

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Hermann F. Elits, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Viron P. Vaky, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Costa Rica.

Frederick Irving, of Rhode Island, a Foreign

Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

George W. Landau, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

Adm. Horacio Rivero, U.S. Navy, retired, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Frank T. Bow, of Ohio, to be Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

Joseph A. Mendenhall, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Officer of Class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

Talcott W. Seelye, of Maryland, a Foreign Service Officer of Class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Tunisia.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## VETERANS' BENEFITS

## HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the young men returning from service in Vietnam and other parts of the world are having a tough time finding jobs and making ends meet if they are going to school.

Part of the problem is the fact that we have not provided them with the benefits they deserve. Hopefully that will be corrected in the near future.

However, there is also a problem of communication. Many of these veterans do not know what benefits are available to them or where to find out what is available.

Recently, the magazine "Changing Times" printed a clear, concise summary of these benefits, along with the necessary qualifications and advice on how and where to apply for them.

At this time I enter into the RECORD this article from the September issue of the magazine.

## VETERANS: DON'T FORGET THESE BENEFITS

Despite the efforts of the Veterans Administration, too many benefits go unclaimed because veterans or the members of their families don't know about them. Furthermore, some of the provisions have changed to include more people since 1970. If there's any chance you or someone you know might be missing a rightful benefit, better check this rundown.

Education. Anyone released after January 31, 1955, who has served 18 months or more in the armed forces is entitled to 36 months of financial assistance for education. Those with more than 180 days of service but less than 18 months can get a month and a half of financial assistance for each month served.

There are different payment rates if you go to school less than half time or are enrolled in a cooperative program, apprenticeship or other on-the-job training, farm cooperative, correspondence course or flight training. Wives and children of servicemen missing in action or prisoners of war for more than 90 days also can get assistance. Rates of payment depend on the amount of time spent in study, the types of program being taken and the number of dependents you have. As of this writing there are three major bills pending in Congress that would increase the allowances.

Veterans released from active duty after January 31, 1955, have eight years from discharge or until May 31, 1974, whichever is later, to complete their training.

Employment. Your old job must be given back to you if you ask for it, provided it was a fulltime position. If you have been dis-

abled and can't do that job, your employer must find you another job in the organization that's comparable in seniority, status and pay. All benefits, including automatic pay raises and promotions that you would have received, must be given to you. You must apply within 90 days of separation or release from hospitalization. If you have trouble, get in touch with your nearest Office of Veterans Reemployment Rights of the Department of Labor.

If you can't find a job, you may be eligible for unemployment benefits from your state employment service office.

Life insurance. Your Servicemen's Group Life Insurance, with its \$15,000 maximum, is good for 120 days after separation, with no premiums required. It can be converted, regardless of your health, to an individual policy issued by one of the 600 participating commercial companies if you apply and pay the premiums before the end of the 120 days.

Loans. Eligibility for VA-guaranteed home loans is no longer subject to expiration. Widows and wives of prisoners of war or those missing in action also are eligible. Such loans can be used to buy, build, refinance or improve a home, or to buy a mobile home, condominium or farm home.

The VA guarantees a maximum of \$12,500 toward a home loan, which may run for as long as 30 years. Maximum interest rate is currently 7%. Ordinarily, the money doesn't come from the VA. The government simply guarantees the lenders repayment of the amount for which the borrower has qualified. You must find a lender willing to make the deal.

Mobile homes may be purchased for up to \$10,000 with a VA-guaranteed loan at a maximum of 10.75% for 12 years. If the mobile home purchase includes a developed site, another \$7,500 and a total of 15 years may be allowed.

Medical care. VA hospitals that have room will care for a veteran who can't afford private treatment for nonservice disabilities. The VA may also provide medical care for those who are about to enter a VA hospital or who have just left it. Private nursing home care is available in some cases at VA expense.

Pensions. Wartime veterans who become totally disabled from causes unrelated to military duty may be eligible for small, monthly pensions, depending on yearly income. Wartime veterans 65 years old and older are eligible for small pensions, depending on their incomes. So are the widows and children.

State benefits. A number of states have voted various rights and benefits for Vietnam veterans, including pay bonuses and exemption from some property taxes for patients convalescing in VA hospitals. Check with your statehouse.

For personal help. Write, call or visit your nearest VA regional office. Many states have a toll-free telephone service to the VA from communities in the state. Check your directory or the information operator for the listing.

## PRESIDENT NIXON SPEAKS BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION

## HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, President Nixon recently addressed the 54th Annual National Convention of the American Legion in Chicago, Ill. Because I believe his remarks would also be of interest to those who were not in attendance that day, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

## REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE AMERICAN LEGION

## THE WHITE HOUSE.

Commander Geiger, my comrades in the American Legion, those who are here from the Legion Auxiliary, all of our very distinguished guests, and all of the past Commanders and others who are distinguished guests here on the platform.

It is indeed a very great honor for me to appear before this convention. It seems that this is my week to appear before conventions. But having first addressed a Legion Convention when I was a junior Senator from the State of California back in the year 1951, I know that we do not discuss partisan politics, so I will not tell you which party nominated me.

What I would like to say today is that, first, I am aware of the magnificent tradition of the Legion, the fact that we think in terms of our country; we recognize that partisan differences really don't matter where the national defense is involved and where the peace and security of America is involved. We are not Republicans, we are not Democrats, we are Americans. And that is what the Legion believes.

My friend Don Johnson, I was saying to Commander Geiger that he was the tallest man who had been Commander of the Legion since Johnson and they are both from Iowa. That is where the corn grows tall.

But in 1965, when he was the Commander and I had the privilege of addressing the convention—incidentally, I appreciated your invitation to come today when I am serving as President. I appreciated it even more when I didn't hold any office in 1965.

Oh that occasion, Don Johnson, as Commander, introduced me. He later, as you know, has become the head of the Veterans Administration. Something has happened that is very important that may not have come to your notice, that we have appointed him as a member of the Cabinet Domestic Council which raises, for the first time in this country, the status of the man in this country with the responsibility for veterans affairs to the position of Cabinet status. That

is where it ought to be because we have to have those matters discussed in the Cabinet.

Now I could stand here and tell you all the great things Don Johnson has stood for and what this Administration has done and immediately we could write that into a partisan context.

I don't do that because, first, it is not true and that is a good reason. I could say that perhaps the best way to describe the attitude that we have on veterans affairs in the House, in the Senate, in the Administration, whether it is a Republican Administration or Democratic Administration, is we must do the right thing for our veterans, for those who have served.

And on that score, it is very significant to note that when we look at the House Veterans Affairs Committee, that we have, of course, a Democrat, who is Chairman of the Committee and a Republican who is the Minority leader. Both of them, however, have the name of Teague, but I can tell you if I call Tiger Teague or Charlie Teague, I get the same answer on veterans affairs, because they agree all the time.

We are proud of our record in this area. We appreciate your advice and I know, Commander, that you have a number of resolutions that have been passed. I want you to, of course, submit them to us for our consideration and we hope that in all the years ahead, whoever serves in the office of President will remember that it is so easy to forget those who have served. Let's never do it in the United States of America.

Now I have selected for my subject to address this great convention of the American Legion here in Chicago, national defense.

Now, when I use the subject of national defense before a Legion Convention, I am sure many would say that is like the preacher talking to the choir, because after all, you are already converted. I hope all members of the choir are converted, but in any event, you are people who believe in national defense.

You pass resolutions for strong national defense year after year. And whenever issues come up, whoever is President of the United States, he can be sure that the Commander of the American Legion, as he comes to the White House, as your Commander here now and as others through the years have been there, will be there, always supporting strong national defense.

I tell you why I talk about it today. I talk about it because it is an issue. It happens to be an issue in an election campaign, but even if there were not an election, it would be an issue, because the American people naturally would like to spend more of their money on domestic needs, they would like to spend enough to develop the country, but they don't want to spend more than they need to.

And so naturally there is honest difference of opinion as to how much we ought to spend in order to have an adequate national defense. I want to talk to you about it now with those thoughts in mind.

How much is enough? What do we really need?

Let me begin by saying something that is quite obvious, and that is that when we speak before a group like the American Legion, you know from personal experience the importance of keeping America strong.

I think perhaps the most eloquent statement in recent times in that respect was by General MacArthur in his very famous speech on the plain of West Point, "Duty, Honor, Country." If you haven't read it, read it. It is one of the greatest speeches perhaps ever made on national defense, and also on what is great about America. About the soldier, he told them, those young men on the plain, "above all other people," he said, "the soldier prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war."

That is something we forget sometimes.

We think that a veterans' organization is primarily interested in problems of war. I have found that veterans' organizations have the strongest commitments to peace, because you know what war is, and you are for strength because you want to avoid more war.

Others may talk of the dream of peace and the horrors of war, but no one understands them better than you, you who have to pay the toll. It is the military man, as much as the poet or the politician, who is the guardian for peace when it comes, and is the restorer of peace when it is challenged.

History is strewn with the ruins of countries which sometimes, for the most idealistic of reasons, lost the will to defend themselves and ultimately lost the will to survive at all.

George Washington stated it also very well, perhaps it has not been surpassed, when he said, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Let us not forget that warning of his, because the stakes now for us and for the rest of the world are infinitely greater than it was in that early period when the United States was a very strong country in terms of its own spirit, but very weak militarily, and not a great factor in the world.

Washington was not alone in his conviction that it takes a strong America to keep a free America. Lincoln, Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson—each time we have found that they have spoken on this subject always reflected in eloquent terms the need for a strong national defense.

I am convinced those are the views of a majority of Americans, whatever their party affiliations. I feel, of course, that there are naturally some small anti-military activists who totally disagree. They have rights to their opinions.

As I will point out, I believe that when we consider what the goal is—and the goal is peace—that it is certainly irrefutable that we need the strong national defense if we are going to reach the goal.

That is why my principle, like yours, is that the United States must never have a defense which is second to that of any other nation in the world.

I say that for a number of reasons which, I suppose, might be open to question, but one of them is not: that it is a matter of jingoistic pride, although we should be proud of our country; it is not a matter of national ego, although we should not be ashamed of our country. But, you see, I have sat across the bargaining table with representatives of other great powers. I know what they stand for. I know that the only way that we can get a reduction of arms, the only way that we can get agreements that will limit the danger of war, is to be sure that the President of the United States, whoever he is, is never negotiating from weakness. That is what we have to have.

Now the question is, "What is enough?" because I realize that others have spoken to this convention and others will speak to Legion conventions in the future and say, "We have enough; we can cut." You should consider that, but I ask you now to consider, very calmly and very quietly, what I have to say about what is enough. I have studied this a great deal. I have had the opportunity not only to negotiate, where I found out what the other side had, and I knew what we had, but I also have had an opportunity, as we have wound down the war in Vietnam, to do something that we all want to do—to cut on defense where it is not needed.

We have economized. We will continue to economize on military spending whenever it is safe to do so. But I have never gambled, and I never will gamble, with the safety of the American people under the false banner of economy.

Lasting peace is built on strength. Economy always but weakness never.

Now, look at the record. Let's see what we have done.

We have been able to reduce defense spending to a safe minimum without betraying our security or dishonoring our treaty commitments.

We have successfully reduced our overall military manpower by nearly one-third. This is all over the past 3½ years.

We have closed overseas bases which were no longer needed for our national security, and we have done that without undermining the confidence of our allies.

We have successfully persuaded our allies to take up a greater share of the free world defense burden than they have in the past under the Nixon Doctrine.

Separate the facts from the campaign rhetoric and you will find that the 1973 defense budget, which has been subjected to so much criticism, accounts for only 6.4 percent of our GNP, and that imposes the smallest economic burden on our country of any defense budget in more than 20 years. Now, that is real progress.

Now we come to the key point.

We have cut our defense budget in terms of its burden on our American economy. Can we go further? In my belief, it would be a mistake to go further, and I am supported in that belief by a bipartisan majority in the House and in the Senate. And to their great credit, let me say, speaking as one who is a member of the minority party as reflected in those two bodies, Democrats and Republicans who put their country above their party voted down big defense cuts because they knew it would cut into the muscle of American defense, and that we must never do.

Now that, of course, is a conclusion. Let me give you the facts to back it up. Let me give you the reasons why I think that Democrats join with Republicans in voting overwhelmingly in both the House and the Senate against these big cuts in defense that were supported by other people who believed that we could cut and still be strong enough, still be, as some have said, the strongest nation or at least with a defense second to none.

When we talk about who is going to be first, who is going to be second, let's put it in terms of what is sufficient for both countries. In that connection, what we find as we look at the Soviet Union and the United States, taking the two strongest powers in the world, we find that today they are relatively equal when we balance it all out in terms of their defenses. We are ahead in some areas; they are ahead in others. We are ahead in the areas we believe are necessary for our defense; they are ahead in the areas that they believe are necessary for their defense.

At the present time, for example, the Soviet Union has a much greater army than we have because they are a land power. They need more. On the other hand, in other areas we are ahead. But now let's look at these various cuts.

If we want to keep the United States from having the second best defense, we must recognize that if we should take the Minuteman III program, the Poseidon missile program, and if we should halt the development of those programs, it would mean that the United States would be the second strongest country in the world in missiles. We would be Number 2, not Number 1.

So now we start. We are second in manpower already. Now we are second in missiles. If we were to cut 60 percent of our strategic bomber force, which is the second recommendation made by some of the others, and if we cancel development of the B-1 bomber, it would mean that the United States would become the second strongest nation in the world in air power. There are no other conclusions you can reach.

If we cut back on our naval strength, as some have recommended, and they have rec-



commended that we can cut carrier forces from 16 to 6, if we do that at a time when the Soviet Union is actively engaged in the greatest naval build-up in history, the United States would become the second strongest nation in the world in naval power.

What this adds up to, my friends, very simply is this: We would be second on the ground; we would be second in air power; we would be second in terms of missiles, and we would be second as far as the Navy is concerned.

That means that we would be hopelessly behind. We cannot let that happen to America. We have to see that America always has enough. So the issue of whether we cut or don't cut is very simply this: The cuts that I have mentioned make the United States the second strongest nation in the world. That is why I have had to oppose them. That is why a majority of the Members of the House and Senate oppose them, and that is why I ask the American Legion to oppose them in the interest of strong national defense for this country.

Let's turn to a couple of other areas.

Many of the Legionnaires here have served in Europe, either in World War II or, after that, in our peacetime forces in NATO. If we would have a major, unilateral reduction of our forces in NATO, what it would do would be to undercut the confidence of our friends; but more so, it would destroy an initiative that we are now undertaking with the Soviet Union and with the Warsaw Pact forces mutually to reduce our forces.

Let's look at another point, looking to the future. If we were to cut back the money going into research and development for a more modern national defense, we risk the safety of the next generation of Americans, because this I know: The Soviet Union is not cutting back on its research and development.

Let us remember: We have made a significant step forward in our talks with the Soviets, but it was hard-headed bargaining. We expected them to bargain hard. We bargained hard. We have had the first step taken to limit nuclear arms. We have had a treaty to limit, of course, nuclear arms as far as defensive arms are concerned; we have an offensive limitation as an understanding. We are going to go on with further negotiations, we trust, later in this year.

But, my friends, the only way, in any kind of a negotiation, you can get something in dealing with a major power like the Soviet Union, or any other major power—the only way you can get something is if you have something to give. If the United States unilaterally cuts back on what we have, you have destroyed their incentive to come to the conference table, because they will already have what they want.

That is another reason why we have to keep these defenses up. That is the responsible position. We are going to continue to be responsible. If we do, putting it on the positive side, we stand today on the brink of a more peaceful, more secure era for all mankind, because from a positive standpoint, we can negotiate in these areas negotiating not from weakness.

Now, none of this could have been achieved without the strong moral support of groups like the American Legion, of individual Americans of both political parties, as I have indicated. If there is one thing that can sustain a President in trying times, it is the support and faith of the people themselves. More than any other American, the President has the opportunity to witness this faith in a thousand big and little ways.

People write letters. They say they are praying for you. A Commander of the American Legion or VFW or another veterans' organization comes in or he calls on the phone. These things mean a great deal, particularly when we have difficult times. I am grateful for the support that you have given, not to

me as an individual, not to my party, but to the President of the United States, who is Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces. You have stood behind your Government during the difficult but successful policy of winding down the war in Vietnam and settling it in an honorable way.

That is why we have been able to bring home half a million American fighting men from Vietnam. But what is more important, we have done it without selling out our allies, without surrendering to our enemies, and without abandoning our prisoners of war and our missing in action. That we will never do.

Now, I would like to say something, if I could, about the men who have served and are serving our country in Vietnam and other parts of the world. I know that it has become rather fashionable in recent times, perhaps in the last four or five years as we have gone through the terribly difficult war in Vietnam, to find everything that is wrong about the men who serve in our Armed Forces: They are drug addicts; they are dangerous people; they are savage; they are people who are really the inferior people, the ones who, from a moral standpoint, agreed to serve rather than not to serve, and so on and so forth.

Let me tell you that I have been to Vietnam a number of times. Since our involvement there began, I have been there in '64, '65—six times, as a matter of fact, before I became President, and once since. I have gone out in the field. I have been to Danang with the Marines. I have been up in the Highlands with the Army. I have been down in the Delta, also with Army forces. I have seen some of the Naval forces, too.

Let me tell you, yes, there are, as there always are in every war, as there always are in any American community of young men, there are men who don't live up to the standards that we would like. But I can tell you that as I have seen the young men who have served in Vietnam, I am proud of them. They are fine, young men and we should stand up for them.

I am very proud, for example, of Marine and Army groups who, in the year 1967—and it has happened every year since then; that was the last time I was there and had a chance to look at it in this particular matter—contributed \$1 million out of their very small pay for the purpose of helping to build schools and community centers and roads for the people of South Vietnam.

I have seen Marines. I have seen young men, enlisted men, not officers necessarily—oh, they were there, too—but I have seen them out there teaching language, working, taking their time, helping these people in a peaceful way. Let me say, instead of making moral heroes of a few hundred who have deserted their country, let's honor the real heroes who have served their country in Vietnam.

They are gallant men. They are not ashamed of their country. They are brave men who did not desert their nation. They are heroes who will stand just as tall as those who fought at Normandy and Iwo Jima. America is not going to turn her back on them. We are not going to make a mockery of their sacrifice and devotion by talking of amnesty for deserters while some of their comrades are held captive in brutal North Vietnamese prisons.

What they fought for and what we seek today is a true generation of peace, not a short, humiliating truce that will encourage aggression and have the effect of rewarding the foes of freedom. I know that many say that the journey to such a peace is long, and of course it is. But it is a journey that we have begun. We have begun it in opening a new relationship with the world's most populous country, the People's Republic of China. We have begun it in our negotiations with the Soviet Union. I have gone to the four corners of the earth, including even

other countries that a President never visited before.

I do not mean that the trips alone will do it, but I do mean that because the United States is strong, because the United States is respected, the United States can be and should be the leader in the world for peace.

That is why we must keep our strength, because if we were not strong we would not be respected. Let's never have a President in that position as he goes abroad. I found a desire for peace in Peking and Moscow. Many of you will find that hard to believe, but it is not desired for the same reason or the same terms in each of these world centers. But it is desired so that if America does not falter or weaken we have a basis to build on.

We can have a hope that the next generation of Americans will not have to face the same specter of war in their time that we have had in ours. This is a noble hope, a hope we all should work to build into reality. It will not become a reality if we heed the honest but misguided voices of those who say we should weaken America today and naively hope for peace tomorrow.

But it can become a reality if we continue to follow a responsible, rational foreign policy, if we keep America strong enough to make that policy credible.

Therefore, I say, let us join together to keep America strong. If we do this, a strong America can continue to lead the world toward a just and lasting peace.

I would like to close my remarks, if I could, Commander Geiger, and my comrades in the American Legion, with these rather personal notes: Having been a member of the Legion since 1947, spoken to local posts, then State groups, and then national conventions, I think I know my comrades and I know what you want for your country.

These parting words are what I think the role of the Legion can be in these years as we move from war to peace.

First, it is vitally important to keep America strong. I know you will support that proposition. Secondly, it is vitally important to honor the men who have served because remember, we are now moving to a volunteer armed force. In order for that volunteer armed force to be adequate to serve it is going to have to be something more than money. We are going to have to give respect to those who guard the United States in times of peace.

Finally, my third request to my comrades in the American Legion is this: In addition to keeping our country strong and honoring those who serve, continue the wonderful work you are doing with young Americans. I was tremendously excited to see the young voters that I saw in Miami over this last week. The fact that for the first time the 18 to 21-year olds are voting means that we have a new element in American politics. It will be good for the country and good for both parties because they bring idealism and enthusiasm that we need.

But let me say I have also been tremendously moved when I have seen the representatives of Boys Nations and Girls Nations. Mrs. Nixon has met them, too, when they have come to Washington. You may wonder whether that kind of work is worthwhile. I will tell you, it certainly is, because the important thing for our young Americans to realize and a great majority of them, I believe, do realize that, is that they should not give up on the system, which was the fashionable thing three or four or five years ago. It is that they should remember that this American system is one that you can change peacefully by working within the system. Here is the message to give them: Tell them that the answer to throwing a rock is to cast a vote. That is the answer.

Finally, let us also tell them and tell all of our fellow Americans that we have nothing to be ashamed of in terms of what we seek in the world. Oh, we have made our mistakes

in foreign policy. I know that we look back to World War I—and there are not so many of those veterans still here, but some fortunately are still with us—World War II, Korea, Vietnam. Do you realize we have sent millions of Americans abroad in four wars in this century; but never for the purpose of destroying freedom, only to defend it; never for the purpose of breaking the peace, only to keep it.

The United States has had, in terms of its foreign policy, an idealistic thrust which has been very unusual in the history of great nations. That is why strength in the hands of the United States means safety for the world. Keep America strong. Be proud of what America has done in fighting its wars and how it is now fighting to bring about generations of peace for the years ahead.

## REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

**HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1972

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my August 1972 report from Washington to the residents of California's 30th District. The report highlights some of the major legislative and national issues being considered by the 92d Congress.

The report follows:

### REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

#### PUSH FOR SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

Congress has recently acted to offset inflation and rising costs for millions of older, blind and disabled persons who continue to live on totally inadequate incomes. The important event came with the enactment of a 20% boost in social security benefits. This increase would be financed without imposing any additional taxes on the average wage earner.

With the welfare-social security bill tied up in the Senate, and final action likely to be delayed, I joined with Rep. Wilbur Mills of Ways and Means Committee to force a separate vote on the social security boost. We won the 20% increase when the House accepted our proposal by a near unanimous vote.

The new social security law provides a 20% increase effective Sept. 1, 1972, with provision for an automatic cost-of-living adjustment beginning in 1975.

#### Older Americans Act

Spurred on by this success, the House went on to update the Older Americans Act of 1965. The catalyst for this change came from several key proposals which Rep. John Brademas and I offered earlier this year.

As passed by the House, H.R. 15657 approves a 9-point program that extends and strengthens the 1965 Act for the next 3 years. The program calls for:

Greater authority to the Administration on Aging as a focal point for federal aid to older citizens.

Expansion of the state grant programs to develop better community based services. Special programs in housing, employment, low-cost transportation and pre-retirement guidance.

New authority to lease or construct multi-purposes senior citizen centers.

Expansion of the National Older Americans Volunteer effort, with new work opportunities for low-income older citizens.

Creation of a National Advisory Council to advise and assist the President on the needs of older persons.

Requirement that the newly enacted nutrition program is closely linked to each state's overall strategy for serving older citizens.

Increased support for research, demonstration and training under the Older Americans Act.

Establishment of a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging in states and communities.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

Recently I joined with another California Congressman, John McFall, in leading a bipartisan attack on unemployment through an expanded Accelerated Public Works Program. Since then 100 other House members have pledged their support for this job-creating legislation.

Through sustained pressure we won the solid endorsement of the House Public Works Committee who held public hearings and cleared the measure for House action later this month.

As reported by the Committee, the bill (H.R. 16071) extends funding for Title I programs under the 1965 Public Works Act for another year, and approves a ceiling of \$1 billion for local public projects. Title I provides for federal construction grants of 80% to local governments in very high unemployment areas, which include several parts of my own District.

If enacted into law, this program would help on two critical fronts. First, it would assist local governments in building needed facilities, such as sewage treatment plants, hospitals, street improvement, and public structures, which drain the taxpayer's pocketbook. Second, it would create immediate employment in the building trades, which are the hardest hit unemployed groups in the country.

#### AIR HIJACKINGS

In May the House Appropriations Committee decided to put aside congressional tradition and approve new funds for an urgently needed program to prevent hijackings. The new fund approval, which normally requires initial action by an authorizing committee, became necessary after a marked increase in hijackings.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I supported this move which provides for the purchase of over 800 metal detection devices. We were successful in gaining House approval for this program as part of the Department of Transportation's budget. The entire package now goes to the Senate for further action.

These devices act as a first-line deterrent to stop hijackers on the ground by detecting the metal in guns and bombs. It is estimated that we will need at least 800 of these devices to meet federal safety regulations and establish a realistic preventive program. Since 1970, over 70 acts of air piracy have occurred with about half of the attempts successful.

If the anti-hijacking funds become law, the Federal Aviation Administration would purchase the devices and turn them over to commercial airlines to screen all boarding passengers.

#### U.S. BORDER HEARINGS

Several incidents have highlighted the serious lack of personal safeguards for those entering the United States at various border stations. Charges were brought against U.S. Customs officers for beatings, abusive searches and invasion of privacy.

I confronted top officials from U.S. Customs with these complaints and called for a congressional inquiry throughout the United States, beginning first at the Mexican border. On April 29 hearings were held in San Diego with testimony collected from more than 20 witnesses from both sides of the border. Several women testified that they had undergone humiliating body searches conducted by nonmedical personnel under the most unsanitary conditions.

A top Customs' official admitted that of the

1,800 women stripped and searched last year, only 285 were found carrying contraband. It became evident from the testimony presented by both the accusers and Customs' officials that border procedures had failed to protect a person's right to privacy.

This failure stems from the erroneous premise apparently accepted by some Customs' inspectors that border crossers can be stripped and body searched at will. One woman quoted a Customs' officer as saying, "When you go across the border you automatically relinquish your citizenship."

#### Recommendations

Based on the San Diego hearings, I recommended that U.S. Customs adopt the following procedures for strip and body searches.

That all strip and intrusive body searches, including body cavity probes, stomach pumping and other internal methods, be conducted only after the officer carefully determines that substantive evidence supports the search.

That the officer detaining a person for a strip or body search file and sign, before proceeding with the search, a report showing the substantive evidence on which he based his decision.

That a qualified medical doctor conduct the search under sanitary and medically approved conditions.

That the person to be detained, stripped or body searched, be informed of his rights, as well as procedures in English or Spanish whichever is appropriate.

That uniform procedures for inquiries and searches be set and enforced, with a mandate that they be conducted in a courteous and expeditious manner, protecting the person and his property from injury or damage.

That all federal officers working at the border wear nameplates, visibly shown at all times and printed in bold letters.

I believe that these reforms, and others that I have recommended, not only protect the person's right to privacy but also permits the government to continue its efforts to stop contraband.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION

After 2 years of effort and debate Congress has approved the Higher Education Act of 1972. Its enactment signaled a true breakthrough for higher education. Not only did it take a significant step forward in providing equal opportunity to all young people regardless of economic background, but also in relieving the fiscal crisis facing many colleges and universities.

The most important feature of the Act is the establishment of a new program of financial aid to needy students called the basic education opportunity grant. Under this program any student enrolled at an accredited institution is entitled to a basic grant of \$1,400, minus what his family could reasonably be expected to pay for his education.

In the past, student aid programs have been administered in an erratic fashion, often leaving the financially needy student without funds or a basis of appeal. The basic grant program eliminates this uncertainty and guarantees a basic level of support. The Act does preserve some of the older student aid programs but only to provide additional help beyond the basic grant.

Another landmark provision is the general support program for institutions of higher education on a continuing basis. Reliance on past programs (which carried specific purposes for scientific research or construction) resulted in a form of cutthroat competition among colleges and universities that often left smaller institutions without adequate support. Under this program each institution would be assured of federal aid based on the number of students receiving basic grants and other forms of student



aid, with a special provision for relief to smaller institutions.

#### TAX DISCRIMINATION IN PHILIPPINES

Congressman Roybal confers with Mrs. Dulzura Villafior, President of the Filipino Community of Los Angeles, and Ruperto Ballao, Consul of the Republic of the Philippines, on legislation that would end tax discrimination against U.S. citizens with Filipino dependents.

Roybal's bill (H.R. 15779) would cover cases where Filipino Americans support relatives who are residents of the Philippines. This tax deduction is identical to the one permitted for dependents who are residents of Canada, Mexico and such former U.S. possessions as Panama.

#### LEGISLATIVE NEWS

**Space Shuttle.**—Roybal voted to fund the space shuttle system for future manned flights. The contract for this space system was awarded to North American Rockwell in Los Angeles. Estimates indicate that the space shuttle will add more than 50,000 new jobs to aerospace and related industries.

**Veteran Benefits.**—Voted to increase non-service connected pension payments for veterans and their widows. Introduced a bill to give added protection to veterans who suffer an injury as a result of a natural disaster while under care at a VA facility.

**Drug Abuse.**—Voted for a coordinated federal attack on the problem of drug abuse, and for the establishment of drug treatment programs for veterans and Armed Forces personnel.

**School Bus Safety.**—Sponsored a bill to require the Department of Transportation to set new safety standards for school buses, build a prototype bus, and investigate all school bus accidents resulting in a death. The bill also mandates that school bus manufacturers and dealers test drive all buses before selling them.

**Juvenile Delinquency.**—Supported a bill to fund preventive juvenile delinquency programs in schools and communities.

**D-Q University.**—Authored a bill to support D-Q University as a national learning and cultural center for Americans of Indian and Mexican descent. D-Q is the first uni-

versity to be created and controlled by both Indians and Chicanos, and is dedicated to the idea of fostering cultural and racial understanding.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 11, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*My flesh and my heart may fail; but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever.—Psalms 73: 26.*

Almighty and eternal God, by Thy mercy and with Thy spirit we join our Hebrew brethren in entering the gateway of another year. Grant that we may enter it together humbly and gratefully with a firm resolution to walk more closely with Thee in Thy way and to labor more faithfully in the service of our country for the good of our fellow men.

Let not the mistakes of the past add to the miseries of the present but forgive us and set us free that under the guidance of Thy spirit we may walk along the roads to peace and justice and liberty in our day.

Whatever happens, good or bad, keep us in the fellowship of those who trust and obey Thee and who love and serve our fellow men.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9265. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a treatment and rehabilitation program in the Veterans' Administration for servicemen, veterans, and ex-servicemen suffering from drug abuse or drug dependency; and

H.R. 10670. An act to amend chapter 73 of

title 10, United States Code, to establish a survivor benefit plan, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the compilation entitled "Federal and State Student Aid Programs, 1971" as a Senate document.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12202) entitled "An act to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of health benefits, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCGEE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 3337) entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition of a village site for the Payson Band of Yavapai-Apache Indians, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6797) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Kickapoo Indians of Kansas and Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 316, 316-A, 317, 145, 193, and 318"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FANNIN, and

Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7742) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Yankton Sioux Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 332-A, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8694) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Yavapai Apache Tribe in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 22-E and 22-F, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10858) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Pueblo de Acoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 266, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives: