

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 13

JUNE 20, 1969, TO JULY 1, 1969

(PAGES 16711 TO 18184)

paying military jobs are available. The armed forces should be in a position of bidding for the services of young men who are part of a society that equips all for useful, remunerative civilian jobs and hence gives all a free choice between military and nonmilitary work.

It may be that we continue the draft because we are concerned about the quality of the men who would enlist under a voluntary system. It is a fact, however, that 49 per cent of our current armed forces are true volunteers: they were not drafted, nor did they enlist out of fear of the draft. In Defense Department parlance, they are not "reluctant volunteers." Our experience over the years has given no indication that volunteers are less capable, less brave, or less dedicated than conscripts. On the contrary, the experience of a career serviceman and the opportunity to train him more intensively are apt to improve his effectiveness.

Another danger that one may see in a voluntary army, one that troubles me deeply, relates to its very efficiency and the consequent possibility that our government will have at its disposal, at relatively little cost to the broad body politic, an instrument of potential danger as well as potential usefulness. I happen to believe that it is not desirable to have American armed forces act as world policemen, dispatched anywhere over the world to intervene in other peoples' affairs, however well-intentioned our interventions may be. One inhibition upon such intervention, no doubt greater than ever after our disastrous experience in Vietnam, is the reluctance we must all have to see our youth drafted into such expeditions against their will. But if, out of our large and able population, a small, efficient volunteer force can be obtained who for one reason or another is not loath to fight all over the world in other peoples' wars, may not this potential restraint on any unwise government leaders be lost?

This danger is one that I cannot fully exercise. There is in principle a chance that out of a large population we may find a small class, happy to be paid for violence, who will lend themselves readily to policies and acts in our name, which we will carelessly allow to be pursued because we are not personally involved. If this were to happen the world would be scarred and the good name and reputation and interests of the United States would suffer immeasurably. Our country's only brake against such a syndrome would be—in some measure as it is now—a vigorous and watchful civilian control over our military.

Probably the most usual objective to the idea of a volunteer army is that if we did not draft soldiers we could not get them to serve, but this argument hardly bears scrutiny. The peace-time draft is indeed new to this country, not having been instituted until 1940; until then our armed forces in peacetime had always been recruited on a voluntary basis. Indeed, with the exception of the Civil War, there was no recourse to the draft in any war until World War One. And contrary to some popular impression, the bulk of those actually serving in the Civil War were volunteers. The Civil War draft drew great opposition and little in the way of positive results. Hence, it is clear that it has been possible to man our armed forces without the draft through most of our history. And, it may be added, a number of other countries, particularly Britain and Canada, closest to us in outlook and political institutions, have generally and do currently maintain their armed forces without conscription.

As we have seen, the average nineteen-year-old draftee pays about \$2,000 per year for the privilege of serving—older draftees, who would be earning more at their civilian jobs, pay even more—but this cost appears

nowhere in the budget. A voluntary system would require that the full manpower cost of the armed services be included in the Defense Department budget and appropriation, and that we face up to what our military establishment is costing us. A voluntary system would be more economical and more efficient than the draft for several reasons.

First, it would save on training costs. At present, more than 90 per cent of those who enter the services do not reenlist. This necessitates putting a man through expensive training procedures, receiving the benefit of his skills for one or two years, and then losing him. A new recruit must be trained to take his place. Not only is this procedure intrinsically costly, but it also means that a significant proportion of our most highly skilled military men, men who have chosen the armed forces as a career, must be tied up as instructors. Under a voluntary system in which the average length of service would be considerably longer than the present two or three years, training expenses would be greatly reduced.

Second, an all-volunteer army would be less expensive because it could be smaller. The men would be more experienced and better motivated; hence, they would be more capable and efficient. Fewer of them would be needed and we would have a more effective fighting force.

Third, once the cost of military manpower is placed on the table, the military would be forced to use its people in a more efficient way than under the present system. No longer would we see a highly skilled individual capable of earning, for example, \$10,000 a year in civilian life, doing mental or clerical work and being paid \$2,000 per year, thus costing the individual \$8,000, and depriving the country of \$8,000 worth of productivity. If the services want a \$10,000-a-year man, they would have to pay him \$10,000 a year, and if they are going to pay a man \$10,000, the people and the Congress will want to be sure that the nation is getting \$10,000 worth of service.

* * * * *

Under either system, it might be wise to re-examine our military education and indoctrination programs. I suggest that we can best keep our democracy safe from militarism not by forcing unwilling young men into service, but by impressing upon all of our men in uniform that they are citizens of a democratic country first and servicemen second. Toward this end, I propose that better civilian control be established over all of our military educational institutions and training programs.

PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE

If the time has come for replacing compulsory conscription with a system of voluntary enlistments—and I, for one, am convinced that the time *has* come—then a number of careful steps must be thought out and acted upon. One issue of prime importance is the matter of pay.

Although numerous pay raises for the military have been passed since 1950, most of these have been not for first-term enlisted men but to induce officers and other enlisted men to remain in the armed forces. Nevertheless sheer justice would require that we pay men serving their country more than we now pay. The effect of the current pay rate is to penalize those who display their patriotism in this way; we should, therefore, immediately raise the pay of these men even if, for some reason, we thought the volunteer arm were not feasible.

Such a step, which would be fully justified on grounds of equity, would also provide a test of the feasibility of the volunteer army. If the armed forces were to offer competitive pay and benefits, there would be little need to rely on the draft, and certainly not in peacetime. The effective recruitment pro-

grams already in operation would be given a tremendous boost if potential recruits could expect, as enlisted men, salaries, responsibilities, and opportunities for advancement commensurate with those they would find in civilian life.

However, that justice requires such an action is no guarantee that we will take the action. As long as the draft exists, there is little incentive for the armed forces to try to get wages for first-term enlisted men raised, and there is likewise little sentiment in Congress to raise these wages. It has been suggested, therefore, that Congress set a target date for eventual elimination of the draft. For practical reasons, the draft cannot, and probably should not, be abolished overnight; perhaps, too, the draft classification machinery should be retained for the unlikely event of another war like World War Two; but it must become stated policy of the government to eliminate conscription for peacetime or limited-war situations.

It might be well, once the draft is eliminated, to require an Act of Congress, rather than a mere executive decree, to reinstate it when manpower needs rise. It might also be well to tie future use of the draft to similar restrictions, such as higher taxes or rationing, on the civilian economy, in order to make very such that the politically attractive option of levying the cost of the war on a small and unimportant part of the population is foreclosed.

HIGHER EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk recently about the crisis in financing higher education. At least three bills, having a total of almost 30 cosponsors, have been introduced in the Senate this year to provide for expanded student assistance programs for higher education.

But the need for student assistance is only one aspect of the financial crisis higher education is facing. At a time when enrollments in colleges and universities are increasing at an unprecedented rate, there is a critical need for new and improved facilities. The need for Federal assistance for construction of college and university facilities and the effects of the Nixon administration's budget proposals in these areas are spelled out clearly in an editorial, entitled "Colleges Still Need Construction Aid," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of June 16, 1969. I commend the editorial to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

COLLEGES STILL NEED CONSTRUCTION AID

The prospect of drastic cuts in federal aid to colleges and universities has so distressed the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission that it has told President Nixon his budget recommendations would be "a disaster for higher education."

These figures explain the commission's concern: Federal contributions for construction at four-year colleges, graduate schools and junior colleges in fiscal 1969 total \$249 million; the Johnson administration's budget for 1970 cut this to \$150 million; the Nixon administration's proposal would eliminate all construction money for four-year and graduate institutions, leaving only \$43 million for two-year colleges. A new interest subsidy which would pay charges above 3 percent on

money borrowed privately is proposed—but this would be a costly, deferred payment procedure.

The commission points out that the federal cuts are budgeted at a time when more is expected of colleges than ever before. Enrollments continue to rise at a rapid rate, and as a higher proportion of the population goes to college, instructional costs rise even faster. On Minnesota campuses, the new waves of buildings never quite catch up to current needs.

Federal construction grants in Minnesota during the last five years have amounted to about 26 percent of the total spent on academic buildings at public and private institutions. This infusion of money has generated additional funds and led to improvements in higher education.

The Minnesota Legislature appropriated \$104.2 million for building in the next biennium at the university, state colleges and junior colleges—a little more than half the amount requested by those institutions. It already is clear that if more funds for colleges are not added to the present Nixon budget, state legislatures and private institutions face an almost impossible financial task in the next few years. Seriously overcrowded colleges and deteriorating quality of education are inevitable, if construction cannot keep pace with the number of students.

FARM PIONEERS OF TODAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement and an insertion.

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

FARM PIONEERS OF TODAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, many stories are told of the courage and hardships endured by our pioneer women. It is true these heroic women made tremendous contributions to the development of Kansas and the Nation.

Women on our farms continue to play an important role in the development of agriculture. Though the hardships are minimal by the standards of their grandmothers, today's farm wives have little time for leisure.

An article "Great Plains Women Face New Prospect" appearing in the June 1969 issue of the USDA publication, *Soil Conservation*, tells an exciting story of the deep faith of four farm wives in the land of Western Kansas. I salute these splendid ladies.

SOME REMEMBER THE DUST AND HARDSHIP— "GREAT PLAINS WOMEN FACE NEW PROSPECT"

Some have forgotten the wind and the dust of the 1930's in the Great Plains. Some have forgotten the courage it took to stay and do the grueling work of putting cover back on the runaway land.

Some have forgotten—but not the women who hung wet sheets over the windows and doors to keep out the suffocating dust.

Not the housewives who scooped the dirt out of their homes with shovels.

Not the wives who watched their husbands struggle year after dry year to grow enough food to keep their families alive.

Not the mothers who stood by helplessly and watched their children die of "black pneumonia" caused by the dust clogged air.

These are the women who today know, as well as their husbands, the importance of conservation on the Great Plains.

Conservation which, under the Great Plains Conservation Program, has given the ranchers and farmers of the region a practical and profitable way to prevent a recurrence of the Dirty Thirties.

A TOTAL PROGRAM

It is a total program . . .
. . . to include cost-sharing, credit, and technical assistance in soil and water conservation.

. . . to keep the dust on the fields—out of their homes and their children's lungs.

. . . to make life easier for them and their families.

. . . to give the women time to be women!

These are the women who today, because of this program, have time for outside work, instructive clubs, productive hobbies. Modern conservation farming practices and household conveniences have turned these women into the Great Plains counterparts of 5th Avenue.

By the time they are grandmothers, these women of the Great Plains no longer are wrinkled and old beyond their years.

One such young grandmother is Mrs. Dwight Finney of Simpson, Kans., mother of five and grandmother of 12. Although Dwight signed a Great Plains contract only a few months ago, he has been farming his 2,380 acres the conservation way for many years. Their farm-ranch operation already has six ponds, 2 miles of terraces, 8 acres of waterways, and 60 acres reseeded to native grasses. Future plans call for an additional 55,000 feet of terraces.

HER LITTLE FACTORY

Charlotte still helps in the fields during harvest, but now she also has time to pursue her own interest in ceramics. Her "little factory," begun 3 years ago in the basement, does a \$500 annual business in ashtrays, bowls, and figurines for friends, relatives, and grandchildren.

"I can hardly get anything else done," Charlotte said, "All I want to do is ceramics."

But, as is so characteristic of the Great Plains women, she does get other things done. She helps operate the citizen's band radio used as a fire warning system in the community. She has served as both president and vice president of the Extension Homemakers' unit in Simpson. She won bowling trophies during a tournament 4 years ago.

"I'm really not that good," she said about her bowling. "We didn't have hired help that year, so I was working in the fields throwing hay bales around. We played nine straight games in that tourney. I won because I outlasted everyone else."

OUTLAST AND COURAGE

And, perhaps, outlast is a word that describes many of the Great Plains farm and ranch wives. Outlast and courage!

Courage to outlast the dust. Courage to outlast the doubts and fears and to build again.

Mr. Jeanette Matousek and her husband, Glen, of Cuba, Kans., have this kind of courage. Glen and Jeanette both remember the big blows of the 1930's. That's why they hesitated to buy high-priced farmland. Until 5 years ago they had been doing a lot of good conservation work—but on other people's land. Now they are applying conservation on their own 620 acres.

It was the Great Plains Conservation Program that finally convinced the Matouseks that land was a good investment. They figured that conservation practices give the land resistance to drought and the other hazards of the 30's, and they were experienced in applying them. The new program offered them the opportunity to do the job quickly and with a sharing of the cost burden.

Today, one of their prize possessions is the farm pond which, among other things, is used for fishing by their three children.

Head bookkeeper for the John Bartholomew farming enterprise is wife Tessie. They farm 773 acres in Jewell County, Kans., where like most central Kansas farmers, wheat is their main crop. Theirs is a Bank-

er's Conservation Award Farm for 1966, honored by the Kansas Banker's Association.

ON ALL HIS LAND

John not only practices conservation on his own land but also on the acres he rents. In fact, he does not rent land unless the owner agrees to sign a Great Plains contract to have conservation work done.

Tessie is one of the women who remembers when times were "not so good."

"We didn't have running water until we moved here 10 years ago," she said. "We didn't have electricity until Nancy started to kindergarten."

But, although these women now have time for clubs, hobbies, neighborhood get-togethers, the PTA, or work as 4-H leaders, they still lend a great deal to the farming and ranching operations of their husbands. Many drive the wheat or silage truck and run errands during harvest, in addition to doing the farmyard chores. Many also have livestock enterprises of their own.

Mrs. Dixie Siler and husband Carmen farm 1,200 acres near Minneapolis, Kans. Carmen is a grain farmer. He entered a Great Plains contract because "I knew it would save my soil, and that's what I wanted." Dixie, with the help of their four daughters, is the hog raiser in this joint grain and hog operation. She feeds *his* grain to *her* hogs.

Dixie markets about 500 pigs a year, either as top hogs in winter or feeder pigs in the summer. She has 32 sows, most of them Hampshires and has selected 35 gilts as replacements or additions for her hog "family."

Her kind of enthusiasm, together with the willingness to work hard and try new things, makes it easy to see why the life and the women of the Plains have blossomed from the dust of yesterday into the beauty of today and tomorrow.

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY GOV. JOHN A. BURNS, OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wish today to bring to the attention of Senators the remarks of Hawaii's Governor, Hon. John A. Burns, on the occasion of the recent Flag Day observance.

I think that his remarks most ably remind us of our heritage, our commitment to freedom, and our fervent hope.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY GOV. JOHN A. BURNS, FLAG DAY OBSERVANCE

My Fellow Citizens:

The Red, White and Blue Flag of the United States of America which we honor here today had its origin in violence and revolution.

It began in 1777 in a newly developing nation located in an economically backward region of the world, across an ocean and far to the West of European civilization.

The Flag was made for a people who were cantankerous, hot-headed and hard-headed; divided in their loyalties; diverse in their political, religious, and philosophical beliefs and social customs and jealous of their own petty regional powers and privileges. The Flag was proposed by a wartime government committee. The climate of the times included rumors of scandal, payoff, treachery, disorganized leadership, and the inevitability of failure of the Revolution.

The Flag was designed by a patriot whose name is not known to us today.

It was the result of a resolution offered by the Marine Committee of the Second Continental Congress at Philadelphia and adopted June 14, 1777—192 years ago today.