits of S. 9 and the home and loan assistance should be available only to those who serve in "areas of hostility."

I do not believe it should be confined only to such veterans. The World War II GI bill and the Korean War GI bill were not confined just to those who served in areas of hostility. We know there were many people in these wars who did not serve in actual combat. Some never served outside continental United States. Yet we did not deny them the GI benefits.

The fact is, military personnel go where they are commanded to go. They serve where they are ordered to serve.

I do not believe we should exclude those who do not serve in areas of hostility -- for this is a matter beyond their control.

Earlier this year, I joined a number of my colleagues in legislation which confined these benefits to those serving in areas of hostility. I did so because I recognized the Administration is opposed to granting GI bill benefits to all veterans of the Cold War, even those who have served as long as 180 days.

I did so because I wanted to serve notice to the Administration that the senior Senator from Hawaii believes the very least we should do is to grant educational assistance and home and farm loans for Cold War veterans in areas of hostilities, such as Vietnam.

Of the two proposals, however, I believe S. 9 is far preferable. Therefore, I am against the amendment to limit benefits to those who serve in areas of hostilities.

I shall vote for S. 9, which does not make service in an area of hostility a requirement for eligibility for GI assistance.

I concur in the reasoning of the majority of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which stated in their report.

"The proposal... to limit eligibility under this bill to those veterans who have served in 'areas of hostilities' as designated by the President was rejected for several reasons.

"In the first place, the philosophy and purpose of the GI bills is and has been to give readjustment assistance to the veteran returning to civilian life after substantial military service and not to reward him for the risk that he might have been exposed to.

"Secondly, most servicemen are not able to choose the area in which they serve. If this proposal were adopted, one would have in effect the paradoxical situation in which a serviceman could obtain readjustment benefits only when the foreign policy of the United States failed to maintain the peace.

"There is even a serious question whether many of the cold war hot spots could be designated as an 'area of hostilities,' since the U. S. troops are often present in advisory capacities. A Presidential declaration of such a situation as an 'area of hostilities' would be an admission of U. S. active military participation in the conflict and would be contrary to the foreign policy of the United States."

Having a choice between S. 9, which would include all Cold War veterans with 180 days or more of active duty service, and the amendment, which would limit education and home and farm loan benefits to those who serve in areas of hostilities, I shall vote for S. 9.

#### Educational Benefits Should Not Be Loans

There are some who contend the educational, vocational and farm training benefits of S. 9 should be put on a loan basis, rather than a grant basis.

I cannot go along with this.

GI benefits for World War II veterans and Korean war veterans were not made on a loan basis. They were outright monthly grants. There is no reason why GI benefits for Cold War veterans should be extended on a loan basis.

Indeed, there are additional reasons why these should be grants.

As the Committee report on S. 9 points out, "the allowances recommended by this bill, in terms of actual value, are roughly equal to 70 per cent of an identical allowance paid in 1952."

The report further states, "the post-Korean veteran will pay a much greater proportion of his education allowance for tuition than was the case with a similarly circumstanced Korean veteran enrolled in school in 1952. The post-Korean veteran, according to a research paper prepared by the Library of Congress, can be expected to pay over 50 per cent of his educational allowance for tuition as contrasted to 28 per cent of an identical amount paid by the Korean veteran in 1952."

The cost of living has gone up since the World War II and Korean War GI programs, which means the Cold War veterans' monthly allowance under S. 9 will not stretch as far as the same allowance did even for the Korean war veteran. And the cost of

education has gone up, so that the Cold War GI will have to pay a greater portion of his allowance for tuition, leaving less for his subsistence.

As the Committee report pointed out, "The majority of veterans attending school under this bill will have to supplement the educational grant with part-time employment and in many cases the wives of these veterans will also have to work to help pay for their husband's training."

It is estimated that the \$110 monthly allowance to a Korean war veteran would have to be raised to \$153.68 a month to provide equivalent buying power. Put another way, \$110 today will buy only as much as \$72 would buy in 1952.

So, it is clear that the grants allowed under S. 9 are not the equivalent of grants allowed World War II and Korean war veterans. This is another argument against making Cold War GIs repay their educational assistance.

There are other arguments against GI loans for schooling. It will certainly discourage a great many GIs from furthering their education. Seventy per cent of veterans have had only some high school training or have completed high school but have no further training. It is doubtful large numbers of them will want to go into debt to undertake college education, and even more

doubtful that they would want to go into debt to train in courses below college level.

To put this program on a loan basis will greatly restrict veteran participation in the educational, vocational, and job training benefits of S. 9.

Educators who appeared in behalf of S. 9 during the Subcommittee hearings on this bill testified that a loan program would not accomplish what needs to be accomplished by a Cold War GI bill.

#### GI Bill Pays for Itself

Experience under the World War II and Korean War GI bills is that these bills do pay back their costs.

The Veterans Administration in a statement on the 20th Anniversary of the World War II GI bill said: "The better educated, higher earning veterans are returning higher taxes to the U. S. coffers at a rate expected to pay back the entire amount twice and possibly thrice over in the course of a lifetime."

Veterans Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., wrote in an article last year: "The \$14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped.... The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to \$1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better-educated, higher-earning GI bill veterans."

I believe experience under the Cold War GI bill would parallel experience under the World War II bill.

There is no need to require Cold War GIs to repay their educational allowances. These costs will be repaid in due time by means of the higher income taxes the GIs will pay as their training qualifies them for higher paying jobs.

Education and Training Under S. 9

S. 9 provides that Cold War veterans honorably discharged after 180 or more days of military service or because of service-connected disability would receive one and one-half days of educational assistance for each day of active-duty service between January 31, 1955 (when Korean War GI aid expired) to July 1, 1967 (when the draft law expires).

Up to 36 months of schooling would be allowed, the same period allowed under the Korean GI bill.

Veterans must begin their education or training within three years after their separation from service and complete it within eight years after separation or the enactment of this bill. No allowance would be paid for any period of educational training before September 1, 1965.

Eligible veterans may use their allowances for:

1. School courses, both at college and below-college

level full time, three-fourths time, one-half time, or less than one-half time.

2. Cooperative courses, combining school and on-the-job training in alternating cycles, on a full-time basis only.

3. Correspondence courses and flight training.

4. On-the-job training on a full-time basis only.

5. Institutional on-farm training on a full-time basis only.

Allowances Under S. 9

A monthly cash allowance would be made to eligible veterans to apply toward tuition and expenses at the school of his choice. A single veteran enrolled full-time would receive \$110 monthly; a married veteran with one dependent, \$135 monthly; with more than one dependent, a maximum of \$160 a month.

Part-time students would receive proportionately less.

Veterans pursuing full-time educational courses with some on-job training included would receive \$90 if single, \$110 per month if he has one dependent; and up to \$130 a month if more than one dependent.

For veterans receiving apprentice or other on-job training, S. 9 provides \$70 monthly if single, on up to \$105 if there is more than one dependent. This education and training allowance would be reduced every four months under a formula as his

work program progresses. Combined GI education allowances and on-job pay could not exceed \$310 a month.

On-farm training allowances would range from \$95 monthly for single veterans to \$130 a month for veterans with more than one dependent. Like on-job allowances, farm training allowances would be progressively reduced as the trainee neared completion of his training.

#### Loans Under S. 9

S. 9 also provides for direct and Government-guaranteed loans to eligible Cold War veterans for buying homes, including farm homes, and for farm lands and livestock to be used by them in farming operations. Again, 180 days of active-duty service are required for eligibility.

This loan program would pay for itself, through repayments on loans and through a small fee -- one-half of one per cent -- on the loans to cover any losses. Experience has shown that losses have been less than one per cent under previous programs.

It is expected some one million veterans will be able to purchase homes and farms under this section, of which some 700,000 may be new construction.

The widow of a veteran who died of service-connected disability also is eligible.

Banks or other lenders can make loans with the Government guaranteeing 60 per cent, up to \$7,500 on residential real estate, and 50 per cent, up to \$4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Direct loans not exceeding \$13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available to guarantee loans.

### Summary

In summary, this is the situation.

Because of the Cold War, our Nation has had to maintain sizable defense forces in Army, Navy, Marines and the Air Force.

To make sure our armed forces have sufficient personnel, Congress has retained the compulsory military training act.

Actual hostilities in Korea ceased July 27, 1953. Yet the draft law has been on the books ever since and is still effective through June 30, 1967.

Thousands of young Americans are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a specific period of time.

Following their active duty, which may take them to far distant areas of the globe, these young people are further compelled to perform additional service in the Active Reserve and then they enter the Standby Reserve.

Once entered upon active duty, their total military obligation generally extends over a period of six years.

If it were not for the Cold War, the majority of these young people would not enter military service. Most would remain in civilian life, pursuing their education, vocations and careers.

#### Cold War Vets Denied Readjustment Aids

As the Committee stressed in the report on S. 9, the Federal Government does not offer these young citizens any assistance other than unemployment compensation in coping with the serious problems created by the Cold War and their compulsory military service.

They are denied the readjustment aids so vitally needed to help them catch up with their contemporaries who did not have to serve but instead pursued their civilian lives.

#### Previous GI Bills Very Successful

After World War II and the Korean War, our Nation recognized the problems of readjustment facing veterans. Under the original GI bill and the Korean GI bill, nearly 11 million veterans received education and training which prepared them for employment.

In Hawaii, 17,000 World War II veterans out of 39,000 took GI bill training. Nearly 8,000 Korean War veterans out of 16,000 in Hawaii received educational benefits under the Korean GI bill.

There is no greater testimonial to the worth and value of this program both to the individual veterans and to the Nation as a whole than the outstanding success of these two GI bills.

Nearly 8 million veterans were educated under the World War II GI bill. They earn on the average \$2,000 to \$3,000 more a year than their nonveteran contemporaries. I do not have the figures for veterans trained under the Korean GI bill, but I am sure they would also average higher pay.

A veteran earning \$2,500 more a year than his nonveteran counterpart over a working lifetime -- say 30 years -- would earn a total of \$75,000 more than the average nonveteran.

In addition, the unemployment rate is much lower for veterans educated under the GI bill than for nonveterans of the same age group.

The picture is clear: veterans educated under these GI bills are more likely to have jobs -- at higher pay -- and less likely to be unemployed than corresponding nonveterans.

Experience demonstrates GI bill veterans are better off.

Experience also demonstrates the Nation is better off. Because of the World War II and Korean GI bills, our professional and technological resources have been vastly improved.

We have 625,000 more engineers, 375,000 more teachers, 220,000 more medical and related personnel, and 165,000 more natural and physical scientists.

This is a priceless return on our Nation's investment in educational and other benefits for veterans.

It is by no means the only return. As I have already mentioned, according to the Internal Revenue Service, veterans who received World War II benefits have already paid back the total cost of the bill through taxes on the higher incomes they earn because of their GI-bill training.

By 1970, both the World War II and Korean GI bills will have more than paid the costs.

There is every reason to believe the Cold War GI bill would pay for itself, too.

I am confident S. 9 will yield more than enough in the future to pay the costs of the program.

S. 9 is designed to increase the employability of millions of Cold War veterans, to give them an opportunity to obtain education and training in civilian fields and to give them an opportunity to buy their homes.

Based on previous GI bill experience, out of an estimated 6,260,000 Cold War veterans through fiscal year 1977, about

1,500,000 could be expected to take advantage of GI bill training, including an estimated 6,000 in Hawaii.

The basic purpose of this legislation is in accord with our Nation's drive against poverty.

It is in accord with our Nation's drive to expand educational opportunities for Americans.

It is a program following a format that has been tried and proven successful.

It is a program that will yield quick and substantial returns-- both to the Cold War veterans and to the progress and well-being of America.

I strongly urge enactment of S. 9 as a vital and necessary Cold War measure.

Statement of Senator Hiram L. Fong, R-Hawaii  
On Military Pay Bill of 1965, H. R. 9075  
Before Senate Armed Services Committee  
August 2, 1965

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate this opportunity to submit a statement in support of H. R. 9075, a bill recently passed by the House of Representatives to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

COMPARABILITY AND BASE PAY

The average 10.6 per cent increase contained in this measure establishes a degree of comparability in base pay between that received by our men and women in uniform and those employed in the Federal Civil Service and private industry. When I testified before this Committee in 1963 on the military pay bill of that year I urged the adoption of a provision in law, making military pay comparable to that paid in the Federal Civil Service. Only the year before, the Congress adopted a provision in the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962, directing that Federal classified and postal pay be made comparable to that being paid in private industry for similar positions.

Direct comparison between jobs in the military and those existing in the Federal Civil Service and private industry are not possible. However, broad comparability equations among these three segments of our economy can be made on the basis of skill levels.

Military pay increases have not kept pace with increases for other groups within the United States. Figures presented to the House Armed

Services Committee earlier this year show that the base pay of both officers and enlisted men have consistently lagged behind the percentage pay increases given other workers in occupations requiring similar skill levels. Since 1952, the last year when all members of our Armed Forces received a base pay increase, the disparity between military and civilian pay has skyrocketed to approximately 36.6 per cent for officers and over 28 per cent for enlisted men. The overall increase in military pay contained in H. R. 9075 is urgently needed to overcome this lopsided disparity.

Because of my firm belief in the principle of comparability for all members of our working community I fully support the provisions of H. R. 9075. Although it does not adopt comparability principle by words, yet its overall effect brings military salaries very close to it.

#### REENLISTMENT

I heartily endorse the increase scheduled for personnel with less than two years service. I am impressed by testimony given before the House Armed Services Committee to the effect that service personnel contemplate reenlisting in the Armed Forces long before their first tour of duty is finished. Comparatively low pay during their first tour of duty may cloud whatever thoughts these men may subsequently have about reenlisting.

The cost of training a recruit is estimated to be between \$4,000 and \$5,000. With the large number of personnel being drafted and enlist-

ing in our Armed Forces, this initial training cost amounts to a sizable sum. In Fiscal Year 1966 the Army alone will require in excess of 111,000 inductees to maintain an enlisted strength of 840,000 men.

Department of the Army figures show that only 20.1 per cent of all inductees reenlisted upon completion of their obligated service in Fiscal Year 1962. In Fiscal Year 1963 this percentage dropped to 11.2 per cent and in Fiscal 1964 only 3.6 per cent of all inductees reenlisted.

Department of Defense figures show a continuous annual decline in reenlistments for all service personnel. These figures show a reenlistment rate of 57.3 per cent in 1962, 53.1 per cent in 1963, 50.0 per cent in 1964 and 48.2 per cent in the first six months of 1965.

These statistics indicate a real urgency to give our Armed Forces personnel an adequate and fair increase in base pay. I am confident that the average 10.6 per cent increase called for by H. R. 9075 will help stem this loss of trained personnel who are so vitally needed for the adequate defense of our country.

#### MOONLIGHTING

The fact that thousands of service families can be classified as poverty stricken under Bureau of Labor Statistics standards because of their low income is another strong argument in favor of enacting H. R. 9075 as passed by the House of Representatives. This fact also demands a continuous monitoring of military pay scales to insure our Armed Services personnel an adequate and decent living income.

Figures furnished by the Air Force Sergeants Association indicate that approximately 22 per cent of our enlisted men in the Air Force were moonlighting in 1964.

A Navy official recently stated that well over 40 per cent of married Navy personnel, both enlisted men and officers were holding down one and sometimes two additional jobs to make ends meet.

General Wallace M. Greene, Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, stated before the House Armed Services Committee that, "A substantial percentage of my marines are forced to seek off-duty employment to meet their minimum financial obligations and to attain a reasonable standard of living..."

Secretary of Defense McNamara has submitted statistics to that same Committee showing that the overall moonlighting rate for service personnel during calendar year 1964 was approximately 29.5 per cent.

The need for so many servicemen to hold two jobs in order to provide adequately for their families is a grave accusation against the present military pay scale. The deficiencies which dictate the need to obtain secondary employment by our servicemen should be eliminated as much as possible. H.R. 9075 is the only measure now before the Congress which comes closest to solving this problem.

#### CONCLUSION

I strongly endorse the other provisions of this bill. Together this is the most forward looking legislation in the field of uniform basic pay

that has been brought before the Congress since I have been a United States Senator. I urge immediate and favorable consideration of H. R. 9075 by this Committee so as to make these salary increases effective as soon as possible.

I thank the Committee for allowing me this opportunity to present my views on this important legislation. It is only equitable that those who are sworn to protect our freedom, with their lives if necessary, be paid wages commensurate with their skill levels, responsibilities and on a par with those who labor in the Federal Civil Service and private industry.

I am convinced that passage of this bill will enhance the prospects for recruitment and retention of much needed quality personnel in the Armed Forces of our country.

FONG STRONGLY ENDORSES  
BILL FOR COLD WAR GIs

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

U. S. Senator Hiram L. Fong, R-Hawaii, strongly endorsed the Cold War GI bill as "a vital and necessary" measure to help veterans readjust to civilian life, "so that they may qualify for jobs, pursue their vocations and support their families."

In a speech prepared for Senate delivery Monday (July 19), Senator Fong called Cold War GIs the "Minute Men of our times, on the alert to protect our Nation and our worldwide commitment to peace."

He pointed out "American GIs serve all over the globe -- in the steaming jungles of Viet-Nam and elsewhere in Asia, in the frigid Arctic, at the wall in Berlin, in the Dominican Republic, on the seven seas and in the air.

"We should help these GIs get over the hump as they return to civilian life," Senator Fong declared.

"As long as Congress retains the draft law requiring compulsory military service in times such as these," Senator Fong said, "we owe veterans assistance in readjusting to civilian life." The Cold War GI bill would not cover veterans who serve only after expiration of the draft law.

At present, he pointed out, "The Federal Government does not offer young men who fulfill their military obligation through active duty and reserve service any readjustment assistance except unemployment compensation."

(MORE)

The senior Hawaii Senator declared, "There is no greater testimonial to the worth and value of GI bill education and home-farm loans than the outstanding success of the World War II and Korean War GI bills."

He cited facts showing veterans educated under these GI bills are more likely to have jobs -- at higher pay -- and less likely to be unemployed than corresponding nonveterans.

"GI bill veterans are better off -- and the Nation is better off," Senator Fong asserted.

"As a result of those bills, our professional and technological resources have been vastly improved. We have 625,000 more engineers, 375,000 more teachers, 220,000 more medical and related personnel, and 165,000 more natural and physical scientists."

He called this "a priceless return on our Nation's investment in GI bill programs for veterans."

"Furthermore," Senator Fong said, "the Cold War GI bill is expected to be paid for over the years, just as the World War II GI bill has already been paid for by greater taxes from better-educated, better-paid veterans trained under that program. The Korean war GI bill is expected to pay for itself by 1970."

Nearly 8 million veterans were educated under the World War II GI bill; about 2,400,000 so far under the Korean GI bill.

In Hawaii, 17,000 World War II veterans out of 39,000 took GI bill training. Nearly 8,000 Korean war veterans out of 16,000 in Hawaii received educational benefits under the Korean GI bill.

(MORE)

Senator Fong announced he was opposed to efforts to restrict Cold War GI benefits only to those who serve in "areas of hostilities." An amendment to that effect is expected to be offered Monday to the Cold War GI bill.

"I do not believe we should exclude those who do not serve in areas of hostility. Military personnel serve where they are ordered to serve.

"Congress did not limit World War II and Korean war GI benefits just to those who served in areas of hostility," he added.

Senator Fong also said he "cannot go along with those who want GI education allowances on a loan basis, rather than a monthly cash basis. This will greatly restrict veteran participation in the educational, vocational, and job training benefits of the Cold War GI bill.

"We gave World War II and Korean War veterans cash grants. There is no reason why we should not give Cold War GIs the same treatment," Senator Fong contended.

Actually, Senator Fong said, Cold War GIs would receive less real assistance than Korean War veterans under S. 9. "The \$110 a month for full-time study granted Korean vets in 1952 will buy only \$72 today for Cold War GIs because the cost of living has risen.

"Furthermore, a greater portion of the monthly allowance has to go toward tuition, which also has risen, leaving the Cold War GI less to subsist on than the Korean war veteran."

Concluding, Senator Fong said the Cold War GI bill is "in accord with our Nation's drive against poverty and the drive to expand educational opportunities for Americans.

"It is a program that will yield quick and substantial returns -- both to Cold War veterans and to the progress and well-being of America."

Statement on Cold War GI Bill Amendments of 1967  
By U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii)  
Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs  
March 21, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

As a cosponsor of the pending bill (S. 9), it is a pleasure for me to offer a statement in support of this necessary and meritorious measure.

It was my privilege to cosponsor the Cold War GI Bill which with amendments became Public Law 89-358 in February last year.

As a staunch supporter of this program, I was delighted Congress moved so quickly in the last session to approve educational, home and farm loan, and other benefits for veterans of Viet-Nam and the Cold War.

It was a great disappointment, however, that last year's bill as approved by the Senate was later cut back in vital respects by the House of Representatives. Among other things, monthly benefits were reduced and on-job, on-farm, and flight training were stricken from the bill before final enactment. In order to get any bill enacted, the Senate accepted the House amendments.

Subsequently last year, a number of us joined our colleague, Senator Ralph Yarborough, former Chairman of this Subcommittee and leader in drafting and passing the Cold War GI Bill, in a sequel bill (S. 3303), which sought to amend the Cold War GI Bill as enacted so as to restore the Senate features which the House had deleted. No action

was taken on S. 3303 before sine die adjournment, and a new bill was required for the 90th Congress, the bill now being considered by this Subcommittee.

The amendments provided by the pending bill (S. 9) are necessary to provide benefits for Viet-Nam veterans and Cold War veterans comparable to GI benefits allowed for veterans of the Korean War.

Briefly, here is what the pending bill will do:

1. Provide 1 1/2 days of education or training for every day of active duty. Present law only allows 1 day for each day of duty.
2. Permit veterans to take on-job, on-farm, and flight training toward an occupation. Present law forbids these three types of training although such training was permitted Korean War veterans.
3. Educational assistance would be raised from \$100 a month for a veteran without dependents to \$135; from \$125 a month for a veteran with one dependent to \$155; from \$150 a month for a veteran with two or more dependents to \$180. The amount for cooperative training is increased proportionately to the other categories.

4. On-farm training allowances are set at \$110 per month for a single veteran with no dependent; \$125 for one dependent; and \$145 for more than 1 dependent. After 12 months, these amounts would be scaled downward.
5. For full-time, on-job training S. 9 sets benefits at \$80, \$95, and \$115, according to number of dependents, for the first four months, then scales these downward after that. Allowance and salary cannot exceed \$110 per month.
6. The flight training allowance is 75% of tuition costs, with the period of entitlement at the rate of one day for each \$1.25 allowed. No limit is set on the monthly allowance, but as the amount increases, the veteran's eligibility will be used up faster. Safeguards are included so that training will be bona fide, occupational training, not avocational or recreational.
7. Restores to the schools the right to receive one dollar per month per veteran-student to help defray administrative costs of reports and certifications required regarding each student.

These amendments contained in S. 9 are needed to provide educational and training assistance for Viet-Nam and Cold War veterans

comparable to that provided by Congress for veterans of World War II and the Korean War.

Today's veterans are every bit as deserving as their predecessors. To deprive them of on-job, on-farm, and flight training and monthly allowances of comparable value is to relegate Viet-Nam and Cold War veterans to second-class status. That is pretty shabby treatment.

Comparability is reason enough to warrant enactment of the amendments proposed in the pending bill.

But there are other good reasons.

On-job training is a tried and proven means of providing needed job skills for workers. Such training is an emphatic and important part of the manpower development and training program. It is one of the more practical elements of the national antipoverty program.

On-farm training is particularly necessary in these days of dwindling food reserves in our country and of growing food shortages elsewhere in the world. We are going to require every farmer we can get and every acre of production we can cultivate.

Flight training, too, is as necessary now as it was years ago for Korean veterans. One of the most pressing labor shortages is lack of qualified commercial airline pilots. By 1970, it is estimated

we will need about 12,000 new airline pilots. Those receiving military pilot training will not be able completely to fill this need. By restoring flight training allowances under the GI bill, we can help to train skilled pilots to meet impending shortages.

Last, but certainly not least, is the need to raise the monthly allowances so as to bring the buying power of these allowances into line with allowances granted Korean war veterans.

Earlier this year, figures prepared in 1965 by the Legislative Reference Service were put into the Congressional Record showing that to buy what a student could buy for \$110 in 1952 would require \$153.68. For a married student to buy what \$135 bought in 1952 would require \$182.50. For a student with two or more dependents to buy what \$160 would buy in 1952 would require \$211.33. As tuition costs and the cost of living have risen generally since 1965, it seems clear that even higher allowances would be needed today to bring GI aid to the level paid Korean War veterans.

The Cold War GI Bill enacted last year actually provides less help for Viet-Nam and Cold War veterans than was provided more than 10 years ago for Korean War veterans.

The rates provided in the pending bill fall below the amount needed to restore buying power up to Korean War veteran levels. However, the allowances would be an improvement over the existing Cold War

GI law. They are in line with another existing law, the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act, passed by Congress in 1965, which provides \$130 a month for young persons whose parent died in service. If we can provide that much to some one based on another person's military service, we ought to provide as much to the one who actually serves.

Plain justice and logic demand that we amend last year's Cold War GI act as proposed in S. 9.

We know from past experience under the World War II GI Bill and the Korean War GI Bill that veterans who take advantage of such education and training eventually repay the cost of the program through taxes they pay on their earnings in higher-skill and higher-paying jobs for which they qualify as a result of their training.

The GI education and training bill is one Government program that pays for itself.

I sincerely hope this Subcommittee will include for the record figures showing what a wise and wonderful investment for our Nation the GI program is.

This is not only an expression of appreciation by a grateful Nation to our men who have served in the military establishment. It is also an investment looking toward a better and brighter future for America.

For when all is said and done, the Cold War GI Bill is actually a resource development plan -- designed to develop our Nation's most

valuable resource -- brainpower of our people.

I wholeheartedly support the pending bill. I urge the Subcommittee to report it promptly and favorably to the Senate for action.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to make a statement in support of this important bill.