

preceded recent legislative and executive actions, concluded that such a delay would not deter the serious student nor jeopardize the national interest.

I appreciate your serious concern with this matter and hope my comments will be of some value.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1967.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: I have given considerable thought to your letter of 4 August, inviting my comments on your letter to General Hershey concerning graduate student deferments.

I appreciate very much the point you have made about the importance of maintaining our national resources of highly educated manpower, both from the standpoint of national defense and the general welfare. In fact, the question as to whether the tightened Class II-S graduate deferment policy would adversely affect our resources of highly trained manpower was specifically addressed by the Executive Branch and earlier by the Marshall Commission. The conclusion was that it would not do so in the long run. In effect, the new rules mean that in the future young men qualified for military service will have to do their graduate and professional work after, rather than before, military service. There has been no conclusive evidence brought to the attention of the Executive Branch as to whether this will result in a lesser or greater production of persons with post-baccalaureate training, considering that veterans are once again eligible for financial assistance to further their education under the so-called G.I. Bill.

As you probably know, under the law and implementing Executive Order, the National Security Council may designate other fields of study, in addition to medicine and allied health fields, as eligible for II-S deferment. This provides needed flexibility to review problem areas in terms of changing conditions.

In your letter, you propose expansion of Class I-D deferments so that students desiring to pursue graduate education, regardless of concentration, would have their induction delayed until after completion of graduate training. At the present time, I-D deferments of the kind you propose are restricted to the needs of the Armed Forces for officer programs. I believe a general expansion of I-D deferments would accordingly not be feasible and it would amount to an indirect way of substituting for Class II-S student deferments.

You further suggest that a delayed induction program could be used in extraordinary hardship cases of a temporary nature. It is my understanding that Class III-A hardship deferments, II-A occupation deferments and I-A postponements are available for this purpose, depending on the nature and merits of the case.

I hope these comments will be helpful.

Sincerely,

THOMAS D. MORRIS.

STATEMENT OF HON. CALVIN L. RAMPTON, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF UTAH;
CHAIRMAN, EDUCATION COMMITTEE, NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE; CHAIRMAN, EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

I am appearing here today in my capacity as Chairman of the Education Committee of the National Governors' Conference. I would like to read into the record a portion of the report of that committee, adopted by the governors on March 1 of this year, particularly those sections dealing with the higher education bill now before this committee, H.R. 15067.

"The National Governors' Conference commends the Congress and the Administration for providing for advance funding of educational aid programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 and for requesting advance funding for fiscal year 1970 for most of the higher education legislation of 1968 embodied in Bill H.R. 15067.

"However, in the firm belief that late funding has been one of the most severe problems for the states and local education authorities under all federal aid pro-