

Americans held prisoner or missing in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of international standards for the humane treatment of animals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 340. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 341. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

78. By the SPEAKER. A memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the use of an engraving of Mount Rushmore on some denomination of U.S. currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

79. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishing a minimum wage of \$2; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

80. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the creation of a national park in the counties of Texas, Cimarron, and Beaver, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

81. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Federal study of airport noise and operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

82. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting Congress to propose a constitutional

amendment authorizing pupils to pray and have Bible readings in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

83. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishment of a national cemetery in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

84. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Antonio and Maria Nair Puleo and minor child, Claudia Puleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6659. A bill for the relief of Theofanis Koutsiaftis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6660. A bill for the relief of Biagio Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6661. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6662. A bill for the relief of Olivia Violet Tennyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 6663. A bill for the relief of Greta Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6664. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Montemaggiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6665. A bill for the relief of Winston Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6666. A bill for the relief of Maj. Michael M. Mills, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia:

H.R. 6667. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claim to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of the late R. Gordon Finney, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6668. A bill for the relief of Amante and Rizalina Cabalda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 6669. A bill for the relief of certain Filipino nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6670. A bill for the relief of John Vincent Amiraute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6671. A bill for the relief of Chan Gok Yiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 6672. A bill for the relief of Lucius Edward Arnold and his wife, Ann Marie Arnold, and their children, Steven Watkins Lucius Arnold and Patricia Diana Marie Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6673. A bill for the relief of Dionissia Efstanthios Kefalinou Tzinieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 6674. A bill for the relief of Adelaida M. Alinsagay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 6675. A bill for the relief of Faustino Murgoa-Melendrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 503. Joint resolution restoring citizenship posthumously to Gen. R. E. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

48. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Beatrice Miller Montonye, Sarasota, Fla., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Milwaukee County, Wis., relative to use of vendor and voucher payments in AFDC without loss of reimbursement of the Federal share of such aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORT FOR CONTINUED FUNDING OF THE SST PROTOTYPE

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, last week, this body rejected by an extremely close vote, continued funding of the SST prototype development. I supported continuation of the development and will continue to do so.

In the First District of Ohio, which I represent, is located the General Electric plant which has been responsible for the GE-4 engines being developed for the U.S. SST prototype aircraft. Thousands of people working and living in my district will be directly affected by the determination made on the SST project. Since I took office in January of this year, I found myself in the middle of the heated controversy concerning the economic problems, the environmental problems, and the social problems which surround the SST controversy. I held re-

peated meetings with representatives from environmental groups in my district and representatives from the aerospace industry presenting all arguments for and against the SST.

After 2½ months of intense review and study of the ramifications of the SST prototype development, I have concluded:

First, the environmental problems represented with the SST development can be eliminated and will be eliminated if the prototype development is allowed to continue.

Second, the progress made in reducing aircraft and aircraft noise has been so successful that the SST will meet all FAA noise regulations and the approach noise will actually be lower than current subsonic aircraft.

Third, the real tough issues concerning the SST are the economic question and the priority question. Federal expenditures to date have no possibility of being recouped if the SST development is terminated. Continuation of the SST project and the appropriation of the necessary \$350 million will give Congress and the country tangible factual basis on

which to judge the feasibility of full development of SST's by American aerospace industry.

Terminating the SST project eliminates existing jobs in the aerospace industry, forfeits the advantageous position which the airlines have in terms of the international airline industry, eliminates the possibility of repayment, adversely affects future balance of trades and writes off the \$800 million plus investment our Government has made to date in the SST.

I am convinced that the age of the SST is upon us and rejection by this Congress will not stop the development of supersonic plans but only eliminate the possibility of American aerospace industry leading the way in this development.

I believe if the SST is considered as an individual issue, it will merit the support and continuation of a majority of this body. Unfortunately, the SST has become a scapegoat for the dissatisfactions of today's society. Terminating the SST will not relieve urban blight, will not provide new mass transportation systems, and will not make welfare reform an accomplished fact.

These vital areas deserve and will get my individual attention and effort. I think the SST deserves the individual and studied consideration of each Member and I ask that this body review thoroughly the SST funding if we are afforded that opportunity.

**MILITARY MANPOWER PROCUREMENT IN THE UNITED STATES: AN OVERVIEW**

**HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent background study prepared for the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force, Jack Rafuse has provided a complete description of the problems created by compulsory military service. In his concluding section, Mr. Rafuse has provided answers to some of the commonly held myths which have buttressed conscription.

As for the claim of a universal obligation to serve:

Exemptions . . . have proliferated with any conscription law, local or national. The exemptions tend to favor wealthy or powerful groups, and to place the greater burden upon the younger and less powerful. By doing so, they render the citizen's "traditional right and duty" to serve, meaningless.

Some fear that the volunteer force would lend undue power to the military. However, the periods in which the military has commanded the highest percentage of the Federal budget have been those in which conscription has been imposed:

The military share of the budget has been as high as 42 percent or as low as 13 percent during periods when we have relied upon volunteers. When conscription has been in force, the percentage has varied from 45 to 76.7 . . . when peacetime (or Cold War) conscription was in force the military has been allotted 45 to 51 percent of the federal budget.

Regarding the charge that a volunteer force would be more prone to foreign involvement, the historical evidence is all to the contrary:

Only the Mexican and Spanish American Wars might be called volunteer army foreign adventures in any sense of the term, and in each case the American people, the Congress, and the President were more responsible than the military for starting those wars which might have been avoided. The volunteer army had less to do with the beginnings of hostilities than did domestic politics.

In the past thirty years, during which the United States has had conscription for all but fifteen months, there have been four foreign wars and numerous small interventions.

As we begin our discussion of the merits of the volunteer force, the historical background should be considered in assessing the various proposals before us. I commend this item to your attention:

**UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE WITH VOLUNTEER AND CONSCRIPT FORCES**

(By John L. Rafuse)

**PART SIX: CONCLUSION**

American experience with both the draft and voluntary recruitment demonstrates sev-

eral things. First, there is no national tradition of the draft. The United States has resorted to conscription only in 1863-65; 1917-18; 1940-47; and 1948 to present. These facts are well known, but there is much more to be said about each case of conscription. The Civil War and the World War I rationales for conscription bear little resemblance to the system or rationale which has been with us since 1940. Each was different from the present system in theory and application. They contributed nothing to "tradition." Colonial militia drafts for local defense were rarely enforced. The proposed universal service (Knox Plan) of 1790 was rejected by the Congress. The proposals of 1814 were more akin to volunteer-recruitment systems than to a draft. The Civil War conscription was very different from today's; it was enacted in spite of sufficient voluntarism, intended primarily to stimulate voluntarism, and enforced at gun-point. The World War I conscription was based on exclusion rather than the need for greater numbers. Today's draft reflects complacency and acceptance of the *status quo*. It exists, so it is allowed to continue.

Those who claim that the real tradition is in the colonial and state militia systems refer to the fact that the American colonies enacted over 600 laws dealing with the duty of all (except those exempted) to serve in the local militia. However, laws are not enacted where they are unnecessary; nor are laws re-enacted unless original ruling is no longer applicable, or unless it is no longer followed in spirit and in letter. When every person in a small settlement was needed to fight, conscription laws were equitable. If anything, the quantity of the legislation demonstrates that the American tradition is to evade conscription wherever possible.

Another factor which is usually ignored in any discussion of the tradition of conscription must be considered here. The militia and the army originally meant two separate institutions, but that is no longer the case. Through a long evolutionary process, the National Guard and the national armed forces have become nearly indistinguishable in the public eye. This gradual unification has misled citizens. It was once acceptable to have a militia draft, though it was totally unacceptable to have a national army draft. The Knox Plan and the 1814 debates point up the differentiation. During the Civil War, men were drafted into units of the Volunteers—state or local groups—not into the regular forces. By World War I, men were drafted into the Federalized National Guard, and with the 1933 amendment to the National Defense Act, all distinction was destroyed. Men are still not drafted into regular forces but the distinction has no meaning to the draftee. Draftees go abroad to fight at the direct and single command of the federal government. It is no wonder that the talk of "tradition" is confusing and convincing to so many citizens.

Exemptions are also important in any discussion of conscription, and they have proliferated with any conscription law, local or national. The exemptions tend to favor wealthy or powerful groups, and to place the greater burden upon the younger and less powerful. By so doing, they render the citizen's "traditional right and duty" to serve, meaningless.

The phrase "right to serve" implies a choice which did not exist for everyone in colonial times and which has been selectively denied at other times since then. When there were economic, social and political advantages attached to army service, it became desirable. But, in America, military pay has steadily lost ground relative to civilian pay during periods of conscription. First term military pay presents none but the most deprived individual with an economic, social, or political opportunity. For those who do see opportunity for advancement, the choice

is enlistment. The use of the term "right," then, is inapplicable in the context of the draft.

As to the duty, it is currently so compromised by myriad deferments that it falls to the small minority of "eligibles." Such selectivity infringes upon the rights of many who would volunteer and demonstrates that the right and duty are unrelated in the minds of those who set the standards.

Aside from the right and duty, the most important consideration is the manner in which the burden of defense is assigned to individuals. Some justify the draft by saying it enables the nation to respond quickly to a threat. The argument is inapplicable for peacetime. Further, it implies that draft enactments have been difficult to achieve, but that is not the case. The chronology of draft proposals follows:

1790 Knox plan submitted to Congress—never enacted.

1814 Secretary of War Monroe submitted his alternative proposals to Congress. House passed a draft on December 14, 1814. Draft was never enacted since the war ended.

1862 First session of the First Confederate Congress enacted conscription, April 16, 1862. Militia Act (quotas to be imposed by federal government) passed Congress and was signed into law June 17, 1862.

1863 February 9, 1863—Conscription bill introduced into Senate. February 16, 1863—Senate debated and passed the bill. February 23-25, 1863—bill approved by the House. February 28, 1863 final version of bill passed. March 3, 1863 Lincoln signed Conscription law.

1917 April 1, 1917—war declared. April 7, 1917—conscription bill requested. Conscription law signed May 18, 1917.

1940 June 20, 1940—Conscription bill introduced. August 2, 1940—FDR gave public support to conscription. September 14, 1940—bill passed Congress. September 16, 1940—FDR signs the law.

1947 Conscription law allowed to lapse March 31, 1947.

1948 March 17, 1948—new conscription law requested. Law enacted by Congress June 12, 1948, signed by President June 24, 1948. It has simply been extended with only minor changes, from that day to this.

Thus, the draft can be enacted quickly if the Congress feels the threat is real. The "threat perception" of the populace is less important, as demonstrated in 1940. It has taken only a short time to get legislation every time it was requested during the last 110 years. The real key to flexibility lies in the existing forces and the reserves, however, for a draftee takes just as long to train as a volunteer. The draft does not give quick response.

There are other widely held justifications for conscription which are equally weak. The inevitable military coup is a frequently cited fear despite the fact that such a thing has never happened in either the United States or in Great Britain.

Some may argue that this is only the most extreme danger, and that military intervention in domestic politics could be less dramatic, but no less effective, if the military interests were able to impose their will, and if that will was at odds with that of the elected officials or electorate. Once again, there seems to be no historical basis for such a fear, though this is harder to measure. One possible measure would be the percentage of the United States national budget spent on national defense. There, the relevant years are those since the Spanish American War, since that war is generally cited as the one which turned American interests abroad.

Table III.1.9 gives the figures for each period since the end of that war to the beginnings of escalation in Vietnam.

The share of budget, like the time necessary for draft legislation, depends upon the popular view of the threat—the potential gain or loss is tied to concern about national

security. The military share of the budget has been as high as 42 percent or as low as 13 percent during periods when we have relied upon volunteers. When conscription has been in force, the percentage has varied from 45 to 76.7. Even excluding the war years, when peacetime (or Cold War) conscription was in force the military has been allotted 45 to 51 percent of the federal budget. The cause of the high proportion of the budget is likely to be the perceived threat. The greater the threat in the view of the policy-maker, the more money spent on defense and the more likely is conscription. The figures do show, however, that there is no casual relationship between volunteer forces and higher budgets. It is interesting (if nothing else) that the current popular talk and concern about the military industrial complex comes during a period of conscription. One possible reason for this concern might be that conscription has become accepted while the military is presently unpopular, so any change is viewed as a change for the worse. At any rate, American history offers no proof that volunteer armies are a danger to domestic politics.

Further, no draftee is ever in a policymaking position in the armed forces, nor can he hope to attain such a position in his two-year term. Even the inference that by sheer weight of numbers the draftees have something to say about military policy cannot be maintained. Conscript armies have done most of the fighting around the world in the last two centuries. During that time casualty rates have been higher and wars more frequent, so the conscripts have not avoided those wars. Table III.1.10 shows the figures for American wars since 1860.

Wars fought by draftees have been most expensive in terms of lives lost. Battle deaths as a percentage of troops in battle areas have averaged less than one percent in our all-volunteer wars, while in wars fought by draftees, the average is 2.75 and the range is from 1.04 percent to 6.34 percent. These figures do not include Vietnam, where we are still compiling statistics—in each sense of the term.

TABLE III.1.9.—NATIONAL DEFENSE AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Time period	Recruitment system	Percent
1900 to 1916	Voluntary	41.5
1917 to 1919 (World War I)	Draft	64.3
1920 to 1929	Voluntary	33.7
1930 to 1939	do	13.1
1940 to 1945 (World War II)	Draft	76.7
1946 to 1950	do	45.0
1951 to 1954 (Korean War)	do	65.1
1955 to 1964	do	51.7

The so-called "humanitarian" or "poveritarian" viewpoint that an all-volunteer army would be merely a scheme to send the poor off to be killed is baseless and demagogic. At the end of fiscal 1965, the death rate for military personnel was 2.5 per 1000—the same as for civilians of the same age-group—despite the fact that 1.1 per thousand of the 2.5 were combat fatalities. In peacetime, then, the death rate is lower in the military. The causes of this apparent paradox are several. The military is so selective that it accepts only the healthiest, and rejects millions by categorizing them as I-Y of IV-F; those who are acceptable have more dieticians and physicians per capita than do civilians; and the supervision and training of the men concentrates largely on physical well-being. The death rate for professional athletes would probably show the same bias, though professional sport does little to contribute directly to the health of the nation, or to get rid of poverty. In war, on the other hand, both civilians and draftees in battle areas are killed, so the entire argument is invalid.

The opposite position justifies the draft on the grounds that military service is good for people. This is something that "everyone knows." Those who view the armed services as agencies for individual social improvement or rehabilitation, are placing emphasis on the wrong thing. In some cases, a type of rehabilitation may have resulted from a tour of duty in the armed forces, but to justify the draft on such grounds is misguided as well as misleading. The only sort

of social rehabilitation which may result regularly from a tour in the military is that certain of underprivileged individuals who may learn a skill which will enable them to make a far better life for themselves later, whether as civilians or as members of the military. Whether this sort of rehabilitation takes place is dealt with in another section of this volume. Even if it were so, it only points up a problem of civilian society rather than a *raison d'etre* for the draft.

TABLE III.1.10.—COMBAT DEATHS AS A PERCENTAGE OF MEN IN BATTLE FOR AMERICAN WARS SINCE 1865

War	Men in battle areas	Battle deaths	Percent of battle personnel killed	Recruitment method
Civil (Union)	2,213,363	140,414	6.34	Volunteer/Draft
Spanish-American	89,000	385	.43	Volunteer
World War I	1,390,000	53,402	3.87	Draft
World War II	11,938,000	291,557	2.5	Do
Korea	3,228,000	33,629	1.04	Do
Total	18,858,363	519,387	2.75	

Another oft-heard justification for the draft is that for military serves as a melting pot and democratizing agent for people from all sectors of American society. This is patently absurd. Aside from the question of deferments which exclude the majority from the I-A pool, there is the basic inequality of military society. It is a true caste system, and the draftee is the untouchable of that society, powerless to change things or to become equal to the other individuals in the "melting-pot." This argument is too idealistic, even from the point of view that all draftees mix together randomly and evenly, with its untrue also. Any person who has developed racial or religious prejudices before he is drafted is unlikely to be inspired by his new status or his fellow-draftees to change his views. Negroes were barred from Regular enlistments until the Civil War, then accepted only for less pay and unequal rights. They were later excluded from the National Guard until World War I. Then they were drafted in disproportionate numbers, assigned primarily to servile functions, and kept segregated. Only within the last few years has there been a conscious effort to integrate the services. The "melting pot" has never existed. It has always been impossible because of the exclusion and deferment policies—policies which have gone so far at times as to grant paradoxical "furloughs" to industry while men were being drafted into military and others were excluded from service.

The history of the American military system also provides a context for some of the other contentions such as Kenneth Boulding's statement that a volunteer armed force would have to be recruited not only by economic means, but also by "even more of the reinforcement of paranoid political attitudes." This would seem to indicate that only volunteer armies have been guilty of excess in war and that the excess is due to fanaticism resulting from the propaganda necessary to induce voluntarism. Such a claim has no historic base. Wars have become less gentlemanly and formalized since (and definitely beginning with) the American Revolution. The excesses of World War II and the universality of conscription are recent enough and have been well-enough catalogued to disprove Boulding's stand.

INVOLVEMENT IN FOREIGN WARS

Another area of major concern to many in the current debate is that a volunteer military would become more active and aggressive—that it would seek out foreign adventures. One of the bases for such a position is the odd logic by which volunteers are assigned only crass, unpatriotic motives, while those who serve against their will are

considered to be more American or patriotic. Such reasoning seems convoluted, at best, but this point will not be pursued here.

As far as history is concerned, there seems to be no indication that American volunteer armies are more aggressive than conscript forces. Table III.1.11 lists the major wars and conflicts in which the United States has been involved with the method of recruitment for each.

Excluded from the list are a great many minor military exercises, most of which were against the Indians. The list, then, is brief, but it exposes no pattern of increased military activity during periods of voluntary recruitment. Only the Mexican and Spanish-American Wars might be called volunteer army foreign adventure in any sense of the term, and in each case the American people, the Congress and the President were more responsible than the military for starting those wars which might have been avoided. The volunteer army had less to do with the beginnings of hostilities than did domestic politics. In the past thirty years, during which the United States has had conscription for all but fifteen months, there have been four foreign wars and numerous small interventions. This is not meant to say that conscription causes wars (though some do take that position) but rather that the military in the United States is what it has always been, an instrument of foreign policy. The means of recruitment has made no difference in American history. We have had foreign wars with volunteers and with conscripts, and in no case did the war result directly from military agitation for war.

TABLE III.1.11.—AMERICAN WARS AND RECRUITMENT METHODS

Revolution	1775-83	Volunteer
War of 1812	1812-14	Do
Mexican War	1846-48	Do
Civil War	1861-65	Volunteer and draft
Spanish American War	1898	Volunteer
World War I	1917-18	Draft
World War II	1941-45	Do
Korea	1950-53	Do
Vietnam	1964-	Do

Discussions of the all-volunteer armed force are not, then, proposals, to hire and train professional killers to seek out wars around the world and sell their services. They are, among other things, proposals to pay an equitable wage for service provided. Under conscription, military wages have lagged behind average annual earnings in manufacturing. Conscription as an institution practically guarantees that such a lag will develop since any manpower shortage can be made up with little apparent cost. Table III.1.12 shows

the differences in military and civilian wages since the Civil War.

It should be stated here that the American political system has not suffered from the fact that 22 of the 37 men who have served as President have been volunteer military men. None of them seized power, and many of the 22 owe their presidency in large part to the reputation they had built as mili-

tary men. The volunteer tradition has not hurt American institutions nor resulted in more wars. A return to that tradition would restore the ideals of no taxation without representation, and freedom of choice for all citizens. It would benefit the individual citizen, and according to Anglo-American tradition, the individual good is the reason for government.

TABLE III.1.12.—COMPARISON OF ANNUAL MILITARY ENLISTED EARNINGS WITH AVERAGE, ANNUAL EARNINGS IN MANUFACTURING

Period	Annual military pay and allowances	Manufacturing earnings	Ratio	Percentage of forces drafted
Civil War (1865)	\$427	\$410	1.041	2
Spanish-American War (1898)	444	394	1.127	0
World War I (1918)	870	980	.888	59
World War II (1945)	1,587	2,469	.643	61
Korean War (1952)	2,584	3,721	.694	27
1960	3,034	5,020	.604	16
1965	3,567	6,130	.581	16

### SHOULD SECONDHAND 707'S BE SOLD TO CHINA?

#### HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, there is apparently a debate taking place within administration councils on the question of sales of American-manufactured goods to mainland China. In considering this question, it should be noted first that the President himself has set the tone of a new American posture toward China— for in his state of the world report on February 25 he referred repeatedly to "the People's Republic of China." It is a small step, but as Chou En-lai noted a few days later:

Even the United States finally has come to refer to the People's Republic of China by its proper name.

The President has gone further, and has expressed to visitors his personal desire to visit China—or at minimum to take the necessary steps so that his and our children can come to know that vast country firsthand. The recent decision to allow visas to Americans wanting to visit China is a good step in this direction.

In order to do these things, both China and the United States will need to modify somewhat the habits and attitudes of the past 20 years of cold war confrontation. As Americans, as citizens of the world's most powerful nation, we can take the first steps, for as Winston Churchill said many years ago, it is the powerful who can afford to be magnanimous.

One such step has already been taken by the President, in his stated willingness to accept China's membership in the United Nations. The President took another such wise step last summer, when he approved the sale, by the Fiat Company of Italy, of 80 trucks to China equipped with engines of General Motors manufacture.

At the present time, there is another such request—by a French firm—to sell to China 30 heavy trucks equipped with engines and transmissions of American manufacture. This is the issue on which the President's advisers are divided. The Department of Commerce and the Department of State both approve the sale,

according to news reports. The Department of Defense, on the other hand, is characterized by what Commerce officials refer to as "Neanderthal thinking" reminiscent of the worst days of the cold war, and opposes the sale.

It may be that this Neanderthal thinking emanates from the office of Dr. Warren Nutter, Mr. Laird's Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs. Mr. Nutter is well known for his hard-line views on both the Soviet Union and China, but in these matters a broader perspective is necessary. As officials in the Commerce Department have pointed out, if sale of these trucks with American engines is not approved, China will simply approach another manufacturer, perhaps in Germany or Britain, to fill the order. American workers and American enterprise will have needlessly suffered, and China will have been told that whatever the President has said, the cold warriors in the Pentagon really make the policy.

This should not be allowed to happen, and in the Senate we have an opportunity and a responsibility to assure the President that the American people are not willing to approach our relations to China in an unthinking and emotional way. For this reason, the Congress should resolve that every effort be made to open trade contacts with China, particularly when the Chinese show the good sense of requesting products of American manufacture when other and competitive products are also available.

Such is the case with the newest illustration of this problem—and here I refer to China's apparent desire to purchase already-used passenger aircraft of the 707 type. These airplanes are made by Boeing, and they are owned and operated by several dozen airlines around the world. They are very successful, and have been in extensive operation for almost 10 years. I mention this to underline two points:

First, that no new technology is involved in the 707;

Second, that the Chinese interest is apparently in 707's owned and operated by third parties around the world, and for that reason does not require a direct decision by the United States.

The question arises because Mr. James Ryan, a New York aircraft broker, proposes to deal with the Chinese and pres-

ent owners and operators of used 707's to arrange sales. In my view, there is no good reason why the American people or the U.S. Government should seek to oppose the transaction in which Mr. Ryan is involved. If the Chinese are not able to purchase these 707's, there are alternatives to which they can turn. The French, for example, manufacture the Caravelle. Similarly, the British manufacture the Comet. There may be others as well—and in my view none is as good as the Boeing 707, and that of course is why it has won such a wide acceptance around the world. But if the Chinese are forced to, they can find substitutes, and then one must ask, how will the American people have gained by that?

There is every reason—political, economic, and technological—why it will be to the benefit of the United States to work toward a period in which Chinese economic advancement is to some extent related to American decisions, and for that reason I earnestly hope that any necessary approvals of transactions with interested Chinese buyers of these 707's would be immediately forthcoming.

### THE TRANSPORTATION SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM

#### HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the transportation special revenue-sharing program is a meaningful breakthrough in the management of public resources. Nowhere are the implications for rapid improvement clearer than in the troubled field of transportation. We need balanced transportation services in this country. That means moving people and goods. It means providing services for all our people, not excluding the poor, the old, the very young, the handicapped. It means improving intermodal coordination and efficiency of freight movements to insure the continued advance of productivity.

This ideal mobility does not yet exist. As a people we rely too much upon the automobile, which has clogged our city streets, poisoned the air, ruined neighborhoods, absorbed parks, annihilated historic places, and made our cities and suburbs noisy, ugly and uninhabitable. That is largely, because Federal programs have provided massive encouragement for highways and little incentive for local government to improve bus and rail passenger service.

The real power to choose between modes of transportation must be returned to the people. Their local leaders must determine the mix of transportation modes. They should not have to accept programs designed in Washington. That is not democracy—it is bureaucracy. Revenue sharing would return the vital power of the purse to the American people for exercise through elected leaders who know their needs and can respond to them. Revenue sharing means revitalized State and local government throughout this country.

ABANDONED CARS

**HON. GUY VANDER JAGT**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide tax incentives for automobile scrap processing. Joining me today are six Members of the House, including the distinguished minority leader. Forty-four colleagues in this body now have joined this year in the sponsorship of this legislation:

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SLACK, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THONE, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

The need for this legislation grows steadily more acute and more obvious. Any time you drive over the countryside, or travel by train or even by plane, observing America's landscape, you find the scenery marred by an abundance of rusting old auto hulks. Only a few days ago Mr. CEDERBERG pointed out to us that in a recent flight over a small portion of his district, over 2,500 derelict automobiles were observed, while countless others lay hidden from view in deep snow. His experience, unfortunately, was not unique. We have all had similar ones. While the problem has increased each year, Government has taken no action to attack this readily apparent form of environmental deterioration.

America cannot afford this kind of wastefulness. Each auto carcass represents valuable resources which should not be thrown away, but rather reabsorbed in manufacturing and thus put to use for the benefit of society. Furthermore, the ever-present drain upon our steel resources would be significantly eased by the recycling of automobile steel.

Two major problems which currently discourage the collection and recycling of these cars could be met through the legislative process, under terms envisioned in this legislation. First, the task of collecting these scattered discarded vehicles is costly, often so much so as to prohibit individual firms from undertaking such work on their own. This program would earmark \$19 million for each of 4 years as aid to the States to finance collection programs. These funds would be derived from the Federal auto excise tax. States would become eligible to re-

ceive these funds upon the presentation of abandoned auto collection plans to the Secretary of the Interior, under guidelines promulgated by him. In addition, the State would be required to enact legislation making possible the transfer of titles of these cars to a public agency or to private disposal businesses.

Second, the processing of the collected automobiles would be facilitated through the expansion of the capacity of the auto disposal industry, made possible by the extension of amortization benefits to processors who install sophisticated, nonpolluting scrapping equipment.

This legislation represents an opportunity to simultaneously enhance the quality of our environment and provide additional resources for manufacturing, two goals not often combined. It is my hope that Congress, through the appropriate committees, will soon give serious attention to this problem.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS E. DEWEY

**HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Thomas E. Dewey marked the end of a brilliant and achievement-filled career. As a public servant and politician, in the best sense of that word, the former Governor of New York State and presidential candidate, compiled a memorable record. He has left signs of his accomplishments for all the people of New York State and visitors from across the Nation to recognize, including a thruway system and a State university complex which are credits to his far-sighted administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the editorial entitled "Thomas E. Dewey, Public Servant," which appeared in the March 17 edition of the Long Island Press:

THOMAS E. DEWEY, PUBLIC SERVANT

All the bulletins last night reporting the death of Thomas E. Dewey stressed how he rode his reputation as a racket-busting district attorney to New York's governorship and later to two tries for president.

Nearly a whole generation has grown up, dimly aware of this man, knowing him only through these salient aspects of his career—crime-buster and presidential also-ran.

But as winner and as loser, Tom Dewey was a man to reckon with. In 1935 to 1937, as a young district attorney, he led a staff of 20 lawyers, investigators accountants and special police in an attack on Murder Inc., winning 72 convictions out of the 73 cases he tried.

He was no match for Franklin D. Roosevelt and he met his most famous defeat in 1948 when underdog Harry Truman fooled the experts. Although eclipsed on the national scene by President Eisenhower, he continued to play a quiet, but highly influential role in Republican politics as adviser to governors and presidents. Perhaps more than any other man, he was responsible for fashioning the "modern Republicanism" that emerged as the first and most effective challenge to the long entrenched Democratic New Deal.

Yet his most enduring accomplishment remains his record as governor of New York for three terms. He not only gave the state an honest and responsible administration, he initiated programs of immense long-term value to this state. He deserves credit for the state Thruway system, for example, which bears his name. But perhaps his most important and far-reaching accomplishment was the establishment of the New York State University. It was born under his administration and has grown into one of the finest public institutions of higher learning in the land.

Tom Dewey's austere personality always stood in the way of his establishing a warm relationship with the people. But those who opposed him, those who supported him and those who have come after and hardly knew of him, owe him a debt of gratitude for his years of devoted, creative public service.

"AMERICANISM": WHAT IT MEANS TO ME, BY ROXANNE ANDERSON

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, declarations of political philosophy by young people are fortunately not monopolized by the radical element in our society. This country is full of young people who cherish the patriotic tradition of their parents and grandparents. Generally, they do not publicize their allegiance, but occasionally their voices are heard, clearly if quietly. Earlier this month, one such voice was raised in a small town in Iowa. Speaking out proudly in praise of patriotism, Miss Roxanne Anderson, a Girl Scout from Shenandoah, celebrated Scout Sunday by reading her own definition of "Americanism." With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting her essay in the RECORD in its entirety:

"AMERICANISM": WHAT IT MEANS TO ME  
(By Roxanne Anderson)

To me Americanism means (1) a custom, a belief or habit of the people of the United States; (2) a word or phrase of American English, especially one that was first used in the United States, such as "Juke Box" and "Squaw;" (3) loyalty to the United States or to its customs, beliefs and so on; but to me it's all this and more. I would like to express my interpretation of the word "Americanism" like this:

"A" is for "All" the people united together in this great country of ours.

"M" is for the "Many" opportunities offered to the people of this great country.

"E" is for the "Endless" privileges of ours that were made possible and handed down from our forefathers.

"R" is for the "Rich" and productive land which makes this country so great.

"I" is for "Independent," the right to choose your religion, your work, where you want to live, and to vote for whom you wish.

"C" is for the "Courage" it took from the beginning to make this great country what it is today.

"A" is for the "Abundance" of food, clothing and shelter for our people in this great country of ours.

"N" is for "Nation," one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

"I" is for the "Intelligence" of the first settlers in planning for this great country.

"S" is for "Security" secure with the knowledge that this great country is never unprepared for any disaster.

"M" is for "Me," may I never forget any of the great and wonderful traditions, customs or habits handed down to me from my ancestors who struggled and fought to give me this beautiful country with all of its Americanisms.

### IRS JOLTS FIRST OFFENDER

#### HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I, and I would guess, every Member of Congress would like to have the dangerous drug problem eliminated from our Nation's scene.

But like all offenses, we want fair prosecution and fair sentences.

Therefore I want you to read the following news story from the Frankfort, Ind., Morning Times.

This tells of a Vietnam veteran who admitted that he possessed narcotics, was tried and because of his no prior arrest record was given a suspended jail sentence, but was then fined.

After he paid the fine he then learned that the IRS was assessing him for \$14,300. I would like for every Member of Congress to read this news story:

FATHER QUESTIONS SON'S \$14,300 "Pot" ASSESSMENT

(By John A. Harden)

The Internal Revenue Service has a legal right—but does it have a "moral" right—to expect a first offender to pay \$14,300 in excise taxes on marijuana found in his possession?

Harold P. Eldridge of Michigantown answers an emphatic "no" in a case concerning his son Michael, 21. If necessary, the elder Eldridge will "ride a bicycle all the way to Washington" to protest to President Richard M. Nixon.

About three weeks ago, Eldridge wrote to the President, but got an answer instead from the district director of Internal Revenue Service in Indianapolis, since the case concerns a Federal tax matter. "The President didn't even see the letter," Eldridge complained.

Harold, Mike and Mrs. Eldridge brought out some cake and coffee on which to munch while telling of their problems.

July 10, 1970, Michael pleaded guilty to possession of a narcotic drug in Howard Circuit Court. Frankfort police had made the arrest and Mike's case was venued to Howard County.

Harold said that the judge and Clinton County prosecutor at that time, Carol Grafton, agreed that Mike should receive a suspended sentence. His 2-10 year sentence was suspended and Mike was fined a total of \$348.

District Director James E. Daly wrote, "Your son had 142.9 ounces of marijuana in his possession at the time of his arrest and did plead guilty to the charge of possession of a narcotic drug and violation of the Indiana Dangerous Drug Act. Since the law clearly prescribes taxing this marijuana at the rate of \$100 per ounce or fraction thereof, we had no alternative but to assess \$14,300 in Federal excise tax against your son."

Eldridge declared, "Morally, there is no justification for the Revenue Service to expect Mike to pay this."

Mike spent a year in Vietnam and participated in three major operations.

"It was there he learned about the drug which is used freely by the natives," his father said. "Naturally, the soldiers see this open use and many of them aren't acquainted with drugs. I feel if he hadn't been in Vietnam he wouldn't have come in contact with dope. We American taxpayers are all guilty for sending our boys to fight a dirty war and then prosecute them for things they get involved in there."

The family noted Mike had never been in trouble before, and according to court testimony, Mike was holding the drug for a Kokomo boy who was still in the Orient. His "friend" had mailed three packages of marijuana before postal authorities discovered the illegal shipment.

Harold continued, "We, the people, send our boys over there and we shouldn't condemn them for getting involved in something like this. Rather than force any boy to pay, the moral thing for our government to do

would be to give the boys a free slate on a first offense. There should be understanding and forgiveness. I feel the law is meant to prosecute people who are a menace to society—the habitual criminals who are pushing dope on our school children, or anyone else, for profit. Mike is not a user and he definitely was not 'pushing' dope."

Harold and five brothers have served in the armed forces and one was killed in the Battle of the Bulge. "We feel the tax imposed on our son and nephew is unjustified," they wrote President Nixon.

After sending three demands for the excise tax payment, the account was placed in a "temporary suspense file" based upon information that Mike is unemployed and has no tangible assets.

Daly's letter continued, "The statutory period for collection of an assessed tax under normal conditions is six years from date of assessment. When your son is again employed, we will expect him to contact our office and make the necessary arrangements for paying the account. We will give him every consideration within the administrative discretion of this office."

Mike completed only nine grades of school, but he was employed in a Frankfort factory upon his honorable discharge from service. When he was arrested, the factory laid him off. Later, after working two weeks, Mike quit.

He has been working at odd jobs. More than 10 Kokomo and Frankfort factories have never replied to his application for work. "Whether its because of his lack of education or his 'criminal record' that is the trouble, I don't know," Harold said. "He prefers outdoor work such as carpentry and roofing."

The Eldridges feel their only recourse is to appeal to the President. "My intention is to still try to contact him even if I have to ride a bicycle to Washington to see him," Harold said. "I don't feel I can afford to hire a lawyer because I am the sole support of a family of seven."

"As one father to another, I ask you to do something about this," Harold wrote to the President.

The Eldridges admit that Michael did wrong, but they feel a first offender with no criminal record should be shown mercy.

How long the matter will remain in the "temporary suspense file," they don't know. For the three payment demands they received, they found the \$14,300 was subject to an interest penalty of one per cent per month, or an additional \$143 each month.

## SENATE—Wednesday, March 24, 1971

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 23, 1971)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator from the State of California.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*May the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Lead us so that Thy will becomes our will. May Thy purposes for man be furthered by our service in this Chamber this day.*

Once more we remember before Thee all prisoners of war. Wherever they may be and whatever their lot, keep them close to Thee. Shelter them by Thy grace, heal their diseases, assuage their pain, and keep their faith and hope alive for the better day that is yet ahead. Infuse

their captors with compassion and with a new sense of justice. By drawing close to Thee may we be kept close to our fellow citizens who serve and suffer on our behalf.

In the name of the Great Burden Bearer. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator

from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. TUNNEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 23, 1971, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.