

October 9, 1969

such information as the Secretary deems necessary, and only if such application—

(1) provides that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) provides for carrying out one or more projects or programs eligible for assistance under section 4 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such projects or programs;

(3) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this Act for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in section 4, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(5) provides for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications from local educational agencies for financial assistance under this Act may be approved by the Secretary only if the State educational agency has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Interagency Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education which shall consist of the Secretary (or his designee) as Chairman, the Attorney General (or his designee), the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, and with the consent of such other Departments or agencies as the Secretary may from time to time designate as having a substantial interest in the field of drug abuse education, representatives of such Departments and agencies.

(b) The Council shall advise in the coordination of the respective activities of the Federal Departments and agencies concerned in drug abuse education.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall promulgate regulations establishing the procedures for consultation with other agencies and with other appropriate public and private agencies.

(d) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may not approve an application for assistance under this Act unless he has given the Interagency Coordinating Council an opportunity to review the application and make recommendations thereon within a period not to exceed sixty days.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education, which shall—

(1) advise the Secretary concerning the administration of, preparation of general regulations for, and operation of, programs supported with assistance under this Act;

(2) make recommendations regarding the allocation of the funds under this Act among the various purposes set forth in section 4 and the criteria for establishing priorities

in deciding which applications to approve, including criteria designed to achieve an appropriate geographical distribution of approved projects throughout all regions of the Nation;

(3) review applications and make recommendations thereon;

(4) review the administration and operation of projects and programs under this Act, including the effectiveness of such projects and programs in meeting the purposes for which they are established and operated, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for improvements in this act) to the Secretary for transmittal to the Congress; and

(5) evaluate programs and projects carried out under this Act and disseminate the results of such evaluations.

(b) The Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twenty-one members. The Secretary shall appoint one member as Chairman. The Committee shall consist of persons familiar with education, mental health, and legal problems associated with drug abuse, young persons, ex-users, parents and others familiar with drug use and abuse. The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman or of the Secretary.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Attorney General shall, when requested, render technical assistance to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of programs of drug abuse education. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies or institutions information regarding effective methods of coping with problems of drug abuse, and making available to such agencies or institutions personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice, or other persons qualified to advise and assist in coping with such problems or carrying out a drug abuse education program.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 10. In administering the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 11. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the

Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The section-by-section analysis furnished by Mr. HATFIELD follows:

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. The short title of the bill is the "Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE. (a) The bill states a congressional finding that drug abuse "diminishes the strength and vitality of the people of our nation," that such abuse is increasing, that there is "a lack of authoritative information and creative projects designed to educate students and others" in this area, and that government and private efforts are required to remedy the situation.

(b) The purpose of the bill: to encourage the development of new and improved curricula, to demonstrate their use and evaluate their effectiveness in model programs, to disseminate educational materials, to provide training programs for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials and other public service and community leaders, and to offer community education programs for parents and others.

SEC. 3. FUNDING AUTHORIZATION. The bill authorizes appropriations for a 3-year period. The fiscal year 1971 authorization is \$7 million; fiscal year 1972 is \$10 million; and for fiscal year 1973, \$10 million.

SEC. 4(a). PROGRAMS. The funds appropriated for this act may be utilized by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the following:

1. *Research.* He may make grants or let contracts with institutions of higher education, other public or private agencies, institutions and organizations for:

(A) curriculum development and preparation on the use and abuse of drugs;

(B) pilot projects to test the effectiveness of such curricula;

(C) dissemination of curricular materials and other information to public and private elementary, secondary and adult education programs for applicants who have conducted pilot projects under (B).

2. *Evaluation.* He may make grants or contracts or other arrangements with institutions of higher education or other public or private institutions, agencies, etc. for evaluating the effectiveness of curricula developed in pilot projects described in 1(B), or conduct such evaluations directly.

3. *Training.* He may make grants to institutions of higher education and to local educational agencies for preservice and inservice training programs on drug abuse for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials and other public service and community leaders.

4. *Community Programs.* He may make grants to local educational agencies and other public and private nonprofit organizations for community education programs on drug abuse (including seminars, workshops and conferences) especially for parents and others in the community.

(b) GRANTS TO STATES. The Secretary may utilize up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated to pay reasonable and necessary expenses of State educational agencies for planning, development and implementation of drug abuse education programs.

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS.

(a) Applications for assistance under this act must—

(1) provide that the activities or services being assisted will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) provide for carrying out one or more projects or programs eligible for assistance under section 4, and provide for proper and efficient project management;

(3) assure that Federal funds under this act will be used to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the level of funds

October 9, 1969

made available at the local level for this purpose, and not to supplant local funding;

(4) provide for necessary fiscal control and fund accounting procedures;

(5) provide for annual reports to the Secretary and such other reports as he may reasonably require.

(b) Applications from local educational agencies may only be approved by the Secretary if the State agency has been advised and afforded an opportunity to comment.

(c) Applications may be amended, subject to appropriate regulations.

SEC. 6. INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL. No application for assistance may be approved unless the Secretary has afforded the Commissioner of Education, the Attorney General, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, and the head of such other Departments and agencies as the Secretary shall designate, 60 days to comment thereon. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may establish procedures for consultation with these and other Federal agencies.

SEC. 7. ADVISORY COMMITTEE. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint a 21-member Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education, consisting of persons familiar with education, mental health, and legal problems associated with drug control, ex-users, parents and others familiar with drug use and abuse. Committee members may be paid the standard WAE compensation.

The Commission shall—

(1) advise the Secretary on administration and operation of, and regulations for, programs assisted under the act;

(2) make recommendations regarding the allocation of funds under the act among the various purposes set forth in section 4, and criteria for establishing priorities, including those designed to achieve appropriate geographical distribution of approved projects;

(3) review applications and make recommendations on project applications;

(4) review the administration of programs under the act, and make recommendations to the Secretary (including recommendations for amendments to the act); and

(5) evaluate programs and projects under the act and disseminate the results of such evaluations.

SEC. 8. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Attorney General may make technical assistance available to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of drug abuse education programs. This assistance may include making available information or personnel.

SEC. 9. PAYMENTS. Payments under the act may be made in installments and in advance, or by way of reimbursement.

SEC. 10. ADMINISTRATION. The Secretary may utilize the services of other Federal or other public or private agencies, to be paid for or reimbursed by agreement.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS. This section defines terms used in the bill, in general conformity with other education legislation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCES FROM VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I submit for myself and Senators CRANSTON, RIBICOFF, YOUNG of Ohio, CHURCH, HUGHES, and MCCARTHY a concurrent resolution directing that all U.S. forces now be withdrawn from Vietnam, the pace to be limited only by steps to insure: first, the safety of our troops; second, the mutual release of prisoners of

war; and third, the assurance of safety through arrangements for amnesty or asylum in friendly countries for those Vietnamese who might be endangered by our disengagement.

Such a complete disengagement is, I think, the last, best response to a war we cannot win and which our allies do not want to end. And it is the way to end the loss of American lives and resources assisting a political regime abroad which lacks the confidence of its own citizens.

Today, after more than 250,000 American casualties, 40,000 American lives lost, and an inestimable devastation of Vietnamese lives and property, we still pre-empt over the most costly misadventure in our national experience. It is a tragic folly which now tests our capacity to admit error and to build from disaster the foundations for more enlightened judgments in the future.

Paradoxically, we continue to squander our Nation's financial and human resources in Vietnam, after wide acknowledgment that there is no way now to win the war for Saigon, that there is no way to gain on the battlefield or in Paris what that Government long ago forfeited—the allegiance of its own people and the control of its own land.

The Saigon regime today has no actual and little potential political base—its essential constituency is the American military presence on its soil. It is the military regime of Generals Thieu and Ky—not the interest of the peoples of the United States and Vietnam—which is served by continuing our military operations in Vietnam.

In the name of self-determination we entered this civil conflict which has now endured longer than the Revolutionary War, claimed more American lives than the Korean war, produced more American casualties than World War I, and unleashed more American firepower than in all the theaters and all the years of World War II.

It is time to say "Enough." It is time to acknowledge that nothing vital to American security can be salvaged by further military operations in Vietnam.

Our continued presence on the battlefield is today the greatest obstacle to the realization of our best national interests. This is the lesson of these recent years—that a military stalemate is more costly to our vital concerns than it is to those of the NLF or the North Vietnamese. It assures that the leaders of South Vietnam will take no action to build a truly representative constituency which can compete against the NLF for the political allegiance of the Vietnamese people.

It deadlocks the Paris negotiations and prevents the scheduling of serious discussions on the release and exchange of prisoners of war. It diverts our energies and resources from critical domestic needs while it threatens a renewal of the divisions and disorders which went so far toward tearing our country apart over these last recent years. What is surely most unacceptable, it asks young Americans to be crippled, maimed, and killed—tomorrow and the next day and the next, with no foreseeable end—in the name of bargaining gains which will never be achieved.

Still, after years of tragedy and frustration, against all the dictates of commonsense and respect for human life, we pursue today a policy of wishful thinking and tired rhetoric.

We have in too great a measure surrendered control of American conduct to foreign capitals which are beyond our control and often unsympathetic to our own best interests. Reductions in the level of violence have been made contingent upon three remote developments—progress at the Paris negotiations, a lessening of the combat operations of the North Vietnamese, and the capacity of Saigon to assume the military burden now carried by American forces.

In the first two instances, we make American policy a prisoner of North Vietnam; and in the last instance, of Saigon. I reject the notion that either Hanoi or Saigon should hold a veto over American foreign policy.

The responsibility of the Congress is not to Saigon but to our own citizens and especially to the young. We can best meet that responsibility by placing the saving of lives above the saving of face. For many months I have believed that there is no other practical course except to begin the systematic removal of all our forces. That process should be completed within a year's time or less. The key question is this: Is the Thieu-Ky regime with all its corruption and repression worth the sacrifice of more thousands of young American lives? This resolution which I now introduce offers a clear no to that question. It is, I believe, a resolution born of patriotic concern for the national interest and a commonsense view of the alternatives that lie ahead.

This resolution calls for the disengagement and withdrawal of our forces in a schedule which is limited only by measures to insure, first, the safety of our men; second, the return of American prisoners of war; and third, the establishment of amnesty or asylum arrangements for those Vietnamese endangered by our disengagement.

It is time to end the slaughter and waste and to fashion a policy of commonsense. It is time for America to redeem both her youth and her ideals.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) submitted by Mr. McGOVERN, for himself and other Senators, relating to withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam, was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 39

Whereas the war in Vietnam has resulted in the loss of more than 40,000 American lives, in some 250,000 American casualties, in the depletion of American resources to the extent of over \$100 billion, and in inestimable destruction of Vietnamese life and property, and

Whereas the war stands today as the

we are having difficulty extricating ourselves.

We should proceed on the theory that we should not, in this Republic, even consider conscripting our youth unless it is at a time when the Republic is in peril and that is needed. However, if we must have selective service, at least we can do our utmost not to disrupt family life and the lives of millions of young Americans as the present selective service law has done. We must not discriminate against any young Americans.

In that connection, we would do well to follow what our allies have done. Canada and England have no draft laws whatsoever. Most nations of Europe, such as Italy, France, Belgium, Norway, and others, have conscription for 12 months to 15 months. West Germany, of all the European allies, stands alone in having conscription for 18 months.

I am sorry to have to add that in many of those European countries, parents of boys about to be drafted are able to buy their way out of having to serve in the armed forces. I am glad that is not true in this country. However, if we have to have a draft, we must not require draftees to serve more than 18 months.

The Armed Services Committee, its chairman, and others, have expressed an interest in the matter of reducing the term of active service. I hope that perhaps when we look searchingly at this entire matter early in the coming year, the period for service will be set at 18 months.

The present tour of duty of men in our Armed Forces in Vietnam is 1 year. Even assuming that an inductee were given 6 months of training instead of the present 4 months before being assigned to combat duty overseas, it is obvious that our military manpower needs could be fulfilled with an 18-month draft. It is unfair and unnecessary to require these young men to serve for 2 years.

If we have to suffer this abomination—and conscription is an abomination—then I, for one, am going to fight to the utmost, early next year, to set the limit at 18 months. I know that many Senators share my view.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. He was most cooperative in the committee when we took this unanimous position.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor but there is one other point I want to make: The question came up in the conference he was talking about, as to the committee's promising to report a bill during calendar year 1970.

I said that I would certainly make every reasonable effort, but that it was a matter which rests squarely within the discretion of the committee. I asked a member to withdraw the request, and he did, because that is what committees are for. But we have the attitude I have already mentioned, with reference to the promise made about the content of any bill we might report. Let me say that no promises were made, although they were asked in good faith. Again, that is what committees are for.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 14001, to amend the Military

Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modification of the system of selecting persons for induction into the armed services under this act.

There were times during this session when the future of draft reform legislation appeared to be bleak. It is gratifying to me that the Senate leadership and the Armed Services Committee were able to reach an agreement that allowed this bill to come before the Senate for consideration.

There are approximately 2 million young men who reach the age of military service each year. For them and their families the draft is one of the most important factors affecting their lives. President Nixon realized the disruptive impact of the present draft system on the individual and recommended to Congress on May 13 that changes be made that would provide immediate relief. In September, the President revised his proposal and requested only a modification that would restore to the President the discretionary authority held prior to the enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1967 with respect to determining the relative order of selection for induction within specific age groups.

Mr. President, on January 22, 1969, I joined with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) and seven other Senators in introducing S. 503, a bill to end the draft and substitute a voluntary military manpower program. At that time, I thought it necessary to examine legislation that would meet the Nation's military requirements but with the maximum amount of personal liberty for our young men. On March 7, 1969, in recognition of the manpower needs arising out of the Vietnam war, I joined the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) and nine other Senators in introducing S. 1433, composed of amendments to the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 which would have provided the most critically needed reform.

Mr. President, there are many in Congress who want to see a complete revision of the Selective Service System. I have worked toward this end myself. However, it is clear that if we are to provide any relief this year, it must be in the form of H.R. 14001. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as a first step toward comprehensive draft reform.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his comments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think I should make my position clear on this question.

I intend to vote against the pending legislation.

I feel that what it does is to constrict the pressure of the draft to that broad age group of 19-year-olds who, as the report indicates, will become the "prime vulnerable" group for induction.

There is a great deal wrong with our Selective Service System. Unfairness and inequity are built-in impediments. We are in need of an exhaustive review of the whole procedure involved in selecting and maintaining our Armed Forces—a review that should include the close scrutiny of all of the loopholes available and, even more, of the whole question of compulsive service.

Perhaps the so-called random selection or lottery proposal is a step in the right direction. I am not sure. In any case, I am not at this time prepared to support a move in that direction. More—much more has to be done.

I did not vote for the extension of the Draft Act last time. It is inequitable and, at first blush, this most recent proposal is pressurized insofar as a single age group is concerned. The fact is, inequities and unfairness still continue in the draft system.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show my position on this matter.

THE LOTTERY: A THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, since the end of World War II our country has been faced with the inequity of a peacetime military draft. It has been my firm conviction, and still is, that peacetime conscription is contrary to the ideals on which our democracy was founded, ideals which we must maintain if our country is to flourish. There has been a proposal to establish a lottery, and I find it just as, if not more, inimical to our youth, our Nation, and our future than the the present Selective Service System.

There are three criteria by which to judge the adequacy of a military manpower procurement system: First, the degree to which it would preserve the maximum amount of individual liberty and freedom from unjustified intrusion by the Government; second, the fairness in its application so that every young man receives equal treatment and no young man is required to make sacrifices that are not demanded of his peers; and third, the system's provision for maximum national security with the greatest efficiency and economy.

The present draft system meets none of these standards adequately—nor does the proposed lottery. We are still faced with the injustice, inequity, and inefficiency with the lottery that we face with the draft. There are some differences, however, which would further frustrate a persisting, intolerable situation. Under the lottery we substitute Lady Luck for conscious choice. This will not alter the fact that some young men are forced into service and denied their individual liberty while others escape any military duty. Furthermore, we would discriminate against the 18- and 19-year-olds more than under the present selection methods.

Patching up the draft will not necessarily move us toward an all-voluntary Army. The continuation of a peacetime conscription serves as a case in point. Similarly, a stopgap lottery system will only postpone the necessary transition to an all-volunteer military. As long as the incentives for voluntary enlistment are not improved, the undemocratic principle of the military draft is further entrenched in our society.

On September 10, 1969, I wrote to the President expressing this opinion, proposing that he set January 1, 1971, as a target date for establishing an all-volunteer Army, having a lottery as an interim measure. To my knowledge no target date has been set. And, consequently, we are faced with the possibility of prolonging and heightening the ali-

enation, discord and polarization that conscription has brought in its 25-year wake.

President Nixon has vehemently supported the concept of an all-volunteer armed force. He has stated that "as soon as our reduced manpower requirements in Vietnam will permit us to do so, we should stop the draft." Secretary of Defense Laird has asserted, furthermore, that the question of instituting a volunteer Army is essentially one of money—cost. We have the manpower necessary to meet our military needs, and we can afford the budgetary cost—a cost, I might add, which is minimal when compared to the social losses incurred by conscription.

If we are to move toward constructive change, a unified citizenry and a more just nation, we must set our goal at instituting a volunteer military and the total abolition of the draft. Involuntary servitude in any form will only perpetuate the dysfunctional effects of inefficiency, inequity, and injustice. One does not reform inequity, one abolishes it.

Therefore, I would like to register my protest vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the passage of H.R. 14001 could be a significant step toward meaningful reform in our Selective Service System. It would return to the President the authority to institute his proposed draft lottery—a random-selection system designed to erase some of the inequities that now exist.

The current draft system leaves a young man in the eligible category from the time of his maximum vulnerability—age 19—until he has reached his 26th birthday. Decisions concerning education, career, marriage, and family are often postponed simply because of the young man's uncertain draft status.

I feel that the proposal before us appears very sound in this regard. Under the random-selection method, each eligible young man would enter the lottery during his 19th year. If he is not called within 12 months after this entry, he is reasonably assured that he will not be drafted. His name, after that 1-year period, is placed in a less vulnerable bracket.

The lottery also provides that each person in the prime age bracket would run the same risk of being called first—there would be no discrimination within the age bracket, and the President would not be under compulsion to call the oldest first within the given age group. In his message to Congress, President Nixon said the first in a series of selective service years would be established. He further stated:

Prior to the start of each selective service year, the dates of the 365 days to follow would be placed in a sequence determined by a random method. Those who spend the following year in the pool would take their places in the draft sequence in the same order that their birthdays come up on this scrambled calendar.

Thus, Mr. President, a young man born on January 1, would not be made more vulnerable just because of his apparently unfortunate birth date. Those persons who share the same birth date would be further arranged according to the first letter of their last names—and that

alphabetical list would be scrambled to make the A's potential equals of the Z's. This lottery would be rearranged each year, further assuring its parity for all young men.

It has been accepted practice recently to induct the youngest men first, and the average age for inductees has dropped from 24 a few years ago to a present average of 20.2 years. The administration's proposal would make drafting on a youngest-first basis a matter of policy, rather than procedure, and would erase most of the inequities within a given age bracket.

The administration has seen fit—and wisely so, I think—to continue undergraduate student deferments and to make the rules governing graduate deferments more realistic. Our Nation needs young men who are being educated by our colleges and universities. To draft them before they finish their baccalaureate training would be to undercut an important national investment. The proposal before us recognizes this fact, but it also recognizes that letting these students completely miss induction would be denying the military their needed skills.

Thus, the proposal would grant the deferment, but would regroup these students in the 19-year-old age bracket once they finish college. The students would, therefore, run the same risk of involuntary induction that noncollege men run.

Graduate school deferments would be extended until the end of the academic year—rather than just until the end of the semester, as is presently the case. As we all realize, most financial planning for higher education is done on an annual basis, not a semester at a time; and much of the graduate work is distributed over the full school year. To interrupt that work—to impose that kind of a financial hardship—in midstream is to possibly drown a young man's career. After finishing out the year, the graduate student would serve his time in the military.

Blanket continuance would be given to only the deferments for medical students and those students in the allied health field. With a shortage of physicians estimated to reach 50,000 by 1975 and an equally alarming shortage of other health professionals, continuing these deferments appears to be in the best national interest.

A major reservation concerning the lottery proposal was whether such a selective service system would have a detrimental effect on voluntary enlistments and various Reserve Officers Training Corps programs. Addressing itself to this concern, the Senate Armed Services Committee has reported that:

The testimony before the committee indicated that the Department of Defense does not consider this to be a matter of great significance based on recent studies.

Thus, without amendment, the committee has reported out H.R. 14001. Some of these proposals, it should be noted, were endorsed by both the Marshall Commission and the Clark Panel in 1967.

Mr. President, the Senate Armed Services Committee is expected to hold full hearings on draft reform next year, and the administration is expected to con-

duct further investigations into various aspects of our Selective Service System. The proposal now before us, therefore, is not necessarily the end of draft reform. It is a beginning, and it could provide an equitable base on which to build still other draft reforms.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 992

A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for uniform national criteria for the classification of registrants, to authorize a random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Military Selective Service Amendments Act of 1969".

AMENDMENTS TO THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

SEC. 2. The Military Selective Service Act of 1967 is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 5(a) is amended by striking out "local board" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "area office".

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 5(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, in meeting any national quota of men to be inducted into the Armed Forces under this Act, selection of persons for induction to fill such quota shall be made from persons in the prime selection group, after the selection of delinquents and volunteers, to the extent that such group has a sufficient number of qualified registrants to meet such quota. Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3) of this section, selection of persons for induction into the Armed Forces from the prime selection group shall be made on the basis of the dates of birth of the registrants and upon such other factors as the President may deem appropriate."

(3) Section 5(a) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(3) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he deems appropriate, to provide for the selection of persons from the prime selection group for induction into the Armed Forces by a random selection system. In the event the President provides for such a system, he may provide for the selection of persons for such service on a national rather than a regional or local basis.

"(4) As used in this section the term 'prime selection group' means persons who are liable for training and service under this Act, who at the time of selection are registered and classified and who are—

"(A) between the ages of nineteen and twenty and are not deferred or exempted;

"(B) between the ages of nineteen and thirty-five and, on or after the effective date of the Military Selective Service Amendments Act of 1969, were in a deferred status, but are no longer in such status; or

"(C) between the ages of twenty and twenty-six on the effective date of the Military Selective Service Amendments Act of 1969 and are not deferred or exempted. Unless selected for induction or unless otherwise deferred from induction into the Armed Forces, a person shall remain in the prime selection group for a period of one year. Any person who is in a deferred status upon attaining the age of nineteen shall, upon the termination of such deferred status, and if qualified, be liable for induction as a registrant within the prime selection group irrespective of his actual age, unless he is otherwise deferred under authority of this Act. Any person who is removed from the prime selection group because of a defer-