

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS  
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

C H E C K S H E E T

(Do not remove from attached sheet) **CH/JH/JW/CFQ/vs**

Subject: Draft Legislation

**Capt. Guida**

Note No.

From: Govt Sec

To:

**LS/LAJ**

Date:

**26-6076**  
**14 March 1950**

**revised**

1. Immediate introduction of the attached draft bill in the Diet is proposed by **the Welfare Ministry.**

2. Your prompt comment is requested.

1 Incl

**Insert pages for the  
Daily Life Security Law**

C. W.

P & P DIV



Early Life Security Law

3/14

(W.H. Mum)

2

From: LS

To: GS

R H Neptune - 2635-479  
Date: 17 March 1950

1. This revised draft bill eliminates one of the objectionable parts of the draft bill which was reviewed by LS check sheet dated 7 March 1950. However, it does not completely meet the objection raised in par 3 of the check sheet above mentioned which reads as follows:

"3. The Chapter on Appeals (Articles 64-68) does not provide for a hearing, and no mention is made of Court Review. While other general statutes assure Court review, the extent of such is inadequate, particularly where there is no provision for administrative hearing. LS therefor objects to the Chapter on Appeals, and recommends that an Article in the following sense be included: 'Any person aggrieved by a final decision rendered by a government agency under this law is entitled to a judicial review thereof, including a review of the administrative findings of fact as well as a review of the questions of law'".

As will be noted, the assurance of Court review is not the point. Rather, it is the extent of the review. The addition of Article 69 which merely assures the availability of review does not follow the suggestion made in Par 3 which includes an expression of the scope or extent of review.

1 Incl:  
w/d

----- A.C.C. -----

Referred to Mr. Wolfe CLCO 3/18

Rec'd GS 3/16



CD

CD

Early Life Security Law

3/14

(Mel. Mum)

2

From: LS

To: GS

R H Neptune - 2635-479  
Date: 17 March 1950

1. This revised draft bill eliminates one of the objectionable parts of the draft bill which was reviewed by LS check sheet dated 7 March 1950. However, it does not completely meet the objection raised in par 3 of the check sheet abovementioned which reads as follows:

"3. The Chapter on Appeals (Articles 64-68) does not provide for a hearing, and no mention is made of Court Review. While other general statutes assure Court review, the extent of such is inadequate, particularly where there is no provision for administrative hearing. LS therefor objects to the Chapter on Appeals, and recommends that an Article in the following sense be included: 'Any person aggrieved by a final decision rendered by a government agency under this law is entitled to a judicial review thereof, including a review of the administrative findings of fact as well as a review of the questions of law'".

As will be noted, the assurance of Court review is not the point. Rather, it is the extent of the review. The addition of Article 69 which merely assures the availability of review does not follow the suggestion made in Par 3 which includes an expression of the scope or extent of review.

1 Incl:  
w/d

Rec'd GS 3/16

Referred to Mr. Y. P. C. L. C. O. 3/18

----- A.C.C. -----



GENERAL HEADQUARTERS  
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

C H E C K S H E E T

(Do not remove from attached sheet) **CW/JN/JW/CPG/vs**

Subject: Draft Legislation

Note No.

From: Govt Sec

To: **G-2/PED**

**Capt. Guida**  
25-6076  
Date: **14 March 1950**

1. Immediate introduction of the attached <sup>revised</sup> draft bill in the Diet is proposed by the **Welfare Ministry**.

2. Your prompt comment is requested.

1 Incl  
Insert pages for the  
Daily Life Security Law

C. W.

P & P DIV



3/14

Daily Life Security Law  
Wil Min

From: G-2

To: Govt Sec

Date: 15 March 1950  
CIS/PSD/HEP/sm

2

PSD/G-2 concurs in the revised draft of "Daily Life Security  
Law."

Incl 1 w/d

-----C.A.W.-----



GENERAL HEADQUARTERS  
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

C H E C K S H E E T

(Do not remove from attached sheet)

CW/JH/JW/GEN/gb

Subject: Draft Legislation

File No.

From: Govt Sec

To:

ESS

Date:

~~26-6076~~ ~~Case No. 6076~~

7 April 1950

1. Immediate introduction of the attached draft bill in the Diet is proposed by the House of Representatives.

2. Your prompt comment is requested.

1 Incl

Amendments to the  
Daily Life Security  
Bill

Cy to GEN, LS/Lt, G-2/PSD

C. W.

P & P DIV



GENERAL HEADQUARTERS  
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

C H E C K S H E E T

(Do not remove from attached sheet) CW/JM/JW/CHH/eb

Subject: Draft Legislation

Capt. Norris  
26-6076

From: Govt Sec

To: FHW

Date: 7 April 1950

1. Immediate introduction of the attached draft bill in the Diet is proposed by the House of Representatives.
2. Your prompt comment is requested.

1 Incl  
Amendments to the  
Daily Life Security  
Bill

Cy to ESS, LS/LJ, G-2/PSD C. W.

P & P DIV



4/7

*Adopt to Daily Life Security  
(Mel. Iner)*

2

From: PHAW

To: Govt Sec

Mr. Markuson 26 6988  
Date: 13 April 1950

1. PHAW offers no objection to the proposed amendments with the exception of the proposed amendment to Article 22 which is not approved.

2. Basis for the wording "when asked by the mayor of city, town or village, or the social welfare secretary" is to allow the local agency head to determine if he wishes to continue to use Minsei-ian and pay their expenses even though he has full-time paid personnel who will have obviated the necessity for the volunteer.

1 Incl  
w/d

-----G. F. S.-----



GENERAL HEADQUARTERS  
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

C H E C K S H E E T

CW/JN/JN/CHN/eb

(Do not remove from attached sheet)

Subject: Draft Legislation

Capt. Morris

From: Govt Sec

To: LS/LJ

Date: 20 NOV 1950

1. Immediate introduction of the attached draft bill in the Diet is proposed by the House of Representatives.

2. Your prompt comment is requested.

1 Amendments to the  
Daily Life Security  
Bill

Cy to PHW, ESS, G-2/PSD

C. W.



2

From: LS/LAJ

To: GS

H.H. Neptune 2635/479  
Date: 8 April 50

The within amendment to the Daily Life Security Bill proposed by the House of Representatives (a) adjusts the bill's provisions to the establishment of Social Welfare Secretaries, and (b) makes other minor improvements. There are no legal objections.

Incl w/d

----- A. C. C. -----

*Rec'd GS 4/10*



GENERAL HEADQUARTERS  
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

C H E C K S H E E T

(Do not remove from attached sheet) CW/JS/JW/CHN/gb

Subject: Draft Legislation

File No. From: Govt Sec To: G-2/PSD Date: 7 April 1950  
Capt. Morris  
26-6076

1. Immediate introduction of the attached draft bill in the Diet is proposed by the House of Representatives.
2. Your prompt comment is requested.

1 Incl  
Amendments to the  
Daily Life Security  
Bill

Cy. to PHW, HCS, LS/LJ C. W.

P & P DIV



47

Amendments + Daily Life Security Bill  
HR

From: G-2

To: Govt Sec

CIS/PSD/EBB/HEP/sm  
Date: 7 April 1950

2

PSD/G-2 concurs in the Amendments to the Daily Life Security Bill.

Incl 1 w/d

-----C.A.W.-----



Re: Proposed Amendment to the Daily Life  
Security Law, Proposed Yamashita Gishin,  
Chairman Welfare Committee House of  
Councillors, April 26, 1950.

1. PHW offers no objections to subject proposed amendments to Daily Life Security Law.
2. The amendments were developed jointly between The Welfare Committee House of Councillors and Welfare Ministry and have been discussed with PHW.

J. H. Mitchell

No objection LS (officer) 4/27 by phone.



27 April '50

Re. Proposed Amendment to Daily Life Security Law, Proposer Kobayashi, Katsumasa, House of Councilors, April 26, 1950

1. PHW objects to subject amendment to Article 34 paragraph 3 and in Article 55, by which "acupuncture technician" and "moxa-cautery technician" would be added as "medical treatment" recognized under Daily Life Security Law.
2. Medical Services Division, PHW, objected to inclusion of acupuncture and moxa-cautery in original revised law on grounds that they were not recognized by the medical professional and were not essential to the treatment of sick and ailing persons. The terms were thus ~~also~~ deleted from original draft revisions.

Whitaker.