

S13788

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20, 1970

I would like to call attention to several significant new programs in the Illinois budget. The total dollars involved are comparatively small. But each has importance far beyond its dollar amount. These are innovative developmental programs. Echoing Justice Brandeis, Governor Ogilvie said:

I am convinced that the state must be the laboratories for the nation. Ours is the opportunity to launch new starts without wasting money in potential failure.

If these programs—in housing, manpower, rehabilitation of prisoners and social services—prove successful, they can be expanded. The objective at this time is to advance each of these programs prudently and well, and to carry them through with quality performance.

First. Housing: The traditional State role in housing has undergone qualitative expansion since the beginning of the Ogilvie administration, and it will continue to do so through innovative programs under the Illinois Housing Development Authority. This year's budget for housing includes \$1 million for a slum rehabilitation program under which rents withheld by the department of public aid will be added to proceeds from receivership certificates.

Second. Manpower: Manpower training efforts are budgeted in several major departments to link people with jobs in industry, and to take people off welfare rolls and put them on payrolls, an objective I have long sought and the reason why I support the Nixon program of welfare reform. Our State administration is actively seeking out potential trainees for the new work-incentive program by making sure that special teams of doctors, day-care specialists, and counselors are in contact with welfare recipients. Moreover money has been budgeted for intensive minority group recruitment and training programs within State government.

The most basic challenge of crime control, of course, is to do more than merely punish offenders. We must rehabilitate them. The Illinois Department of Corrections' budget has been increased by 20 percent to do this. It will concentrate upon remedial education of the one-third of its inmates who are functionally illiterate and will revamp its vocational training program. It will shift its emphasis from isolated institutions to communities, where through group homes, half-way houses and intensive counseling it can supervise men while they do useful work.

The Ogilvie administration cooperated fully with the Illinois Law Enforcement Officers Conference I sponsored in Washington this month.

Third. Social services: The State budget also renews the request for funds for experimental social service work designed to end the redtape and the confusion which permeate Government efforts to help people who need help. Results from projects now in the design stage may show that with new management programs the effectiveness of the welfare system can be dramatically improved. We cannot just strike out senselessly at this system even though we recognize its obvious deficiencies.

Through sound fiscal management, continuing review of program development, and the proper allocation of its limited resources, the State of Illinois is better meeting its responsibilities and serving its people.

Mr. President, I commend Governor Ogilvie and the members of the general assembly for their outstanding record and recommend a study of this record to my colleagues in the Senate who so graciously have shared their own creative thinking in many areas with me.

PROPOSED USE OF UNUSED HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS FOR URBAN MASS TRANSIT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, this year the CTA raised its fare to an all-time high of 45 cents to keep from going broke. And the bus systems in Joliet, Danville, and Peoria failed for lack of funds.

Urban centers are finding it more and more difficult to get funds for adequate urban mass transit. Yet last year the highway trust fund had a surplus of over \$2 billion in unobligated funds.

That situation seems pretty ludicrous to me.

I have cosponsored a bill to allow highway trust fund money to be used for urban mass transit. The money could be used to purchase equipment and to retire debts incurred by forward-looking mass transit systems like the CTA, which obligated itself and is now having difficulty paying off bonds.

I strongly feel that as long as mass transit systems are raising rates or failing or both because of lack of funds, enormous amounts of money should not be going unused when their judicious use in mass transit may help greatly in relieving the pressure on highways in or in proximity to our metropolitan areas.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.A. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly, partly on a matter of procedure concerning the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon and other Senators, which incorporates the plan of the so-called volunteer army.

Let me preface those remarks by a brief statement. This is more than an amendment, as that term is ordinarily understood. It is a basic, sweeping change in policy in our plans for national security and for the plan of having the manpower available to carry out those policies.

In effect, it would say that we are not going to have a selective system any longer, after it expires on June 30, 1971. Instead, we are going to have the so-called volunteer army.

This amendment, as an amendment, in its present form, is opposed by the President of the United States.

President Nixon made a recommendation on this subject matter. He appointed a commission and that commission made an affirmative recommendation which was filed sometime in April of this year.

But when the matter was coming to the floor and was being pressed in a serious manner, I needed to know exactly what the position of the White House was. I therefore made that inquiry and I got an answer.

I am authorized to say on the floor of the Senate that in its present form, and as a part of the procurement bill, the President of the United States is opposed to it.

Generally, what he favors in this field would be the orderly and regular development of a legislative enactment contemplating hearings, and contemplating the ordinary procedures necessary to a substantial change in policy.

I have not talked to the President myself, but I talked to one representing him directly. I do not think it is necessary for me to go any further than to say that the White House has backed up what I have just said. I will give the name of the man I talked to, upon request of any Senator. It is no secret. I have not spoken to the President. I just do not want to go any further than I should. But I had to know on that point, and I got the answer.

I state that as a fact now, as a part of my background of thought that, after all, this is not an ordinary amendment.

Now, Mr. President, in a bill of this magnitude—

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question at that point, for clarification? Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Do I correctly understand that the President has provided the Senator from Mississippi with some written statement on his position on this amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. No, he has not. He has not. We need not waste a bit of time in questioning now how the President feels about this, I do not think.

August 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 13787

appropriate because the budgetary process should provide direction to State government. For only with the discipline that the chief executive can bring to bear through fiscal controls can we hope to achieve our vision for Illinois.

This budget is superior, in my judgment, to any Illinois budget in recent years in allocating money where it is most needed. Before last year executive review of budget requests was limited. Individual agencies often dealt directly with the legislature. Agency submissions often were passed on to the legislature without change. Once appropriation bills were enacted into law, the Governor had no mechanism to control expenditure of money by the agencies.

This year, the Illinois Bureau of the Budget within the office of the Governor has breathed new life into Illinois State government. No new taxes, reduced operating costs, and smaller payrolls are the direct results of the modern tools of management approved by this general assembly and utilized to the fullest extent possible by the Ogilvie administration.

In place of the decades-old procedure of allowing agencies to submit budget requests with little or no executive direction and then passing on the entire package to the legislature, we have substituted a system of controlled executive budgeting. Department heads submitted their final requests this year only after receiving detailed guidelines and policy determinations about the direction of the State's overall program. As a result, no less than \$350 million was cut from the original requests before the final budget was presented to the general assembly.

In applying tight fiscal controls the Ogilvie administration stressed four management objectives:

First. Cutting costs. The goal is to insure that all the State money is spent efficiently. Previously, Illinois has had no effective control over the cost of State government. This year, Governor Ogilvie instituted a system of apportioning funds to State agencies every 3 months. Under the former practice, agencies were free to spend at will without controls during the entire 2-year life of their individual appropriations. Now they must justify their commitments and costs each quarter. The apportionment system has enabled the administration to conduct an ongoing budget and expenditure review throughout the year.

In addition, a cost reduction team has been trained to review ongoing agency operations. Each agency is compelled to assume that its operations will increase in productivity through experience and effective management.

Second. Holding down State employment. State government has always employed too many people to do the jobs assigned, a problem that plagues our State governments, particularly those with outmoded spoils systems. The result has infected all State government operations. Our present Illinois State administration is determined that there not be more people on the State payrolls than are needed; coincidental with this goal is a determination that each State employee earn his keep.

The Governor has instituted a personal control system designed to provide the information required to insure that people are employed only where they are needed.

Third. Getting government out of activities it need not be in. One of the basic functions of State government is to provide people with services that they truly need and want. All too often, however, government continues to operate programs that are no longer effective. Frequently, traditional formulas for distributing funds become excuses for avoiding the hard decisions. The budget review provides an opportunity to examine the base of each State program.

The Governor has served notice that next year he intends to look at traditional institutional funding practices and formula grant programs just as critically as his administration surveyed operations this year.

Fourth. Accountability. State government has not been held accountable as it should have been. In the past agencies have proliferated so that responsibility became diffused and avoided. Over 50 agencies with separate appropriations report directly to the Governor.

Many governments, facing a troubled society and major new demands, have taken the easy route of reorganization, at the top, into super-agencies. All too often nothing has changed below. This year careful consideration is being given to the reorganization of the executive branch. This will be reorganization from the bottom with the emphasis on programs, not hastily imposed box shuffling from the top down.

This approach means that Illinois is attempting to make every tax dollar provide the maximum possible benefit for those who pay the bills, the general public. It means the Ogilvie administration is putting an end to programs which are no longer effective, and phasing out jobs that are no longer necessary. Sound management also demands accountability. Illinois is avoiding the easy answer of reorganizing at the top to simply create a more ponderous bureaucracy.

It also means that my State has instituted a system of controls which will bring under a continuing review the spending process of government—thus ending the year-end rush to spend all appropriations in order to justify the same or a higher budget the next time around.

The evidence of this kind of sound management philosophy can be found on every page of the detailed State budget document itself. And the result has been good news for our people in 1971—no new taxes.

And probably most important of all, the 1971 budget actually reduces the operating costs of Illinois government. This means that more State tax money will return to the communities and individual citizens of Illinois—in the form of unrestricted bloc grants to local governments, aid to hard-pressed police departments, assistance for hard-pressed school districts, and help for the needy, the sick, and the disabled. And fewer tax dollars will be staying behind in the agencies and departments of the bureaucracy.

Sound management, of course, is only half the battle. The other—and equally important—half is the establishment of firm, clear priorities for the allocation of our limited resources. The fiscal year 1971 budget for my State reflects those priorities.

It provides for the strongest and most far-reaching program of environmental protection in the history of our State—or of any State in the Union. Every power proper and necessary to arrest the continued damage to our air, water, and land is contained in that legislation. The general assembly also approved appropriations necessary for hard scientific study of pollution problems and ways of solving these problems.

The State has undertaken a massive program for land acquisition for public parks and recreation areas, and funds have been appropriated to permit State installations to come into complete compliance with high standards of pollution control. Moreover a long-range plan to help finance sewage treatment projects in Illinois communities to abate the major source of water pollution in our lakes and rivers will be put to the voters at this coming general election.

Social legislation with the potential for making historic breakthroughs got priority attention this year. It includes an expanded program of providing day care for children to free their mothers to work and to learn, a new school breakfast program for the hungry, and continued pilot efforts in welfare services aimed at breaking the cycle of despair and defeat among the poor.

For education, the State is providing more money than ever before in the history of Illinois—nearly \$1.7 billion—to aid local schools at all levels, to provide increased support for State colleges and universities, and to broaden substantially the opportunities to provide financial assistance for deserving students.

The current State budget implements new programs and funds for housing, an area of great personal interest to me, that made it possible for Illinois to qualify for private foundation grants and Federal funding. This support, in turn, may lead to dramatic progress despite the current stagnation in housing development.

For correctional work and law enforcement, there are major new efforts to educate and rehabilitate prisoners. Additional agents were authorized for the Illinois Bureau of Investigation, and a high level of support was given to the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission to allow it to continue as the best such State-directed effort in the Nation.

Tax relief has been extended to larger numbers of the elderly and special assistance was given to local governments which will feel the impact of the exemptions granted individuals from the hated personal property tax.

For road building, the legislature has approved the largest program in our history to rebuild and extend a system that had fallen into a State of disrepair and neglect. Necessary funds have been provided to create a new major airport near East St. Louis that potentially can be the catalyst to restore prosperity to this sadly impoverished area.

August 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 13789

Mr. HATFIELD. May I ask another question?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. HATFIELD. I understand that the President's position on the concept of a volunteer military is that he has very definitely come out in support of it. Both during the campaign and, I think, when he appointed the Gates Commission to make this study, he indicated his support. I am a bit confused as to whether the President is expressing himself on the concept of a volunteer military or on the timing or implementation.

Mr. STENNIS. I said, as plainly as I could, that the President opposes this amendment, as an amendment to the bill. The thing that he favors about the volunteer army is a bill which would be enacted in the regular course of the legislative process. That is what he, in effect, has already said over and over, and made a start on it with the Gates Commission.

Now I want to continue, as that is the situation.

Mr. HATFIELD. This has been a telephone conversation with the President with the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. No. I said I had not talked with the President. I am not in the habit of quoting people by name from the President. I have my facts.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am not challenging the Senator's facts. I just want to understand what the facts are, as to whether the Senator talked with the President, or a staff person, in writing, or what.

Mr. STENNIS. I told the Senator that I do not have it in writing. But I have it. I can back it up.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I thank the Senator for his questions.

Mr. President, another thing that affected me, I cannot agree to a request here for a few hours debate on this measure. I think the Senate is due an explanation on that.

There comes a time when the man who is the so-called manager of a bill must make up his mind what his duty is.

Thus, confronted with this amendment, so seriously pushed yesterday afternoon, I saw that I had to decide what my duty was, not what I would like to do.

Accordingly, I was satisfied that my duty was to say that this matter should not be passed on by the Senate in its present mood, until it is fully debated and the facts are known to the membership, and to get those facts out. It just cannot be done in these few hours. I have proposed to develop the facts here on the floor as best I can, as will others.

Another point that weighed on me was that the amendment, in its present form, calls for a \$4 billion increase per year—a \$4 billion increase per year, Mr. President, in the budget.

I do not know of any time in the history of the Senate that it has ever passed a new policy and a new bill that added—and this is just wartime, like World War II—that added \$4 billion to the budget with 4 or 6 hours of debate. Of course not.

This thing has got to be developed on the facts, as far as it can.

The \$4 billion is actually \$4.3 billion, and that is the lowest responsible estimate that I know of. It is generally admitted that it may be more. Some think considerably more.

So, I reached the conclusion as to what my duty was and I do not hesitate to try to carry it out.

I want to mention that I am getting the actual facts together that will have a bearing on this issue.

It is said that we are going to get men who will take volunteer courses to carry out this policy.

We are at war now, Mr. President, and I want it to end; but I do not favor just pulling out, regardless.

The amendment would increase the pay of an E2, which is the corporal level, \$160 a month.

My commonsense tells me that that is not going to get the men to do the job that we are involved in now. We are already in war.

I am going to show the full facts from authenticated official figures before the debate is over. But as a preliminary matter, the riflemen in Vietnam represent 16 percent of the Army in Vietnam. But they took 54 percent of the casualties.

When we add the mortarmen and the tank helpers that go along with the riflemen, they constitute only 22 percent of the Army in Vietnam. But they took 67 percent of the casualties in the fiscal year 1970.

Those are official figures in Vietnam. Can we argue here that we are going to get men to volunteer for a \$160 a month increase in pay to go into a situation like that? I do not think so. At least, the matter should be weighed more than it can be here on the Senate floor.

I am going to develop these figures more at length. They are not classified. They show what we are up against.

Those are just some of the matters that come to my mind more readily that have a direct bearing.

The volunteer army may be all right once the shooting is over. I do not just condemn everything about it, but I think personally that it will be many years before it would work.

Those who sponsor the call lay down certain necessary transition steps to take. I am talking now about the President of the United States. He is the man who sponsors the call.

Mr. Laird in a recent letter to me in response to a request I made for his ideas on this amendment said:

This amendment assumes the termination of the draft legislation in July, 1971. I am convinced that the military manpower need will require the continuation of the draft beyond that date.

I point out that the President in his April 23, 1970, message to Congress stated that steps to reduce the draft call to zero, increase the number of volunteers, and to end the draft system should be initiated subject to overriding considerations of national security.

In stating his position, the President provided three safeguards in proposing the termination of the draft.

First, the draft could not be ended all at once. There must be a phase-out of the system in order to secure maintenance of our defense posture in each step.

Second, it would be necessary to extend the induction authority beyond July 1, 1971.

This is the President speaking and not the Senator from Mississippi.

I continue to read:

Third, as reliance on the draft is decreased, a standby draft mechanism for emergency use should be developed.

The amendment does not provide for these essential safeguards.

I will develop this later. I want to bring out now some of the major things that this amendment does, and would do, contrary to the recommendations of the President of the United States. He is, of course, the one whose opinion carries weight. Even though some might have suggested it before he did, the President is still the real father of this proposal. So, those points will have to be debated and argued.

I call on those who sponsor the amendment to give some solid, sound reasons to show why the President is wrong, where he is in error, and where he cannot sustain these reasons that he gives.

Let us not refer to the Commission. I have great respect for the Commission. The responsibility of that Commission was over when its report was filed. They are eminent men. They did the best they could.

I know some of them and I respect those that I know and I respect the reputation of all of them. But I doubt that they talked to a GI since World War II. I doubt that they have talked to any GI concerning the things he thinks about since World War II. That was a long time ago. Maybe some of them did. I hope that they did. It sounds kind of like a remote proposition.

Mr. President, I think the President of the United States has had more contact by far—I know he has—than any of the Commission members have within the last few years with this problem. Those are some of the things in the background of my mind.

I want to identify the statement of the President to which I have referred. It was a message from the President relative to reforming the draft system, 91st Congress, second session, April 23, 1970. That was referred to our committee. There were hearings. As I have said, I am not trying to kill the whole concept of a volunteer army.

The thing that I have been concerned about in the hearings has primarily concerned the extension of the draft, which I think is absolutely necessary. It expires by operation of law next June 30.

This matter came up last December after the House had passed an amendment providing for what we call the lottery system. There was a feeling and a sentiment in the Senate that, when that matter came to the floor, it would have a lot of amendments tied to it. It was already about November, as I recall.

I felt certain that, if there were a lot of amendments, the matter would not pass in conference.

I favored the so-called lottery system. I remember that we talked to the leader about it. However, skipping over all of those things, there was an understanding that, if the amendment that the House had passed was permitted to come to the floor and not be amended, that in early 1970, this year, our committee could

start hearings on the proposition of the extension of the Selective Service Act. That was agreed to. I agreed to that, and the bill came on the floor and was passed without the scintilla of amendment. It became law. The President got his request on that matter. I think as a whole that it has operated all right.

Mr. President, I want those Senators who are present to listen to this. We were back in session in January and February. General Hershey was retired and a new draft Selective Service man was to be selected.

Mr. President, I will go back just a little. As early as last fall when this agreement was had we had a man in Selective Service assigned to the preparation of these hearings. Mr. Braswell, our Chief of Staff, worked with him during that preparation, and they made a lot of headway getting ready for these hearings that I planned to hold.

They had to have a head of Selective Service. Without recalling names, several persons were discussed and it took a good while. Finally, Mr. Tarr was selected. I thought he was an outstanding choice. He was approved and he went into the matter with his sleeves rolled up. I said, "What about hearings?" He said, "Please give me time." I thought he was entitled to it.

We called on the White House for a bill on Selective Service extension and they had to work on it a good deal but they got it together. However, time was running all the while and we had to start our hearings on this massive bill that is now before the Senate.

I made some effort and thought a lot about the appointment of a subcommittee for hearings on the Selective Service. It is a sticky subject. I just never did get to the selection of that committee. I am thinking now in terms of the Selective Service Act.

In the meantime discussion about the volunteer army came up, and that report was filed in late April. I recall that Mr. Gates came by my office and talked about it before they filed it. In my mind, and I know everyone agreed with me, the Selective Service hearings would bring up the subject of the volunteer army.

I never dreamed that, with the exception of some opposition, the proposal would be not to have Selective Service continue. The war was still on. According to the President's plan, it would probably continue a while, and the President himself was saying all the time, "We have to have a transition and I have to have an extension of this Selective Service."

The Senator from Massachusetts had been in favor of hearings early, and he continued to be in favor of them. I conferred with him from time to time. We got into this massive bill, and we had subcommittees running day and night. They held hearings. That has already been described.

This is a huge bill and we had witnesses of all kinds. We finally got to the markup of the bill and we spent 2 weeks on that. Then, there was the campus unrest and everything else going on by then. That loomed pretty large in my mind about opening those hearings then.

It was not the proper time to get at it in that atmosphere. I wish to be frank about the matter. I knew the House would not start hearings unless it was after the election. That is part of life, running for reelection. We had men running for reelection, too. That added to the problem. It was not reason enough, but it was part of the picture.

Anyway, I always thought we should have hearings as soon as we could. I was prepared for them. I expected and really wanted the volunteer army matter to come in with the hearings and as part of those hearings. I still think the only logical way to hold hearings is to have the hearings on the extension of Selective Service.

Am I impinging on anyone's time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. STENNIS. Then, we could take up the volunteer army as maybe a segment of those hearings, as soon as we get this bill off the floor, whenever that is, and subject to the necessary duties our committee will have and that many members of the committee will have in conference on this bill, which I hope will be short. This is the very matter I expect our committee to take up next, and I am talking about in the year 1970.

It is a matter of making room for other things that will be coming along. I want to get Selective Service hearings started in 1970, and that will include this volunteer army concept. We will get the views of the Secretary of Defense and anybody else in official life, and outside witnesses. We will be churning along on this matter because we are already ready on the Selective Service part.

Now, I stated a moment ago the White House sent down its proposals. I am reminded now that it was limited to giving the President discretion in this student deferment and a change in the quota system. We do not yet have an actual bill for extension of Selective Service from the administration. We have several proposals from Senators, one of them being rather long. We have bills for the volunteer army. However, we do not yet have an actual bill on Selective Service extension as a whole, although we know about what it will contain. We know the problems that go with it and that have been worked on.

If we can get this bill off the floor and subject, as I said, to the situation with respect to the conference, the hearings on Selective Service and also the volunteer army will be the next order of business.

I revert to what I started to say in the beginning, to outline the matter briefly, about the matter being pressed for passage here as a part of procurement for the military services. I do not blame anyone, but I think before it is passed the facts should be before the membership in the best way we can get the facts under the circumstances. I am getting together all those facts, as are other Senators, and we are trying to draw these issues as well as we can.

I warn the membership of this body that we are running far, far ahead of time; we are running away with the recommendations of the President. It seems to me we are closing our eyes to the war that is going on in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, I think it will continue for some time under the policy of the President, which I am supporting.

Now, to come in here contrary to his recommendations and his wishes and pick this thing up off the floor without really a chance to develop all the facts and put it on such an important bill, a bill that must pass this year because they cannot make appropriations until this bill passes, I think is a highly unwise thing to do. I think it would cause harm; I think it is unsound. I think it would seriously jeopardize our security—not some alliance; I am not thinking about some obligation we have on the other side of the world.

I am thinking about the security of our Nation, our people. I am concerned about the war we are already in. It is on the other side of the world. I feel a precipitate withdrawal there would cause us far more trouble in the future than we are in now. There is a difference of opinion on that.

I think we have to meet these facts as they are, rather than as we would like them to be.

Whatever merit the proposal has, it ought to stand on its own rather than be brought in here as a part of this bill. I will oppose it to the utmost for the reasons I have given.

Mr. President, that states, in brief form, the reasons I have in asking for more time to gather the facts and debate this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have no intention now, or ever in the future, of debating with my chairman. I hold him in as high a respect and admiration as I do any man that I know in this world. I am not going to dispute anything that he said, because he speaks from years of accumulated wisdom, far superior to mine.

I would, however, like to reemphasize several things I said yesterday. While they might be termed "rebuttal," they are not; they are just a restatement of this amendment because I happen to be one of the cosponsors.

First of all, this amendment does not repeal the draft. I want to make that abundantly clear. The draft ends automatically the end of June, 1971. If the Congress wants to renew the draft, it can do it; but this amendment has nothing to do with July 1 or June 30, 1971.

I like to think of this proposal as I used to think of a promotion when I was in business. If I had an idea to advertise, to attempt to get more customers or keep customers, I did not spring it overnight. I would sort of urge them on, entice them, you might say. I think that is something this measure does. Before we can ever talk about a voluntary military, we have to let the troops know that they are going to get more money, they are going to get more fringe benefits; and I do not think the time to do that is July 1. I think we should pay it to them now, so that they can be thinking about it, and think, "Well, by golly, maybe the grass is greener in my uniform than it is going to be in my backyard at home, looking for a job."

The pay increases, the fringe increases,

are, to me, the real meat of the Gates Commission report.

We have raised the pay of the military several times in the last few years, but I do not think anybody can say that the military pay, particularly in the lower enlisted grades and the lower officer grades, would be enticing enough to anybody to say, "I want to be a soldier." Yes, there are many young men in this country who look forward to wearing the uniform, and they do not care about the pay, just as we have many young men in this country who are going to become ministers and do not care about the pay. We have many men in this country who engage, in many areas, in politics that are not profitable. I cannot make that same argument about the Senate and the House. Many men are going to become policemen and firemen; certainly the pay is not what attracts them to that. But whether we can get the 75,000 men a year that we need to keep a standing Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps going I think is something we cannot gamble with. Certainly, a little more enticement is going to help.

So all this amendment really does is say, "Look, fellows, here is what you are going to get if you decide to stay in the military."

I can say that the last pay bill had a very salutary effect on the troops, and I think this one will have the same effect.

I became interested in this subject a long time ago, I think before anybody else in the country. As I said yesterday, I have spent 37 years in the Active Reserve, the Air Force, and the National Guard. In my last 5 years, when I was in the Senate, before my self-imposed sabbatical leave, I had a Mobilization Day assignment, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel for the Air Force. That meant that if war came, within 10 days I would put on a blue suit, march over to the Pentagon, and be a Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.

So I have spent a good many years in that area. I have taken whatever correspondence courses could be taken on military pay and on control of personnel.

Looking at the number of dropouts that we have every year in just the Air Force alone, young enlisted men who had spent 4 years, say, studying electronics at Keesler Air Force Base, or photography, or hydraulics, or engine maintenance, only to lose them and see them go to work for some company at a much better salary, I became convinced that we could save money by this move.

Dr. Milton Friedman is a member of the Gates Commission. I am not. He is a learned economist. I am a layman at best. But I have had quite a bit of experience in the personnel field in both civilian life and in the military. Both he and I agree that there ultimately will be a saving.

Here we are talking about what I have to confess are estimates. The Gates Commission is pretty much talking on guesses. The figures the military will use to oppose this amendment are guesses. My guess at one time was that the Air Force would save \$1 billion a year if there were a proper pay scale and fringe benefit improvements and promotion improvements to entice young men into

making the Air Force their career. I apply this to every other branch. Possibly in the Air Force there has to be more of an education program because we are in a little more sophisticated area than the other services find themselves in—without any reflection on the other services.

So I feel that my original motive in this matter certainly has not changed. We are not proposing to end the draft. We are merely proposing to set the foundation stones on which we can build a voluntary military service.

The question arises, what are we going to do in an emergency? What have we always done in an emergency? The Congress has passed draft laws. We had one in 1917. We had one in 1940. We had one again in 1948, and the one passed in 1948 has never been rescinded.

In the amendment that the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I, and other Senators are sponsoring, we provide for something that has never been provided for before—a real basis on which to build a working Reserve. After 37 years spent in the Reserve I think I know a little about it, perhaps not as much as some people know, but more than most people know. We have never had a universally effective Reserve force in this country, except for the ground National Guard and now the Air National Guard, and some segments of the Reserves which are active in air transport. We have never had a Reserve, for example, that could be called up. I remember back in 1939—I was then a first lieutenant in the Infantry Reserve, I think it was the 317th Brigade, though I may have forgotten it—but they called up all the officers. First of all, we had only half officer strength, and only three of us could pass the physical. That would have been a heck of a division, marching off with three officers, three first lieutenants with rifles on their shoulders. I have never seen any improvement in the Reserves since, except the National Guard, ground and air, and I would add the Navy, although I do not think the Navy, outside of the air component, could muster a real reserve force.

When I think of Reserves, I think of young men in this country up into their thirties, who have had some exposure to military training. I do not necessarily mean ROTC. I can remember the days of the Citizens Military Training Corps, that gave us many fine officers in World War II, and its training consisted of a month each year for 4 years, and then an examination, and the young man would be commissioned a second lieutenant in the Reserves.

We are turning out, contrary to what Senators might hear in the media or read in the newspapers, more Reserve officers than we ever have in the ROTC. The Air Force alone has about 140 requests from colleges that it cannot meet. The Army has about 67; I think that figure is substantially correct.

So the source of our officer strength, the ROTC, is not disappearing. We wish we had had better reception at some of the colleges where we have it, but it has not been received, and I suggest that the Pentagon take it out of all the schools that do not want it. If some of our fine

eastern and western colleges do not want the ROTC, let us take it away from them and give it to some of the little schools that do want it, because frankly, I think we get a finer grade of officers from the smaller schools anyway.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I was interested in the Senator's point, because two colleges in my State of Kentucky have been seeking for 5 years or more to have ROTC installed in those colleges, and they have the support of both the faculty and the regents and the student body. One of them has more than 8,000 students.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator, and I happen to know that is true, because I have seen those two schools listed among those that want to have an ROTC program, either Army, Air Force, or Navy.

But, not having had what you could really call a reserve system in this country, where we could call the troops up, except in the cases I have listed, this bill is designed to provide a starting base for a Ready Reserve. One of the ways in which that can be accomplished is that we are going to require the continued registration of every young man in the country. This does not mean he will be drafted; it just means we will have the name and address of every young man, and then we can try—we are not going to force him—but we can try to interest the young man in taking some kind of military training. I do not mean 25-mile hikes and all that business, but at least to understand what war is and why nations have to go to war sometimes, to understand the need for discipline, and to begin to understand the need for leadership.

I think we could do a pretty good job with young men of this country if we approached them on a voluntary basis and said, "Look, we have a voluntary Reserve in this country; it would be to your advantage to join it. We are going to pay you a little bit to attend drills; you are not going to get rich on it, but one thing you are going to do, you are going to know a little bit something about being a soldier or an airman or a sailor or a marine, and if it ever becomes necessary to institute the draft again, you will be called."

I think I can speak with experience greater than that of any other Member of this body who has been in the service in saying that the man who has been exposed to training is usually the man who does not get hurt. It is the man we try to make a soldier of in 6 weeks, or an airman of in 8 weeks, or a marine of in about the same time, who just does not understand it, and he is more prone to be hurt than the other men. I would use that argument with any of my grandchildren, in urging them to take some kind of military training.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have read some of the comments of the Senator from Arizona on this question at other times.

S 13792

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20, 1970

Just looking through the amendment, is there a provision in this amendment to require some kind of universal military training?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. KENNEDY. There is nothing in the amendment that would require, in any way, some sort of universal military training for all young people, even for the limited period of time of which the Senator from Arizona has spoken. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; and I say to my friend from Massachusetts, moreover, that I would lead the fight against universal military training. In addition to my interest in this legislation from the point of view of thinking we could save money, there is also my concern with the rights of the people of this country. As I said yesterday, I do not think it is right for our Government to tell any young man how he is going to spend 2 or 3 or 4 years of his life.

I think we have enough young men who, if they were left alone, would meet the need for 75,000 volunteers a year. But universal military training, while it has been very effective in some countries, I just cannot fit in with the American way of life, and I say to my friend from Massachusetts that if anything like that is ever proposed here, I will be out in front, leading the fight against it.

I would propose an appeal, a very understanding appeal by the military services to the young men to associate themselves with some Reserve unit; and while I may have sounded critical here this morning of the services, we have had very little attention paid to the Reserves over the period of years that I was associated with the Reserves, which was well over half of my life. Outside of the Navy, which constantly pays attention to its Reserves, and the Air Force, which pays attention to the Reserve units that have transport assignments, and the National Guard, both ground and air, we have nothing that we can bank on in time of war.

So we have proposed, through the mechanics of this amendment, to set up a way for the services to become interested.

Mr. KENNEDY. The training the Senator was talking about, then, was in relationship to the Reserves?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is right.

Mr. KENNEDY. Strengthening the Reserves?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have four grandsons. When they get to the appropriate age, in school, I would try to interest them in taking military training. I might go farther than some grandfathers, because I have got a lot out of it myself. I would urge joining up with a local Reserve unit that would meet, say, twice a month for 2 hours to learn about the problems of being a soldier, an airman, or a sailor. But in no way should this be mandatory or required.

My personal feeling, I might say to the Senator from Massachusetts, is that a young man is a lot better off having exposed himself to some military training. It is much like when I was a boy,

all of us learned how to box. We did not do it to go around being bullies; we just did it so we could protect ourselves, and because if others knew we could box, they would put us on a list to be left alone.

This might be important to the United States; if the potential enemies of this country knew we had a Ready Reserve, ready to go, that could be called up overnight, maybe it might have a salutary effect so far as peace is concerned.

Mr. President, I did not intend to speak long on this measure at this time. I shall devote further time to it. But I hope Senators on both sides will pay close attention to this matter. The learned Senator from Mississippi has had more experience in this field than, possibly any of the rest of us.

But we think—those of us who sponsor this amendment—that now is the time to lay the groundwork. Now is the time to tell the troops around the world that we are going to pay them a little more money and that we are going to give them a little better fringe benefits. I have in mind, for example, if a man is stationed in the Mediterranean, let his wife come to the Mediterranean. If he is stationed any place that his family can go, take the family there. Make it easier for him. We do not make it impossible for our civilian employees to live overseas, but we certainly put all the rocks in the world in the road of a man going overseas in uniform.

We could improve the fringe benefits in medicine, for example. We could provide better housing where better housing does not exist now.

We are talking about a large chunk of our population. It is not going to be 3.5 million men. It is probably going to be between 2 million and 2.5 million men when Vietnam is over, or it might even be before Vietnam is over. But, still, that is a lot of people.

I witness Senators on the floor of the Senate every day shedding big crocodile tears about 100,000 people or 500,000 people who lead a tough life. Right now, 3½ million men—potentially 2½ million men—lead a tough life all the time, regardless of what they are paid. When a man is risking his life and defending the rest of this country and the free world, I do not think one can put a dollar sign on it.

So it is something we have to be serious about and considerate about—all the things I have mentioned and many, many more.

Mr. President, I hope that we have a long debate on this matter. I think it will help the country to understand what we are trying to do and to understand what I think we will have to do.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the able and distinguished senior Senator from Arizona yield for several questions?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield, but I should like to remind the Senator that I am the junior Senator. I am one of the oldest junior Senators in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. ERVIN. I would say, if the Senator from Arizona would permit me to do so, that the seniority in experience of the very distinguished junior Senator from Arizona has conferred upon him great wisdom.

My questions are these:

First, does not the Senator from Arizona think that every man has the same duties to his nation that all other men have?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator. I feel that way. But I do not think we should force that service on a man, unless we are in times of real emergency, when we have to get 10 or 12 million men into uniform.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Arizona agree with the Senator from North Carolina that service in the Armed Forces of the Nation has a tendency to make a man understand more clearly his duties to his country and to value his country more highly?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I could not agree more with the Senator from North Carolina. He is a distinguished veteran himself and wears one of the highest decorations this country gives.

I know of very few men who have served in the military services who have ever turned against their country. A few, yes. But, on the whole, they not only come out of this experience with a greater regard for their country but a better understanding of their country as well. In addition, they come out of it with a distinct, clear understanding of the need for leadership—and we have too little of it in this country today—and the need for discipline. I do not mean the kind of discipline of clicking heels or popping to a salute. I mean the discipline that we do not find today—the discipline of respect, the discipline of time, the discipline of work.

If I had my life to live over again—I have said this often—I probably would have taken my appointment to West Point, and I would either be a general today or I would be dead; but I would have enjoyed my life a great deal more.

Mr. ERVIN. I know it to be true that the distinguished Senator from Arizona, notwithstanding the fact that he did not make of himself a professional soldier, has devoted a large part of his time and his energy to serving his country in the armed forces—and even in times of peace, in the Reserves of the United States. I think he merits the commendation of our Nation for having so conducted himself.

I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if he does not agree with the Senator from North Carolina that, if the financial status of the Federal Government permitted, it would be highly desirable for the Federal Government to require every young man to receive training in the armed services of the Nation for a limited period of time, and if he does not agree with the Senator from North Carolina that such a policy would ultimately promote the health of the Nation as well as better citizenship in the Nation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might say to my friend that I have always said that there are two things a man has to do—he has to pay taxes and he has to defend his country. I would not agree that, even if the Federal Government could afford it, we should force an unwilling young man to take military training. I think it would be to his advantage. But he might disagree.

August 20, 1970

S 13793

In answer to a question from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I said that I would not favor universal military training, because one of the two major premises that I stand on in relation to this amendment is that I do not think the Federal Government has the right to tell any man or woman how they are going to spend 3 or 4 years of their life. This is in regard to the young man who does not want to be drafted or does not want to be a voluntary member of the military. I think it would be to his advantage to take this training, but I could not back the type of universal training that it would take to do what the Senator thinks is wise, even though I think the training would be wise.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Arizona concede that a very good case can be made for the proposition that it is just as fair to depend on voluntary taxpayers for the support of the U.S. Government as it is to depend solely upon volunteers for furnishing the manpower for our armed services?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator makes a very interesting point. I am afraid that if we had voluntary taxpaying, we would not raise a great deal of money. But I am not worried about depending upon the young men of this country to provide a voluntary military force.

Keep in mind that I am talking about the normal times in which we hope to live. I am not talking about World War I or World War II or—well, I do not like to use Korea, but even Vietnam. Had we had a voluntary military, I think that we would have been able to fill all the slots needed in a war the size of Vietnam had we fought that war the way we should have fought it. I do not happen to agree that under the direction of Secretary McNamara or President Johnson, this war was fought in a proper way. But that is beside the point. So while I am very much interested in becoming a voluntary taxpayer—something I do not believe we will ever see—I do not believe we can compare the two, enticing as that might be.

Mr. ERVIN. I would certainly agree with my distinguished friend from Arizona that the conflict in Vietnam has not been fought in the proper way. I would be inclined to the opinion that the same observation could be made with respect to the Korean episode. I have always been convinced that those civilians who have the ultimate charge of our military forces would be intellectually enabled to serve their country in troublous time in a more effective manner if they would pay less attention to trying to find out a consensus of opinion and would spend more time reading the advice which Polonius gave to his son, Laertes, on the occasion when the latter was about to journey from Denmark to Paris. In substance, Polonius told Laertes, "Beware of entrance into a quarrel, but once in it, so bear thyself that the enemy will beware of thee."

I say with the firm conviction of the correctness of my assertion that if the civilian authorities had permitted the military to take charge of the situation in South Vietnam, the military would have won this war 3 or 4 years ago.

I cannot help confessing another abiding conviction, that a nation can never justify sending its boys into battle to die in a war it does not permit them to win.

I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his courtesy in yielding to me. I rejoice in the fact that he and I ordinarily share kindred views on military subjects, even though my views in respect to the pending amendment prevent me from voting for it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina with whom I have served in such a delightful way for many years. It is true that we do not agree on this question, but I would hope that the Senator would lend his judgment to it as we go along. I certainly agree with the remarks he just made. The observation made after the fall of Dienbienphu, that the French did not lose Dienbienphu in Vietnam, they lost it in Paris, is precisely what is happening in America today.

If we lose the war in Vietnam, we will have lost it in New York and Washington. We will have lost it through the distortions made by the news media regarding the war and what it does.

I have said time and again that had we made up our minds to win the war in Vietnam at the same moment we went into it, the war might not even have started, because any nation facing up to the fact that they would be opposed by the greatest power on earth, by the naval and air forces of the United States, I do not think they would choose to fight.

I suggest, as distasteful as it might seem, this is one of the instruments of national policy which this country has never understood.

I do not believe that World War II would have occurred had the United States been armed and prepared and had Germany known that a foot on Poland, or a foot on England would also mean a foot on the United States.

Mr. President, it is unfortunately true that peace is kept only through power. I wish it were not so. I hope that my grandchildren will live to see the day when peace in the world will be kept because of the goodness in men's hearts and minds and not their evil.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me one more observation, without losing his right to the floor, I should like to state as an abiding conviction that when statesmen or politicians, or whatever we may call them, fail to such an extent that war comes, they should take a back seat and allow the military men, who have been especially trained to wage war, to direct the actual tactics in the area where the war is being waged.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is absolutely correct. There is not one single instance in history that will not back him up. It is unfortunate, but it is true.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, continuing this dialog on the voluntary Army concept which has been proposed by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) and cosponsored by the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and other Senators, I want to make some comments at this

time concerning the dilemmas in which we find ourselves.

I have had an opportunity to read the Gates report and to read the proposed amendment. I have been in favor of a voluntary Army, and have made speeches on the subject, for at least 5 years.

The question obviously becomes filled with emotion when we think of the deep resentment people feel around the country, be they young or old, over the arbitrary selection caused by the draft laws.

The other day, I had the opportunity to talk to people in the Defense Department and to talk to some people, impartial civilians, looking into the subject; and almost everyone agrees, so far as I can see at this time, that any draft law which drafts less than all the people must, of necessity, be inequitable. There is no possibility of making it operate evenly, because we are going to select certain people and make them do things which we are not going to make others do.

It is also obvious that the country and the taxpayers, cannot possibly afford any kind of uniform service law, where everyone is required to serve for a stated length of time whether we are at war or peace. I am not sure that it would be right anyhow, for reasons which the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) just stated.

Then we have the other situation, when we are at war, whether declared or undeclared. Many Americans have been killed and many Americans are still in Vietnam. In an unpopular war of this kind can we maintain the necessary forces to complete the President programs if the draft is dropped? What we are looking at is not the situation we were faced with as this administration came into office, but what the situation will be in Asia and the rest of the world after July 1, 1971. Hence, we will try to determine what kind and what categories of personnel will be needed to provide security for this country.

According to the President's announcements which have already been made public, our armed services in Southeast Asia, as of May 1, 1971, will be about 240,000 troops as compared to 540,000 in January of 1969.

Many of these troops will be logistic forces—communications, supply troops, and so forth. Some of them will be artillery. Some of them, obviously, will be ordinary infantry, defending whatever bases and depots we have still there.

No one knows now what the situation will be 3 months later, whether we will be reducing the number of troops still further—which we all earnestly hope we will be—or whether by that time we will have reached some kind of agreement with North Vietnam which will enable us to get out even more rapidly.

In looking around the rest of the world outside of Southeast Asia, where else are we liable to be using troops in ground infantry action? It is very difficult to see where this would happen except perhaps, in Western Europe in the event the Soviets decide to heat up that area.

We have had some 350,000 troops, members of the armed services, in Europe for 25 years. For the life of me I have

been unable to understand why we have done this. For the life of me I have been unable to understand why the United States should use its own forces in the area of Western Europe, which is economically and, from the point of view of manpower, better able to protect itself than is any other area that I know of around the world.

It makes no sense to me. Over and over again I have joined with the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) in urging that we have a very substantial reduction of forces in that area.

In the Mideast fortunately, and through the very fine activities of our Secretary of State and President, we have at least a tenuous cease-fire. We hope that we will be able to move from that into further negotiations for a permanent peace in that troubled region.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a comment on that point concerning his comments on the European forces?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator's comment is most pertinent. I can well understand why Europe would want to have more than 500,000 Americans in Europe today, more than we have actually in Vietnam. They are there as hostages. In the event western Europe should be attacked, we will be there.

What I cannot understand is their reluctance in the past to bear their fair share of the cost of troops needed for a common defense. This, I think, has been ludicrous and I think it is a scandal that in years past we have not said, "If you want us here, the least you can do with your high level of prosperity is to pay a fairer share of the costs involved."

These countries now recognize that they must pay a fairer share. The question is how much. I think we are some ways apart in what we think is a fair share.

The point the Senator makes is very well taken. It has been an unfair situation. I have talked with officials who helped create NATO. They never envisioned that we would, 25 years later, have troops in Europe to the present extent and bear the present level of expense.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Illinois. The points he has made are very accurate. Not only have they not paid for the costs of our troops, but also they have not fulfilled their own NATO commitments. As a matter of fact, one of our NATO allies, France, has thrown us out and required that we be in another country.

Apparently the whole complex was developed from the idea that we might be facing a threat from Eastern Europe. I think that is still a possibility. But one country that has been urging us to keep our forces there Western Germany has now reached a nonaggression treaty with the Soviet Union. I do not know that it is worth anything but if it is this further emphasizes the desirability of removing our troops from there. We can meet our

commitments to NATO by airlift. We can bring our troops back in. We have no desire to go back on our commitments.

The point I make is that 1.25 million volunteers are in the armed services. Some 800,000 additional men are volunteers in their first term of service. If we have this capability now in this country, do we in fact need to further extend this draft situation which can be nothing but inequitable, no matter how we look at it?

The major argument in favor of it is that we cannot get troops for the "nitty-gritty" ground combat. People are enlisting in other specialties. They will volunteer to be pilots or to go on Navy ships. They will enlist for the electronics field or communications. But we do not find many people enlisting for ground infantry action.

This is a problem and the question is how do we solve it.

Again, we have to look at where we will use troops of this kind in the future. What is the immediate threat which would create a need for drafting a number of troops of this kind?

It is hard, frankly, to see the realism behind it.

We now have a proposal to reduce our overall services to 2.9 million from about 3.5 million. But for each troop we put into combat, for each flier, for each Navy combat person, or for each marine we have more backup support troops than any other country in the world. I think it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 11 to 13 or something of that number for each person who actually conducts any fighting. I am not sure of the exact figure, but it is very, very high.

We do not need to go in this Cadillac form if we are engaged in a war which involves the security of the United States.

We need to give the necessary support pay and recompense to the actual people who are engaged in this as a career, yes. But do we need an overall force of this size—2.9 million persons?

My own thinking is that we do not as long as we have a method of calling up large masses of people if we find ourselves in a very serious problem, as well as keeping a strong Reserve and National Guard force.

We can reduce the Regular Army by a considerable amount of personnel. These points seem to militate in favor of this amendment and in favor of a volunteer army and dropping the draft as of July.

The things that we cannot envisage right now concern the defects that would turn up if we were to have rather extensive hearings on this matter next year.

Does this amendment which we have under discussion in fact provide the proper amount in order to be able to make a high-class volunteer army more practicable?

How much additional training allowance or pay will we have to have in order to get combat troops in the infantry?

Why are the Marines able to fill their lists with volunteers while the Army infantry cannot. Is there that much difference in their fighting roles, or their pay and allowances or their service living conditions? Or is it the method of recruiting or the allure of the Marine morale? These questions need to be examined.

What are the policy problems of the future with respect to the actual use of troops?

Will we have to find ourselves in the Cuban area, for example?

Strong intelligence indications that have recently come to light show that the Cuban problem, far from getting better, is getting worse. They are stronger militarily, their missile capability is getting better, and their nuclear capability is being increased.

There is at the present time one nuclear noncritical plant in operation used for peaceful purposes. It is my understanding that another one is proposed for 1971 or 1972 which is a critical mass type nuclear plant.

Every Cuban working in it has been trained in the Soviet Union. There are continued reports from Cuban intelligence that missiles are in the country. What is going to happen in Western Europe? Is there going to be an agreement which will calm down some of the tensions which have existed in that area? Are we going to be able to stay out of the Middle East or find ourselves engaged there, God forbid, in a more direct way?

These are all problems we are going to have to wrestle with in determining what we are going to do in connection with this amendment. I am frank to say I have not made up my mind. Are we being premature in taking the amendment up at this time or is it necessary to get started on it now, as has been suggested by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Oregon so we can test it out in the intervening 6 or 8 months prior to the time the draft expires and comes up for renewal? It is a most perplexing and difficult problem and it is one that should be examined at this time.

We have been wrestling with other problems that are difficult but we have not been wrestling so much in connection with problems which affect the welfare of so many of our young people, as well as those who are enjoying the luxuries and freedoms we have in our Nation. I have not made up my mind on what to do about this matter, but I hope before the final vote we would have some debate, some discussion, and open remarks as to what our policy position may be around the world within the next 2 years, because it is within those 2 years that I feel this voluntary Army versus the draft situation will be most critical.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Colorado and Senators who have engaged in this colloquy today on the subject which we intend to lay before the Senate very shortly, namely, amendment No. 844.

Mr. President, Before I make any further comments, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the

August 20, 1970

very able Senator from Colorado has just addressed himself to some of the most fundamental points we are concerned with in the overall manpower procurement responsibility that we in Congress have, a responsibility to enact legislation that will provide our military organization with sufficient manpower to meet not only domestic defense needs of this Nation, but to implement our foreign policy as well. I am pleased that the Senator touched on these important points of foreign policy which depend on an adequate military force to carry them out and to implement them.

I shall make only one or two points this morning because when we call up the amendment we will go into other arguments and debate on the matter.

The question has been raised this morning by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), about the cost of an all-volunteer military. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has used the figure \$4 billion as the cost which would be required to implement an all-volunteer system.

I would like to quote from the same letter from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, who indicated that there is not today in the Pentagon a real basic set of data on which to compute accurately an exact cost. I would add further that the Gates Commission report, on page 7, indicated that with the basic pay increase, proficiency pay, Reserve pay increase, additional Medical Corps expense, recruiting, ROTC, and miscellaneous, the figure would come to \$3.24 billion.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize very carefully this morning that it costs approximately \$6,000 to train a soldier. Today we have draftees coming into our military program under what we call a mixed force; namely, we have volunteers, and we have those volunteers who volunteer to avoid conscription, and we have draftees. When one considers we have a 92 percent to 95 percent turnover rate within our draftee group, I think it is very apparent that we are expending a great deal of taxpayer money to train people to a point where, at about the time they become proficient, they are out of the service.

The Navy has indicated that it is believed the No. 1 problem they face today is what they call "personal turbulence," and that is simply another word for turnover rate. That is in a branch of service in which there is today an all-volunteer recruitment program. Some of those volunteers are not true volunteers; they are enlisting to avoid the draft. The point is that even in enlisted situations there is this high turnover rate.

We are expending over \$3 billion for the training of draftees. Our present system is costing us over \$3 billion and I am saying, and my cosponsors believe, if we accept these figures—and they are very general and I do not purport to say they can be computed to the exact dollar or perhaps even millions of dollars—if for the moment we accept the \$4 billion figure given by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that the all-volunteer system would cost us, I would point out that costs us over \$4

billion to maintain the coercive nonvoluntary draft program.

When one considers the two figures, it is obvious that by reducing the turnover rate under a voluntary system, we would receive far more in return for our \$4 billion in an all-volunteer force than we get from \$4 billion in a draft mix system.

Further, we have the support of a very important committee appointed by President Eisenhower in 1957, which was headed by Ralph Cordinier. The report became known as the Cordinier report, and I would like to quote from that document.

It was estimated at that time, and this goes back to 1957 so if anything the figures would be increased as they apply to the situation today, 10 percent of the military force is engaged in training new recruits.

When one considers that by instituting an all-volunteer system, under the best calculations which have been given us, we would release a number of people today who are involved in a constant training program; and that is estimated at a 3-percent reduction in personnel for training purposes. If one considers a 2.65 training level, as the Cordinier report referred to at that time, that would mean 79,500 personnel could be released from the entire time they have to give to training, for other military assignments.

The Gates Commission states that when you take the present accession and other recruitment programs, we have about 250 million true recruits or enlistees; and on that basis, out of the 325,000 that go in as "new" each year we would have to have only 75,000 additional new enlistees to have an all-volunteer system.

When one considers the savings that could be made in manpower alone in an all-volunteer system in the area of training, it is obvious we would not have to pick up a great number more men than are voluntarily enlisting without the pressure of the draft.

The question has been raised this morning also as to the matter of whether all young men have a duty to perform to their country and whether that duty can only be performed through military service.

I would like to say that I speak as a combat veteran of World War II. I feel that the experience I had in the Navy was a very excellent experience. At the same time, I do not believe that, because I was privileged to serve in the Navy in World War II, fighting for my country, I should assume I have a higher degree of citizenship than any person who was not able to serve in the Armed Services, as many of my friends with whom I had attended the university were denied entrance into the military service, when they were seeking to serve. It was excellent for me, but, by the same token, I do not believe it gives me an extra badge of citizenship that is denied those who were not in the military service.

Furthermore, as I indicated yesterday, when we talk about serving our country, we should not restrict our thinking to believing that the only way to serve our country is through serving

in a military uniform. I think that is one way of serving one's country, but I think there are many other ways one serves his country. I would hate to think that we would restrict our thinking, in discussing the amendment, to the thought that only young men in uniform are rendering a service that is looked upon as doing one's duty to his country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation, and then I should like to ask him some questions.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will support a volunteer Army in peacetime. But when, as now, battlefield casualties are high I do not believe a volunteer Army is either equitable or wise.

In my view, it is inequitable to permit the risks of battle to fall only on those less affluent Americans who are induced to join the Army by a pay raise. And it is unwise to insulate from the horrors of war middle- and upper-class Americans who might lead the protest against senseless foreign adventures.

I recognize that the present draft system has many of the defects of a voluntary system. But the draft can be made more equitable, as I have fought to do for years. The volunteer Army is inherently inequitable.

There are some who argue that we never would have become involved in a large scale war in Indochina, if it were not for the draft. This is sheer speculation. The one certain fact is that we are in Indochina now, and that the process for determining who will serve there should be a fair one.

Some suggest that if the draft were ended, American involvement in Indochina would have to come grinding to a halt. This, of course, directly contradicts the finding of the Gates Commission that our military manpower needs could be met by an all-volunteer force. In any event, if the Congress wishes to end the war, it can do so by legislation directly aimed at that goal.

Finally, I note that the cost of the Hatfield amendment for this year is at least \$3.2 billion dollars. When we have such pressing budgetary problems and domestic needs, I sharply question whether a volunteer Army, even if desirable, should rank so high on our list of national priorities.

I would now like to ask the Senator from Oregon how his cost figures are related to the level of unemployment?

Mr. HATFIELD. In reply to my friend and colleague, the figures that I quoted included unemployment.

Mr. KENNEDY. What level of unemployment?

Mr. HATFIELD. Is the Senator referring to the Cordinier report?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am familiar with the figures in that report. I am referring to present estimates of the cost of a volunteer army under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HATFIELD. The \$3.2 billion under the Gates Commission finding?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. It has been some time since the Gates Commission report was made. Unemployment has increased

since that report. It has actually doubled. How does the Senator think that fact affects the cost of his proposed program?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is quite correct in saying that the figures on unemployment are changing, but as far as the report is concerned, unemployment was approximately 5 percent at that time.

Mr. KENNEDY. So the cost of the Senator's proposed program is based on an unemployment figure of 5 percent?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. How does it vary as unemployment varies? Of course, this matter was developed quite completely in a Defense Department report and lead to extraordinary estimates on the cost of a volunteer Army, ranging from about \$4 or \$5 or \$6 billion up to \$17 billion, as I remember. The cost was very closely related to the unemployment question.

Has the Senator any information now which would suggest that, under his amendment, there would be a difference in cost if there were a reduction in the unemployment rate or a rise in the unemployment rate over the period of the next 2 years?

Mr. HATFIELD. The figures we are using at this time are on the basis of the finding in the Gates Commission report, which was based on an unemployment figure of approximately 5 percent, as I have said. As far as the total cost is concerned, we must realize that we are dealing here with certain variants—the size of the military force we are going to base it on, whether it be 2.5 million or 2.6 million, and the fact that we must include in this estimate anticipated savings, following the recommendations of the Gates Commission, which among other recommendations, would transfer certain present military duties to civilian jobs.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is being done at the present time, as I understand.

Mr. HATFIELD. That action has been taken in certain instances.

Mr. KENNEDY. Nothing currently prohibits the military from moving in that direction in a more extensive way, or even recruiting civilians for clerk and typist jobs, for example.

Mr. HATFIELD. There is no prohibition. The point is that we would be calling upon the military, by action of the Congress, to accelerate that program or policy.

We do go into other cost factors, for example, transportation. It is estimated by the Gates Commission that we would save a minimum of \$68 million in transportation, on the basis of a lesser call for transporting recruits or inductees from one place to another.

In the field of training and administration, the estimated reduction in the cost of such programs is \$675 million.

In the area of what they call civilianization, or the very point we were just discussing, moving further in the direction of providing civilian personnel with responsibilities now being performed by military personnel, the estimate is that there would be a saving in cost of \$100 million.

Then, as far as the impact upon the general economy is concerned, there is a

very interesting figure, which I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts is aware is an element in the cost calculation, and that is the loss of productivity to society by men trying to avoid the draft. We are losing a great resource in this country, as the Senator knows, as a result of a sizable number of people—it is up to 60,000—moving out of the country to escape the draft. And it is estimated that over 30,000 men have now refused induction. Others are in colleges and universities in an attempt to avoid the draft. This has resulted in an increased cost of education for people who are not really seeking an education or who are qualified to receive it, but are there for the single purpose of avoiding the draft. That is a difficult figure to state in specific terms, but it is estimated that the saving could reach as high as \$3 billion, and that, of course, would have another great impact on our economy.

So I think all these factors must be considered when we consider the cost of a volunteer system versus a coercive system, and what it means in the long run.

As I indicated yesterday, I may add to my comments to the Senator from Massachusetts, the real cost of this program under a volunteer system would not be any more than the present cost. By that I mean that the present costs are being borne not just by the taxpayer, who should bear all the costs for the defense of this country, but by the requirement that we are placing upon the shoulders of our servicemen to subsidize their own military service because of the noncomparability of the pay scale they are receiving when contrasted to what they could earn in civilian life.

John Kenneth Galbraith called this "the patriotic tax," Dr. Ol called it "the hidden tax." Whatever you call it, it is still there.

Therefore, when we consider or talk about an all-volunteer system in terms of dollars, it really is not going to cost, in real dollars, more money. It means only that we are going to send the bill to the taxpayer, rather than requiring the young men to subsidize their own service.

Mr. KENNEDY. Those same savings in cost would have existed in Australia, when they instituted the volunteer army system, would they not?

Mr. HATFIELD. I am sure in some degree. Perhaps not to the same magnitude.

Mr. KENNEDY. But all the different cost-saving elements, lower administrative overhead and the others which the Senator has mentioned, were there perhaps, in some varying degree.

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me interrupt the Senator at that point. When the Australians moved from one type of system to another, they did not include any additional incentives, as we are doing, so we could not make quite the direct comparison the Senator is attempting to make between the two countries.

Mr. KENNEDY. They had some modification, did they not, in pay scales?

Mr. HATFIELD. No significant modification.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, one can question whether the pay scales included in the Senator's amendment are going to be

significant enough and sufficiently attractive to young people to induce them to participate in our involvement in Southeast Asia.

I understand that in the Australian experience, the principal consideration was the unemployment question. When they instituted the volunteer army, they had relatively high unemployment. As soon as that unemployment was met with economic expansion, the bottom, effectively, fell out of the whole volunteer army system in Australia. The Australian experience does not suggest that we should expect any savings from a volunteer army.

I wonder if the Senator would reveal to us any information he has about other industrial countries that have tried to introduce this system and tell what additional savings have been made with the institution of volunteer armies. Because I suspect the record of other countries that have attempted it has not been quite as sanguine as my colleague from Oregon suggests.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am happy to say to the Senator, in response, that I think he has posed at least two questions here. He attempts to draw an analogy to the Australian situation, and I think, upon reading the Gates Commission report, the Senator would find this is a most inappropriate analogy, and that it is not possible to draw a valid analogy between Australia and this country.

Let me quote from page 171 of the report, addressed to that very question:

Some has cited the Australian decision to return to a draft as evidence that an all-volunteer force is not feasible for the United States. There are several reasons why this argument by analogy is inappropriate. First, the Australians have not made a concerted effort to attract additional recruits on a voluntary basis. Once the decision was made to use conscription to raise force levels, no serious effort was made to increase voluntary enlistments either by raising pay or redoubling recruiting efforts. Second, the Australian economy is heavily unionized and apprenticeship programs requiring four or more years deplete the pool of men available for military service. Third, Australia has enjoyed a rapid growth in its economy (the unemployment rate is about 1 percent) which makes civilian jobs relatively more attractive than military service. Finally, civilian earnings significantly exceed military pay rates. Civilians receive over-time and other supplementary compensation in excess of the common wage rates set by the government for both the military and the civilian economy.

The Australians could have expanded the size of the Armed Forces on a voluntary basis by raising pay—

What we are planning to do here—and reorganizing recruiting.

Which we provide in this amendment:

Given the important differences between the two countries, one cannot conclude that the Australian experience shows that the United States would be unable to attract enough recruits on a voluntary basis if energetic and efficient recruiting were combined with competitive rates of pay.

Let me add one further point as to the second question that I believe the Senator from Massachusetts raised, and that is, have we any other evidence of any other countries? Yes, we have. We have very outstanding evidence in both Can-

August 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 13797

ada and Great Britain, where they have instituted this kind of system.

Mr. KENNEDY. How did the force levels in Britain change over a period of time after they adopted a voluntary army? Have they increased, remained the same, or been reduced?

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me respond to the Senator's question with a quotation of further facts from this report:

The Canadian Armed Forces have always been entirely voluntary except for the period from 1940 to early 1945. The Canadian forces presently number slightly less than 100,000 men—

Mr. KENNEDY. 100,000 men?

Mr. HATFIELD. 100,000 men—supported by an annual inflow of about 12,000 men.

So that is the situation as far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is not suggesting that the fact that the Armed Forces of Canada have been able to raise 100,000 men demonstrates that we can have a voluntary army here with our much broader military obligations.

Mr. HATFIELD. That was not the question the Senator from Massachusetts asked.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I was talking about some kind of comparable experience. Because 100,000 men does not even meet the present demand for troops in Vietnam—

Mr. HATFIELD. Would the Senator care to suggest some country that is comparable, in terms of the obligations we maintain?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, but is there an industrialized society that has to any extent a force level, in terms of total population, which would be comparable to the United States? Canada, quite clearly, with 100,000 men, is not.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would say there is no country comparable to the United States as far as the requirements that we have for military forces. Perhaps the Senator would be willing to accept Great Britain. But he is not going to find any country that has the requirements we have today for the maintenance of a high manpower level in the armed services, because of our international commitments and our international involvements.

Mr. KENNEDY. All right.

Mr. HATFIELD. Consequently, the Senator is asking a question for which it is impossible to provide an answer.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I just questioned using the example of Canada as a possible response to my question. I think Great Britain may be a useful example if the Senator would indicate to us what their force levels were prior to the time that they went to the volunteer army, and what gradual reductions in force levels have been experienced since the transition to a volunteer army system.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Because I do not think anyone has demonstrated on this floor, that we could get a volunteer army that would reach even 2 million men, with the kind of pay raise the Senator suggests. I am questioning that point.

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me make the record clear here, because I would not want

the Senator's implication to stand as a fact. We have today a volunteer military force of more than 2 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. But that is not completely accurate. Surely the Senator does not mean to suggest that the 2 million who volunteered were not influenced by fear of the draft?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator was not here earlier to hear the very careful description we made, based upon these two reports. If the Senator has other studies, I shall be glad to study them, but these two, one prepared by the Defense Department and the other by the Gates commission, have both indicated very clearly that in our Armed Forces today there are between 2 million and 2.25 million true volunteers, of which 1.25 million are men beyond their first tour of duty.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, the Senator has the figures. I do not have them handy. Does he have the Marshall Commission figures on this particular question?

Mr. HATFIELD. No. I have studies more recent than the Marshall Commission report. The Marshall report was in 1966.

Mr. KENNEDY. But did not the Defense Department study you refer to precede the Marshall Commission?

Mr. HATFIELD. 1966 was the Marshall report, and we are now dealing with the report of 1970. But I might say that the Gates Commission report is based upon the Defense Department's own study figures.

Mr. KENNEDY. All I mean to say is that the Marshall Commission looked into this very question as well; and, their report being one of the basic documents, I was wondering whether the Senator had the results of that report.

Mr. HATFIELD. I do not have the Marshall report here. I have later reports. I do not have the Marshall report in its total form, but I do have these figures from the Marshall Commission report. They set their base at 2.65 million men and estimate that it would cost between \$4 and \$7 billion. The Gates Commission concludes that \$2.12 billion would be needed to expend annually for a stable force of 2.5 million.

So when we raise these reports, we have to determine the base we are starting from, because we have different bases from different studies.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sure the Senator from Oregon will say that we are just as justified in relying upon the Marshall Commission report, with their estimates, as we are on the Gates Commission report.

Mr. HATFIELD. No, I would not say that; because the Gates Commission report is a more recent report. I think it probably represents a more thorough approach and study than does the Marshall report.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is really a question of personal subjective judgment, I am sure. As a matter of fact, it seems to me, in looking through the Gates Commission report, that there was a good deal of reliance upon many of the findings of the Marshall Commission report.

Mr. HATFIELD. I think it is quite obvious that all these commissions are

required to use certain basic data that would be similar to all of them.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

But if the manpower level were going to be 2.6 million, does the Senator question the Marshall Commission report about the cost of a voluntary army?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes. Let me just point out one or two things about the Marshall Commission. They did not estimate the recruitment short fall and the elasticity of supply correctly. Consequently, their pay projections, I believe, can be considered as less than totally accurate.

Using the \$17 billion figure—let us take that as a point—a first-term enlistee would receive \$13,045 annually.

Consequently, I think we are dealing here with quite a range of calculations that makes the Marshall report less reliable, in my opinion, than the Gates report, which sets a pretty clear base upon which they make their calculations.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand—I wish the Senator would correct me if I am wrong—this \$17 billion figure was developed in the Defense Department study report. Am I not correct? It was developed by a distinguished citizen of the Senator's State, as I recall—Dr. Oi.

Mr. HATFIELD. Dr. Oi, from the State of Washington, the University of Washington.

Mr. KENNEDY. Those figures were propounded by the Defense Department not the Marshall Commission report. But in any event, both studies run contrary to the recommendations that were made to the Gates Commission. The Senator would agree with me on that, would he not?

Mr. HATFIELD. The only thing I would agree with is that all these reports are using certain basic DOD data, and each commission, I suppose, has a certain approach to its assignment and perhaps certain preliminary or prior commitments or convictions.

I should like to take note of one interesting thing on this point. Within the knowledge that the members who came together to serve on the commission came together with certain prior viewpoints. Yet, as they moved into the data and made their evaluations and studies, it was a unanimous report.

Consequently, I think that one has to say that any commission is going to start its assignment with certain prior commitments, convictions, or viewpoints. But the important thing is that as these commissions made their studies and came forth with their recommendations, there is the widest range of representation on the Gates Commission, that a far more in-depth program was undertaken by the Gates Commission. Therefore, I would say that because of its more recent date, 1970, we are dealing with much more current viewpoints as it relates to our national commitments and international commitments.

I am not saying that one has to pick one report over the other. They all have made their contribution. I am saying that I would like to pick the latest findings, the latest commission study, because I think it is far more current.

I should like to point out one thing further to the Senator from Massachusetts. The Marshall Commission was not

concentrating, was not focused, upon the issue of the voluntary military. The Gates Commission was specifically studying that particular issue.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator pointed out earlier, the Gates Commission was appointed by the President and realized that the President had made certain statements during the course of the campaign on the desirability of a volunteer army. I am not prepared to suggest that the Gates Commission was either required or forced to come out with an endorsement of the volunteer Army; but, as the Senator pointed out quite clearly, these commissions started off from different points of view.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that both the Marshall Commission and the Gates Commission did have some continuity or similarity of staff people, so there was some relationship between these commissions.

Mr. KENNEDY. I take the Senator's word for that. I was rather interested in the Senator's comments yesterday—

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me comment before that, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt, on the last implication, that the President had made certain statements in the campaign, the implication being that perhaps the commission might reflect those statements of the President.

I think it is amply clear that the President, Mr. Nixon, has appointed a number of commissions; and, as one reviews some of these commissions, it certainly has not followed that they have reflected the prior statements of the President. I would only cite one as an example this morning, and that is the commission studying pornography.

The preliminary—or at least, the announced—findings thus far of that commission certainly do not reflect the prior statements of the President of the United States. Therefore, I would not want the record to show that there was any implication here that the President's prior statements would have had that kind of effect upon a commission studying the voluntary military.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator pointed out, the Gates Commission was established to get into the question of the volunteer army, its prospects, and was directed toward that particular question, as I recall, rather than toward making a broad and general survey of how to eliminate the inequities in the present draft system, including the question of a volunteer army, which was the charge of the Marshall Commission.

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me point out again that it was very clearly indicated that all those who had been appointed to this commission by President Nixon did not have common agreement as to their viewpoint at the time of their appointment, so it was not as though we had a stacked commission.

Mr. KENNEDY. I was interested in the Senator's comments yesterday about the ability to raise the armed forces that will be necessary through the volunteer system. The Senator quoted several military leaders as being authorities on this point.

I am wondering whether the Senator has had the kind of experience I have

had in going around to colleges and universities and asking the young people how many of them would actually volunteer for the Armed Forces. I recall a comment by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina in which he said that he has done that at nine or 10 universities and has a volunteer army of about seven and a half. He said that at one college a fellow put up about half an arm.

I am wondering what the Senator could add to the consideration of this question from the impressions he has gathered from his travels to universities and colleges.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would be happy to share my experiences which now total close to 200 campuses I have visited in the past 2½ years discussing this subject, not in each and every instance, but on a goodly number of campuses.

I have found, one, that the young people of this country today overwhelmingly—I do not now include any minority, hard-core revolutionary groups—I am talking about the overwhelming number of university students today—have great, great desire to experience in their lifetime an opportunity to make a major contribution to their country.

In other words, I find no overwhelming desire to shrink from a responsibility to one's country among our student population.

I think they feel that service to one's country is not looked upon as being exclusively carried out or performed in a military uniform.

I find that students today are interpreting service to their country to mean people, not just geography, national boundaries, or a national state. They see it as their fellow man. There is a certain universality in their philosophy about their fellow man, in all parts of the world. This has proved true by their response to the Peace Corps, VISTA, and other such programs.

Two, I find that the students today evidence a growing concern about the coercive element in our society, the kind of regimentation, the kind of authoritarianism which they feel Government policy represents and in the civilian sector, meeting certain military requirements such as the draft represents.

I think, too, when we look at the attitude of the student toward the military today, we cannot divorce that from their attitude toward Southeast Asia and the war in which we find ourselves. That particular point is hard to distinguish because it is so interrelated. But I am saying that a number of young people today are indicating support for a volunteer military.

Let me give the Senator the range. We have men like Sam Brown and Dave Hawk who were active in organizing the moratorium program. They might be considered as being of a different philosophical persuasion than the YAF which is the Young Americans for Freedom. They have all endorsed this amendment. In other words, here is a broad range of what we would call, without labels, liberal to conservative, and we should also consider men like Roy Wilkins, and Ralph Abernathy who are certainly in

touch with the members of the black community, and the YMCA, which is another representation of today's youth, all of whom endorse this proposal. So, if I were to respond in a general, over-sentence statement, I would say:

I find overwhelming support for a voluntary system.

I want to emphasize strongly, however, that I do not ascribe to our young people today any lack of patriotism or lack of desire to serve their country. I think there is great danger, when we say on the one hand that the young people do not want to join the military and, through implication, that they do not sense a responsibility to their country.

When we look at the ROTC programs on many of the campuses where I have visited, those programs are filled. I find that in the applications coming to my office for appointments to the Army, Navy, and the Air Force Academies, the young men from my State who are applying represent young men such as student body presidents, captains of football teams, and many top students academically. So that we will get the highest caliber of young men out of high school in Oregon today who are applying, through my office, to the service academies.

Thus, in every way that I can measure it, I believe that the young people of this country will perform their duty to their country at any time their country has a requirement for them. I have that kind of confidence in the students of today.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am wondering whether the Senator has had an opportunity to ask young people, when he goes to these college and university campuses, how many of them would volunteer.

I have yet to find even a small minority in the schools, colleges, and universities that I have had a chance to visit showing any enthusiasm. Everyone seems to be for a volunteer army, but I think the fundamental question is, how many young people who go to college will actually volunteer?

With all respect to the Gates Commission report, and to General Gruenther's experience in recruiting, the attitudes of students in the schools, colleges, and universities today, attitudes I know the Senator must be very much aware of, have led me to the very strong feeling that we would not be able to get many college students in a volunteer army.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to comment further on the question the Senator from Massachusetts poses to university students by asking them how many would volunteer. I do not really think one could expect to get much in the way of results from that kind of question. Of course, I accept the Senator's report this morning. But let me remind the Senator from Massachusetts that only 8 percent of the draft manpower pool are being conscripted. Thus, we are dealing with a hypothetical attitude. How could any young man answer that question if he is not looking forward to a career in the military?

Only 8 percent are being drafted. Therefore, there is no volunteer system

August 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 13799

today as it relates to those in the draft manpower pool. That is, they are all subject to the draft. I do not think we can make this measurement, or give them an alternative, until there is a viable alternative to ask them that question.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is assuming, correctly, that university students are sufficiently intelligent and aware of what a volunteer army is. They are probably better briefed on the question of a voluntary army than many Members of this body. They know that a voluntary army would mean in terms of payments, in terms of, perhaps, an increase in educational opportunity. But I really challenge the Senator to find out how many young people—especially those going to college—will volunteer. I had the opportunity to do so in my own State. It has been extraordinary to find such an unenthusiastic response. At first, when I asked the question, there was a sprinkling of hands of people who would volunteer, but today this is virtually nonexistent.

Mr. HATFIELD. Does the Senator purport to represent this as some kind of scientific poll?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. But I asked the question enough times to convince me that there was not much interest in the military. I think my experience would convince any open-minded Senator that volunteers for a volunteer army are just not there from any of the universities, colleges, vocational trade schools that he might mention. I do not question that, perhaps, in some of our urban areas, in Appalachia and other areas, or in Alaskan native villages, where the young people have never been beyond the fences of their own homes or reservations, one could talk to young people about the benefits of a voluntary army and there would be some volunteers. I do not question that at all. But that is one of my objections to a volunteer army in wartime. Its appeal will only be to less affluent Americans. The more fortunate young men will not have to serve.

Mr. HATFIELD. Does not the Senator realize that the average draftee is 19 years old and a high school graduate? I mean, the Senator is developing a conscription system primarily from the same basis of what we think about as student deferments.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am opposed to student deferments.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the point is where are the draftees coming from today? Are they coming from the universities and colleges from which the Senator from Massachusetts has not been able to get much of a response concerning volunteering? Not at all. We are talking about the high schools. That is where the average draftees comes from.

Mr. KENNEDY. The draft system, which I support, reaches across the board.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I find a paucity of people in the high schools or in the colleges or universities who say they will volunteer. Maybe the situation is different in the State of Oregon. But I seriously doubt it.

The thing that I do not doubt is that I can go to places in my own State, in the lowest income areas, and offer the kind of pay which is suggested in the amendment of the Senator and come up with some individuals who will volunteer because they are being denied an opportunity to participate in our society in a meaningful way. The armed forces, in their judgment, offers them the only opportunity to fulfill their desires. I do not question that.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, let me ask if the Senator will yield for a question. Is the Senator in support or in opposition to a comparable pay program for the military serviceman?

Does the Senator feel that we have a comparable pay situation today?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not think we have a comparable pay situation.

Mr. HATFIELD. Would the Senator support a pay increase, particularly for enlisted people, at this time?

Mr. KENNEDY. A modest pay increase, yes; but not in the Senator's figures. I would support a modest pay increase. Probably it would not be comparable pay.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is for a modest pay increase but not for comparable pay.

Mr. KENNEDY. A modest increase; that is correct.

Mr. HATFIELD. Is the Senator aware that we have at least 12,500 military personnel receiving welfare checks today because they qualify under welfare status?

Mr. KENNEDY. I was aware that there were some; yes.

Mr. HATFIELD. Does the Senator not agree that this is something that needs to be done?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. But it is a question of priorities with our budgetary problem and our pressing civilian needs. I do not think a \$3.2 billion military pay raise has the highest priority.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, let me reiterate what I think is something that we should keep before us. This amendment does not repeal the draft.

I think the colloquy on the inequity of the draft this morning has been a good discussion. I have enjoyed it. But let us not lose sight of the fact that the colloquy this morning on the elements of the draft do not really concern us at this moment in this amendment.

This amendment simply adds to the pay scale of those serving in our military branches on the basis of affording comparable pay. It goes beyond the modest pay increase expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

From the standpoint of those who cosponsor the amendment, we believe that the young men serving in the military today ought to have comparable pay to that which they could otherwise earn in civilian life. We think this is equitable. We do not think a man serving in the military should be put on a basis of second-class citizenship. We do not think we should say to him, "You don't have the right to comparable pay."

We who sponsor this amendment do not believe that is fair or equitable. We do not believe that our ideals and our

concepts of Government should perpetrate this upon our young people.

I want to make it very clear that this amendment will not decide the continuation or lack of continuation of the draft. If we agree to this amendment, we will have almost a year to answer some of the questions that the Senator has raised to his satisfaction and permit him then to support negative action or lack of action to permit the draft to expire.

This is the purpose of those of us who cosponsor the amendment. We will have almost a year in which to see whether we can recruit men and get a sufficient number on the basis of increased pay to have a volunteer army or military. But we cannot transfer from one system to another without a realistic transition period.

That is why we have offered the amendment today. I appreciate the comments from the Senator from Massachusetts, because he and I have discussed this matter before. I respect his viewpoint.

I feel that we are working for the same objectives. I feel that our differences perhaps are on the basis of procedures by which to accomplish those objectives.

Let me say again that this amendment in no way commits Congress to action either by extending the draft or by doing nothing and permitting it to expire.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if we are talking about comparability or pay increases, this is something else again. I think all of us want to do justice to those who are being called to serve in the Armed Forces. But, as I said, I think we have to balance that against other kinds of economic needs.

I am not prepared at this point to debate that matter. But I am prepared to point out that on page 4, line 1 of the amendment, it states:

The President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the military departments shall exercise the authority vested in them by law to provide for the military manpower needs of the nation through a voluntary program of enlistments.

And no matter how we say it, that is a volunteer army.

I do not question that we can get volunteers. But the kind of volunteers we will get are those in our society who have been disadvantaged in one way or another and who will look to the Army as being their only means of getting out of a more difficult and perhaps more hopeless situation.

I quite sincerely challenge my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, to inquire at the colleges and universities and the community colleges of his State or any State. He will find there, I am sure, that the young people are for the voluntary army.

If he asks how many are prepared to volunteer, I think the Senator will find a much better indication of the sentiment of these young people than the report of the Gates Commission, with all due respect, and the findings of General Gruenther. And he would perhaps understand more fully my concern about the inequities of an all-volunteer army.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I would restate that

S 13800

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20, 1970

I think we are dealing with a very unrealistic hypothesis when we try to take a poll or make some kind of a survey as to how many college or university students will volunteer for military service when that is not the source from which we derive our inductees and draftees. They are not coming from the colleges and universities. They are coming from the high schools.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is not accurate in that statement. With the abolition of graduate student and occupational deferments the random selection system is more and more applying to all young men.

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me point out again that when the Senator speaks of random selection he is dealing with a manpower pool of 12 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. But the draft is beginning to assume that out of those 12 million, college students serve as well as others.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts would agree that we are not drawing from college students proportionately in relation to the inductees we take into the draft each year. The fact remains we still have from that group of people he referred to rates of enlistment of true volunteers.

Mr. KENNEDY. But surely college students will not volunteer even nearly as much as men from the lower income groups.

Mr. HATFIELD. But let me remind the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that when he talks about this group, we might take the blacks as one such disadvantaged group in this country. We have 11.7 percent in the Army through the draft program and enlistment program. At the same time—

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator tell me the reenlistment rates for blacks in Vietnam?

Mr. HATFIELD. I have the overall reenlistment rates.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would my good friend tell me the reenlistment rates for blacks in combat divisions in Vietnam?

Mr. HATFIELD. First I would like to finish my thought. The ratio of blacks to the total population is about 12 percent; so we have comparability with those who are serving as volunteers, forced volunteers, or inductees. That is the point we should keep in mind.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point I would like to keep in mind is the rate of reenlistment in combat divisions in Vietnam. There are twice as many among the minority groups. In the 1st Cavalry I believe, 42 percent of the reenlistments were black. The reason is they get additional pay for jump pay or combat pay.

The question we have to decide is whether the volunteer army will be made up solely of the poor people in this country, the people who are denied the opportunity for economic or other reasons, of going to school or college and getting good jobs.

Mr. HATFIELD. I think the Senator has put his finger on probably the most fundamental point of all. The Senator pointed to the fact that in this country,

outside the military, there have been conditions growing over a period of time which have denied certain people in this country the same rights to achieve and progress as other people. But must we put that responsibility upon the military procurement program we adopt in this country? I believe the Senator has been a leader in attempting to rectify this situation, and I have indicated my involvement in trying to change the condition in this country. We have made a commitment to the poor and the black in this country that we are going to provide them with equal opportunity.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will say to my dear friend from Oregon that I will be the first person to support the volunteer army when we rectify those inequitable conditions. When we eliminate these conditions, I will be the first to support the volunteer army.

Mr. HATFIELD. I hope the Senator does not forget that the enlistment rates for those below the poverty line and for blacks are approximately the same irrespective of the method of recruitment. In other words, what difference does it make at this point whether a black or a poor person thinks he has a better opportunity if he goes into the military to achieve greater status, income, and dignity under a draft system rather than a voluntary system?

Mr. KENNEDY. The question is whether under a volunteer army system all who serve will be poor. I think they will be and I object to the volunteer army for that reason.

Mr. HATFIELD. I suggest two things: Reenlistment rates of whites are substantial today under a draft system. Therefore, I think while we hope to establish a purely volunteer system, the reenlistment rates would be greater because there would be more adequate comparable pay. Second, because there has been a denial of lack of opportunity for those in our civilian society, let us not thrust on the military program the responsibility for that inequity in our society. We in Congress must move and do our job and maintain our responsibility to correct those inequities. But I do not think we should put the onus for those inequities upon the military and indicate it is their responsibility by some implication.

I would like to quote one other statement from the Gates Commission report. The Senator was concerned about whether we would be able to maintain our volunteer rates with the war and all that is going on now. Under the Department of Defense study, the Gates Commission, which drew from those studies, it is indicated we have the same number of volunteers today as before the Vietnam war.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment or two so that a colloquy may ensue at this point? I hate to bring this spirited debate to an end. It has been very interesting and helpful.

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

PROGRAM—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader is in the Chamber and I would like to ask him if he would enlighten the membership concerning the program for the remainder of the day and the week, if possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, I am glad to respond to the acting minority leader. I am delighted the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is in the Chamber. This request has been agreed to by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and the distinguished minority leader (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on amendment 813 there be a time limitation of not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the manager of the bill, and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the sponsor of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not object. I think we can get through with that amendment and dispose of it today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would imagine there will be a vote on that amendment, although what the outcome will be I do not know.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is a possibility that a second Fulbright amendment may be called up but we will have to wait to see what happens.

Tomorrow the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) will offer an amendment under a 1-hour time limitation, as, hopefully, will the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS).

After those amendments have been disposed of it is the intention of the joint leadership to call up Calendar No. 1129, H.R. 18127, an act making appropriations for public works, and so forth. That is the public works appropriation bill and there will be time available in which to consider it. The leadership gave serious consideration to calling up that measure this afternoon but it could not because of developments over which there was no control and which came up overnight. Therefore, to the best of my knowledge, we will have at least one amendment to be voted on this afternoon, and maybe another one. There will be three tomorrow. When disposed of, the Senate will take up the public works appropriation bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi ask that the unanimous consent be held up for the time being?

Mr. STENNIS. With respect to amendment 813? No, I do not.

August 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 13801

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

(Later in the day this order was modified to provide for a recess to 9 a.m. tomorrow.)

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Journal has been approved and the unobjected to items on the calendar have been disposed of, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that at the conclusion of his remarks the Senate then return to the pending business.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1749) for the relief of Eagle Lake Timber Co., a partnership, of Susanville, Calif., and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes again the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD).

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. First, as a cosponsor of the amendment, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his continuing leadership with reference to the all-volunteer Army proposal. For my information, does the Senator from Oregon know at this time when the amendment might be considered.

Mr. HATFIELD. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi, the majority leader,

the minority leader, and I discussed this matter yesterday. We stood ready for a time agreement, and we are ready to move on a time agreement, but it was not satisfactory to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

So I can only give the Senator a general estimate, and that is that even though we stand ready now for a time limitation, it provides that the amendment will not be laid before the Senate before Monday, and a vote had not before Tuesday, or perhaps even Wednesday.

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator will yield further, one question raised in the colloquy yesterday between the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi was with reference to the possible effective date and whether or not adoption of the amendment would amount to repeal of the Draft Act. Speculating with the Senator from Oregon on the possibility of arriving at a compromise, if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon were effective when the President determined it was in the national interest, could the apparent conflict he avoided between those opposed to an all-volunteer army for that reason and those of who now support the all-volunteer army proposal.

Mr. HATFIELD. In response to the Senator from Arkansas, at the present time, under the wording of the amendment, it would be implemented on the first calendar month following enactment as far as the pay increase is concerned. I would like to emphasize again, as the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) emphasized this morning, the amendment in no way commits the Senate to action on the draft, which is due to expire June 30, 1971. It in no way commits the Senate to that question. It commits the Senate only to an implementation of a pay increase, which would be comparable pay to civilian employment, or an approximately 60 percent increase for the enlisted rates and an approximately 25 percent increase for junior officers.

Therefore, we do not really confront the question of the expiration or of action on the draft.

Second, let me point out that it is the very intention of those of us who have been cosponsoring this proposal that it is a step toward an all-volunteer military. The Senator from Kansas, who holds the Purple Heart and many other awards for distinguished military service, realizes that every program for recruitment cannot be cranked up 1 day after the expiration of an existing system on the previous day. Therefore, there must be some sort of transition period.

We feel that from this point until June 1971, almost a year from now, we would have ample time to make a judgment and an evaluation of whether or not recruitments and enlistments were increasing sufficiently to meet our needs, whatever those needs may be at that time. Therefore, we avoid the kind of problem that would occur if we tried to throw out one system one day and start another system the next day.

That is why we feel it so important to implement this new effort, to get that

period of testing and experience, to see how people respond to it. That is why I think it is important to do it now.

Mr. DOLE. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I agree largely in his response. There appears to be a very serious question, however, whether there may be a gap between the effective date of this legislation and the expiration of the Selective Service Act, assuming that act were not extended.

I am only suggesting a possibility that might bring together some with differing views, whereby the amendment would be implemented, when determined by the President as Commander in Chief to be in the national interest.

The President, whoever he may be, is the Commander in Chief of the armed services and of course has a direct interest.

I would also point out, as the Senator from Oregon knows, that President Nixon, should he be the President, is a strong supporter of the all-volunteer-Army concept. We have a President who supports the concept, but who questions when it should be implemented.

I am simply raising that possibility in an effort to reach some accommodation.

Mr. HATFIELD. May I respond to the Senator from Kansas that I appreciate his idea of getting support for the basic commitment we have in common, which is an all-volunteer armed force. I would point out that the Senate is going to have to make a decision on the question of the draft before the next presidential election. In other words, I think we can pretty well depend, with God's protection and grace, that Mr. Nixon will make the decision on implementing this measure, if it is to be implemented, between now and June 1971. Otherwise, if it is not implemented at this point, we are going to be faced with the probability of having to extend the draft, come next June, for at least another year, and maybe two. Whatever the length of time, we will be faced with that reality.

That is why I feel the sooner we can implement this proposal, the sooner we can get perhaps a more accurate base on which to determine whether this Nation is ready at this moment for an all-volunteer armed force, based on whether we can get the needed manpower. We will have that amount of time and have that experience in order to make that kind of judgment in June. We will have alternatives. We will not be faced with only having to extend the draft for another year or another 2 years—which would be about the only alternative as I see it, at that time.

Mr. DOLE. There is a great deal of merit in bringing up the amendment at this time as we should move forward.

I understand there have not been full and complete hearings but I am realistic and knowing that hearings might be held, but that no bill would be reported to the Senate.

So this is an opportunity to present the amendment and at least discuss the pros and cons. If we can assure the American people, young and old, that there will be no gap, it will be a great step forward.

Mr. HATFIELD. I think that the Senator, here again, has raised a most valid

August 20, 1970

S 13802

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

point, and one that the record should certainly show, clear and unencumbered by any confused language, and that is that we are doing this at this time in order to avoid a gap, and this is what I believe to be at least the best insurance we could get against just that one thing, the gap that the Senator refers to.

If we implement this at this time under this pay increase, the cost question has been raised, that the cost is such today that if we cranked the whole thing down to zero inductions, we would be saving about \$3 billion, according to the best figures we can get from Gates Commission. This Commission has indicated about a \$3.2 billion cost under the various components and the pay program, and rather than an added-on figure, I think it could be shown that, after a transition period, we would be trading one figure for another: that is, the \$3 billion it would cost us for the draft as opposed to \$3 billion for an all-volunteer system. But in addition, we would be getting far more for our money, because we are going to have less turnover than with our inductees today, and the military services are going to require fewer men for training programs and training stations, who can then be reassigned to other functions.

So I think there are many savings that could be effected by an all-volunteer system. The Senator from Arizona said this morning he believed we would actually save money, with less outlay than we have today under the conscription system.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand, only about 7 percent of the young men drafted now stay in the Armed Forces beyond their 2-year obligation. According to the Gates Commission there would be very little difference in the cost question, which would mean, with the lower turnover, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, less expenditures for training. You start with the same number, but they remain longer under the volunteer concept.

Perhaps the senior Senator from Massachusetts raised a valid question. I have asked a number of college students about the voluntary army, and find a great many are for it, because they do not plan to volunteer. But this is a fact of life. Many of these same young students are now in college because of a draft deferment, so they are in a sanctuary, in any event.

The idea is to get away from peacetime conscription, which may not be involuntary servitude, but something close to it. So the concept, so far as I am concerned, is sound. There will be inequities, but in an effort to answer some of the objections, I have prepared a list of a number of questions and then have tried to provide appropriate responses. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some of the usual objections raised to the all-volunteer army concept, together with some of the responses to those arguments.

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

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES—VOLUNTEER ARMY

I. COST

One objection often registered against the all-volunteer army is that it is simply too expensive.

Responses

(1) The President's Commission On An All-Volunteer Armed Force (The Gates Commission) has estimated that the cost of the program, if it is initiated in fiscal 1971, would be \$3.24 billion.

(2) But this figure does not take into account savings due to reductions in personnel turnover. As the Gates Commission Report noted: "When force levels are stabilized, the additional expenditures needed in the transition to a voluntary force will be partly offset by savings engendered through lower turnover and a reduction in the number of persons in training status."—page 8.

Other authorities have commented on these savings:

(a) "Lower turnover means that fewer recruits must be trained, producing considerable cost savings since at present there is nearly one trainer for each trainee."—Walter Y. Oi, professor of economics, College of Business Administration, University of Rochester in Current History, July, 1968.

(b) ". . . At the present time, only about 7 percent of the young men drafted stay in the Armed Forces beyond their 2-year obligation.

"This high turnover rate causes many of the services' most experienced personnel to be tied down in training new recruits. Today, seven out of every 10 men in the Army have less than 2 years military experience. As one Pentagon military official has noted:

"As soon as we are able to operate as a unit, the trained men leave and we have to start all over again."—Senator Hatfield on the Senate floor, January 22, 1969, S1432.

(c) "The essential wisdom of the American scheme of allocating its resources through voluntary mechanisms rather than through government management needs to be extended to this important area of human resources where the costs of misallocation are measured in years, productive and important years, of hundreds of thousands of our citizens."—Scholars Committee on Selective Service Report to President K. S. Pitzer Stanford University, page 12.

(d) "Every young man who has served in our armed forces knows the incredible waste of our present system of forced but short-term service. He knows the money that could be saved, the new efficiency that could result from a volunteer system which calls on young men not to endure two years of service because they have to, but to choose it for a longer period because it offers advantages that seem to them appealing."—Adlai E. Stevenson, speech at Youngstown, Ohio, October 18, 1956. In the Congressional Record, January 22, 1969, S1437.

II. FLEXIBILITY

Some opponents argue that an all-volunteer army would undermine our military flexibility.

(A) An all-volunteer army would not provide us sufficient military manpower. The volunteer concept simply cannot work.

(B) Given time the concept will work, but not under present circumstances. We need a more gradual phase-out of the draft.

Responses

(1) In case of a national emergency, the President will have authority under the Hatfield amendment to request a standby draft by a joint resolution of Congress. If the need is clear, Congress would respond. As the Gates Commission concluded: "The Commission has recommended a standby draft which can

be put into effect promptly if circumstances require mobilization of large numbers of men. History shows that Congress has quickly granted the authority to draft when needed"—page 13.

(2) The volunteer system could certainly provide us the same number of men as we employed before our involvement in Vietnam. The Gates Commission program is based upon a force of 2.5 million men, roughly the same figure (2.43 million men) as we maintained in the force before Vietnam.

(3) In fact, the all-volunteer force would enhance, rather than undermine, the flexibility of our military. The guerrilla wars of the 1960's and 70's require well-trained compact units, as opposed to the large masses of men that conscription produced for our World War II commitments.

As Mr. Nixon pointed out in a speech of October 17, 1968:

"Conscription was an efficient mechanism for raising the massive land armies of past wars. Also, it is easier and cheaper simply to order men into uniform rather than recruiting them. But I believe our military needs in the future will place a special premium on the services of career soldiers."—Congressional Record, January 22, 1969, S1434.

III. BLACK AND POOR PEOPLE

It has often been suggested that the all-volunteer army would attract a disproportionate number of poor people, especially blacks, thus leaving the burden of national defense primarily on them.

Responses—Poor people

(1) It is unfair to criticize the all-volunteer army because it might, in increasing salaries to improve the force, attract those who are presently unable to earn higher salaries elsewhere. It is not the all-volunteer army which is to be blamed; rather we should take further steps to insure that good paying jobs become available throughout society.

(2) There are some jobs in society which are often considered to be unattractive and often dangerous. But no one considers that employees to be exploited, since they take the job voluntarily and receive adequate remuneration.

Responses—Black people

(1) No matter where the poverty line is drawn, there will always be a greater number of whites than blacks who fall into that category. The Gates Commission provided some statistics: "The proportion of blacks below the poverty line in 1967 was 38 percent while only 11 percent of whites were in the same category. But, in absolute numbers more than twice as many whites (17.6 million) as blacks (8.3 million) were below the poverty line"—page 142.

(2) When we look at true volunteers under the present system, we do not find a disproportionate number of blacks. The Gates Commission commented: "Among true volunteers, blacks are now serving in the armed forces almost exactly in proportion to their numbers in the U.S. population"—page 144.

(3) It is physically impossible, just in terms of numbers, for blacks to compose the majority of the armed forces. Economist Milton Friedman, writing in The New Guard, noted: "It has been estimated that even if every qualified Negro who does not now serve were to serve, whites would still constitute a substantial majority of the Armed Forces."

(4) Two concluding remarks should be made concerning blacks serving in the all-volunteer army:

(a) Present advances that are being made in providing equality for blacks should mean that more jobs will open up in the civilian economy. This would reduce the likelihood

August 20, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 13803

that blacks would turn to the army in disproportionate numbers.

As Mark Hatfield commented: "As we expand the opportunities in the civilian job sector, fewer black men will find the military to be the most attractive road to higher economic and social status, and this will tend to place an effective ceiling on the proportion of blacks who enlist."—speech reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 3, 1969, S3592.

(b) The Gates Commission made the following prediction on the number of blacks that would serve in the all-volunteer force: "For the Army, we estimate that the proportion of blacks will be 17 percent for the mixed force and 19 percent for the voluntary force as compared to 12.8 percent in the Army today."—page 15.

IV. MILITARISM

Opponents to the all-volunteer army may argue that it would destroy the constitutional and traditional subordination of the military to the civilian sector. The expression often used in connection with this argument is "mercenary army," describing a bloodthirsty force that kills for cash.

RESPONSES

(1) It is unrealistic to suggest that employing only volunteers at higher pay would completely transform the military-civilian relationship or that it would make drastic changes in the motives of our men.

(a) "To suggest that men who enlist to serve their country do so only for pay is to demean the hundreds of thousands who voluntarily serve today. More than half of all the men in today's forces are true volunteers." The Gates Commission Report, page 136.

(b) "A mercenary is a soldier of fortune—one who fights for or against anyone for pay. What we're talking about now is American soldiers, serving under the American flag. We are talking about men who proudly wear our country's uniform in defense of its freedom. We're talking about the same kind of citizen armed force America has had ever since it began, excepting only the period when we have relied on the draft." Richard Nixon, campaign speech, October 17, 1968.

(2) It should be noted that the only real change in the composition of the army's personnel will be in the lower ranks. The higher echelons, which are composed of career men anyway, are the ones who determined the relationship of the military to the civilian sector.

(a) "The danger of military elitism comes primarily from the officers who are, and always have been, professionals. The civilian influence must be injected at the top—in the office of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force, if we are to establish safeguards against the dangers of a military clique or class. The possible military threat to political stability is largely unrelated to the system used in recruiting enlisted men."—Senator Hatfield, Congressional Record, April 29, 1969.

(b) "To the extent that a military force endangers freedom and democracy, the danger comes from the higher ranks of commissioned officers, all of whom are volunteers, as are most of the lower ranks of officers and all of the higher ranks of noncommissioned officers. Using conscripts instead of volunteers in the lowest enlisted grades, and those are the only ranks in which we use appreciable proportions of conscripts, is no protection—as was illustrated by recent coups in Greece and South America."—W. Allen Wallis, University of Rochester in Science, March 28, 1969.

V. THERE ARE SOME LESSER WORKABILITY ARGUMENTS WHICH COULD BE ADVANCED

You should be aware of these:

(1) We, and specifically President Nixon, could be taking steps now to enhance the attractiveness of the military, short of adopting an all-volunteer system.

(a) Senator Scott alluded to this on the floor July 27, 1970:

He noted that President Nixon can and should be "... gradually replacing those draftees who are presently serving in Vietnam with volunteers ... By sending only volunteers to Vietnam to replace those soldiers whose tours of duty in Vietnam have ended, the administration can take the lead. It can visibly demonstrate that the volunteer concept is a viable one." S12125

(b) "The President would like to reduce the draft gradually and to improve the quality of the military services by increasing their appeal. He has asked Secretary of Defense Mel Laird to prepare new programs that will encourage men to re-enlist.

"Laird is ready to offer up to 10,000 new family units, educational opportunities for servicemen who would like to study, and various financial inducements. He is even willing to abolish KP and hire civilians to do the hated kitchen work."—Jack Anderson, "Volunteer Army is Far in Future," *The Washington Post*, March 27, 1970, page D-15.

(2) How can we possibly attract doctors and other high-skill people since they can no doubt always make better pay in the civilian economy?

(3) Will all branches of the armed forces receive the same pay? If so, won't everyone seek to serve in areas or branches (Navy or Air Force) which would entail the least direct risk?

(4) We could end the inequities of the present draft system by ending deferments and initiating a program of national service for everyone. This would obviate the need for the all-volunteer force.

Finally, we propose three reasons why the draft should be replaced with an all-volunteer system:

(Note that counter-proposals, such as the one above for National Service, would not answer all these points.)

I. Conscription is the greatest infringement of personal freedom in America today.

"We should recognize that (the draft) is about the most odious form of Government control we have yet accepted. We should not forget that it is a basic violation of our traditions of freedom and individualism."—*The Wall Street Journal*, March 1967 editorial.

II. The present draft is unfair and inequitable.

(A) Even under the lottery system, with the risk supposedly spread equally, some young men are forced to serve while others are not.

"Any system which selects only some from a pool of many will inevitably have some elements of inequity."—President Nixon in his message to Congress, May 13, 1969.

(B) It is discriminatory within society as a whole since those who are forced to serve are burdened with a "hidden tax."

(1) "Whatever the extra amount, we are paying a larger sum in concealed form. Conscription is a tax in kind—forced labor exacted from the men who serve involuntarily ..."—Milton Friedman, "A Volunteer Army," *Newsweek*, Dec. 19, 1966.

(2) "We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee."—John Kenneth Galbraith, "The Case for a Volunteer Army," *Time*, Jan. 10, 1969.

(3) "Men who are forced to serve in the military at artificially low pay are actually paying a form of tax which subsidizes those in the society who do not serve. Furthermore, the output of the civilian economy is reduced because more men serve in the military than would be required for an all-volunteer force of the same strength."—*The Gates Commission Report* page 9.

III. It is inefficient and real costs can be reduced. Drafted men lack the desire and intensive training that would exist under the all-volunteer system.

(A) "A volunteer army would be manned

by people who had chosen a military career rather than at least partly by reluctant conscripts anxious only to serve out their term. Aside from the effect on fighting spirit this would produce a lower turnover in the armed services, saving precious man-hours that are now wasted in training or being trained. It would permit also intensive training and a higher average level of skill of the men in the service. And it would encourage the use of more and better equipment. A smaller, but more highly skilled, technically competent, and better armed force could provide the same or greater military strength."—Milton Friedman, *The New Guard*.

(B) The Association of the U.S. Army (AUSA), which does not advocate a volunteer army, concluded nonetheless that "an all-volunteer force should be a more efficient one."

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on what the Senator from Kansas has said, because I believe he is putting his finger on a number of good points.

The idea that somehow the draft provides us with an across-the-board, more equitable system of recruitment than an all-volunteer system, merely because college and university students are not responding to a question as to whether they are going to volunteer, if we carried that logic to its conclusion, we would not accept any volunteers in the military.

Mr. DOLE. That is very true. And a great number of people would volunteer as generals, but not many want to volunteer as privates. The Senator from Oregon, the principal sponsor of the amendment, understands that one way to attract young men into the Army is through realistic pay scales. Perhaps some of those would be college students—perhaps not any great number, but, as the Senator knows, our induction rate is very low now. Our draft calls will be down to practically zero next year. In fact, as Secretary Laird has already announced, I do not recall in which month, but in one of the coming months the draft call will be zero, because of volunteers and deescalation in South Vietnam.

The Senator gave the figure; was it only 8 percent who are relisted, out of the drafted manpower pool?

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. So we are not discussing any great departure. We are proposing a realistic proposal that would make it attractive for young men to enter the service and to have some comparability with those on the outside as far as pay scales are concerned. That is the primary thrust of the Senator's effort.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I do not believe it is a radical departure. It is not an effort to create some mercenary force; it is not an effort to create an all-black army; it is not an effort to create an army composed only of poor people. I agree with the Senator's earlier statement in that we are going to have pretty much the same black-white ratio we have now; maybe a slight increase of blacks, but a very slight increase.

The objections should be answered. This is a serious question. It is a departure in some sense, but not the radical departure many feel it is, because they fail to understand the volunteer concept. It has great merit, and I support it.

Mr. HATFIELD. I appreciate the comments of the able Senator from Kansas, because here again I think we have to realize, when the Senator speaks about this not being a radical departure or an innovative scheme that has not been tried, that for 170 years of this Nation's history, we relied completely, to provide military services for this country, on a volunteer system. For 170 years; this is the first time in the history of this Nation that we have tolerated peacetime conscription.

The Senator knows the history of conscription in this country; it has been used only in times of great emergency—the Civil War, World War I, World War II—and I think the fact is that we have come to accept it as a way of life because it is the easiest thing to do, and that we, therefore, have not really attempted to put into action a voluntary system, which would be far more in keeping with the history of this Nation than a conscription system.

I think when we look at Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and the other countries of the Western World which have relied upon a volunteer system and have done so successfully, that it is certainly a general indication; even though they are not comparable at all to our country's requirements and commitments, it certainly shows that other countries as well as the United States have been successful in the raising of armies and other military branches on a volunteer system, plus the fact that we, today, have a volunteer program providing the military manpower for the Marines, the Navy, and the Air Force, and it is only the Army for which we basically have to rely on the draft for manpower.

I do not think we would have to do that if we returned to the tradition of this country by providing equitable pay. I do not think it is fair for the men themselves to bear the cost of their own military service. The taxpayers should pay for the military requirements of this Nation, and that is all the amendment proposes.

One last word. President Nixon has made it very clear, both in his campaign and in the Republican Party platform of 1968, as well as the Republican Party platform of 1964, that this Nation, under his leadership, is committed to an all-volunteer army.

Let us not read more into what the President has said, or try to interpret the President, because he has stated it very clearly in a radio message he gave to the American people during the 1968 campaign. He predicated the timing of this change on a diminished manpower requirement in Vietnam. So I think it ought to be very clear that we are not claiming the President has endorsed his particular amendment at this time; but the President has stood very clearly and firmly in support of the concept, as well as both major political parties, Democrat and Republican, in their party platforms.

Lastly, I think this gives the President and Congress an opportunity to undertake this through a reasonable transition, in a very responsible way, to see if it will work; I for one believe it will, but it certainly will have at least almost a

year to determine the validity of my belief.

Mr. DOLE. I have the exact comment that then candidate Nixon made on October 17, 1968. He addressed himself to the voluntary army concept and also the objection it would be a mercenary force. He said:

A mercenary is a soldier of fortune—one who fights for or against anyone for pay. What we're talking about now is American soldiers, serving under the American flag. We are talking about men who proudly wear our country's uniform in defense of its freedom. We're talking about the same kind of citizen armed force America has had ever since it began, excepting only the period when we have relied on the draft.

I believe that is the statement that the Senator from Oregon had in mind.

Mr. HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. The President made clear without equivocation; that he supports the all-volunteer army concept.

Mr. HATFIELD. I would say further, in connection with the point about the number of draftees serving in Vietnam, which has been discussed this morning, that we have the figures which indicate that 88 percent of the infantry riflemen in Vietnam are draftees; but under President Nixon's withdrawal projections, they will have left by this time next year—that is, those who are being withdrawn—and we expect to have most of those draftees out of Vietnam. As of July 1, 1970, we find, computing the total armed force strength in Vietnam, that approximately 25 percent of them are draftees.

So that we have, again, the basis of a mixed force fighting in Vietnam. It is not a matter of having all our draftees there and our professionals or nondraftees elsewhere.

Mr. President, I look forward to the continuation of this discussion, and I am hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services can—

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I will vote against the Hatfield amendment to create an all-volunteer Army.

The effects of this amendment would be so far reaching that I feel it is unwise to just tack it onto another bill without full and extensive Senate committee hearings.

I have several serious questions about a volunteer Army which should be answered in such hearings.

First, what will it cost? According to the Department of Defense, it would cost \$4.3 billion, but some observers estimate it could cost far more. When the budget deficit for this fiscal year is currently estimated at over \$10 billion—when there are desperate needs in such areas as education, health, housing, and the environment—I believe Congress must seriously study both the total cost of this proposal and its priority as it relates to other national needs.

Second, would a volunteer Army increase the already substantial power and influence of the military on American life?

Third, what effect would this amendment have on the war in Vietnam? Although I oppose the war in Vietnam and am a cosponsor of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war, the effects of precipitately instituting an all-volunteer Army in the midst of a war need further and serious study.

Fourth, what are the alternatives? Although the Gates Commission which studied the volunteer Army concept released a report of over 200 pages, only four were devoted to "Alternatives to an All-Volunteer Force." I think possible alternatives deserve more consideration.

Fifth, is the push for an all-volunteer Army a reaction to the tragic involvement in Vietnam rather than a needed and practicable reform? After all, in peacetime we virtually have an all-volunteer Army and in times of war some type of draft will probably be necessary anyway. What is really gained?

I believe questions such as these should be explored in depth in legislative hearings and that it is not sufficient to adopt such a far-reaching program by the simple expedient of an amendment to a bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EAGLETON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am very much impressed, indeed, with the fine analysis of this problem—the points involved and the consequences of the adoption of this amendment—put forth by the Senator from Missouri. I think that with his fine, analytical mind, he has analyzed the matter clearly and has made an excellent contribution to the debate.

Mr. EAGLETON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. And I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding for this purpose.

Mr. HATFIELD. I am not so sure that I am glad I yielded at this point, but I am happy to say that I appreciate very much the questions raised by the Senator from Missouri; because I think he has raised not only valid questions but also questions that really go to the very heart of this amendment, and for which we certainly feel we have the material and the data to give response. I would like to have the privilege of a copy of the Senator's questions. They certainly deserve more than an off-the-cuff response at this point.

I think that by reading the colloquy that took place this morning, the Senator from Missouri will find that we did address ourselves to most of these questions, and I would be happy to go into greater depth on the points he raises.

Mr. President, I am about ready to yield the floor. Before I do so, I want to reiterate that the cosponsors of this amendment and I are and have been ready to reach an agreement on time. I am hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, together with his colleagues who oppose this amendment, can come to some kind of agreement so that we can look forward to a vote—not trying to hurry the debate but recognizing, as the Senator from Mississippi said yesterday, that the Senate is trying to clean up its work, trying