

This proposal, then, requests a change in the order of call on a 2-year pattern, leading to the establishment of a prime age group. It requests the deferment of full-time graduate students across quite broad disciplinary categories, and it provides for a continuously monitored advisory list of critical occupations and essential activities.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

Does any other member of the panel have any other comment they would like to make at this point?

I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert in the record approximately a hundred telegrams and letters that I have received from college presidents and university presidents across the country.

I would ask unanimous consent to include articles which I have on this particular subject, and also to include the speech which was made by Senator Ted Kennedy yesterday on the Senate floor in regard to his proposal for the draft.

Without objection, it will be in the record at this point.

(Documents to be furnished follow:)

S. 3052—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO REVISE THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to revise the Selective Service System and I ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3052) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the equal application of deferment policies, to authorize an investigation of the feasibility of establishing a volunteer army, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Hart, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Yarborough), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the hallmark of a free society is a pervasive spirit of individual freedom and choice. In contrast, the hallmark of a closed society is compulsion. We must, then, be ever alert when our free society demands for its survival some constrictions on individual freedom and choice.

The survival of the United States depends in part upon an effective armed force. To maintain that effective force, our military services today rely on the draft to supply them with a steady flow of qualified young men. We must recognize that the draft is inherently a constriction on individual freedom and choice, as it relies upon compulsion to accomplish its purposes. Because it does rely on compulsion, we must be certain that its operation diminishes individual freedom and choice as little as possible. If we do not, if we are not certain that our draft is as fair as we can make it, then we have curbed the pervading spirit of a free society unnecessary.

There are other powerful reasons for demanding that our method of military conscription be fair. Draftees are about 16.5 percent of total military strength. Draftees are 37 percent of total Army strength. They are 31 percent of Army strength in Thailand, and 42 percent of Army strength in South Vietnam. Draftees account for 41 percent of Army fatalities in South Vietnam. Draftees, then, account for less than 2 out of every 10 military men; but they account for 4 out of 10 Army combat deaths in Vietnam. Any system which must choose among equally qualified young men—some to be drafted, some not—must be as fair a system as we can devise.

The Vietnam war only serves to sharpen the focus on the draft. In past weeks draft calls have been revised upward. With the termination of graduate school deferments, the young men inducted to meet these higher calls will represent an entirely different cross-section of skills and motivations than has ever before confronted the military services. And as the intensity of the war increases, more and more draftees will wind up as war casualties. Consequently, I would expect the focus to get even sharper in the coming months.