

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 20

OCTOBER 13, 1966, TO OCTOBER 19, 1966

(PAGES 26445 TO 27878)

volunteering. The recent Gallup finding suggests that the armed forces would be able to get enough men under this system. Serving in Europe and America, as most military men do, or even in Vietnam, might have more appeal to many than two or three years in American slums or Asian, African, or Latin American villages. (One proposal is for three years of nonmilitary service to be an alternative to two years in the armed forces.)

This step would still only mean "moving toward" universal service, as the President and McNamara propose. Two-thirds or more of the men subject to the draft, and all women, would be affected only if they chose to volunteer. The growth of volunteering might be only tenfold in the first years of the program—not the hundredfold increase required for truly universal service. A practical way to begin would be to increase the Peace Corps to Jack Vaughn's goal of 50,000, to turn VISTA into an organizing and supervising agency for another 50,000 domestic volunteers; to increase the Job Corps to about 50,000 and add a component of service to its work; and to begin a GI-bill kind of fellowship program for another 50,000 volunteers.

If this happened, and the idea of volunteer service spread, those drafted into the Army would soon be the minority. Then, instead of talking about exemptions for Peace Corps Volunteers, we would find the problem turned upside down. It could be said that those drafted for military service were exempt from the system of universal voluntary service. In fact, if practically all young Americans came to feel the obligation to volunteer for some kind of service, the draft might be put out of business altogether. All the calculations of the high cost of putting the military on an entirely volunteer basis leave out the possibility of universal voluntary service.

How much would such a volunteer service program cost? Not as much in a year as one month of the war in Vietnam. Not as much as doing nothing—as failing to mobilize the talents and labor of the younger generation. Not as much as hiring professional teachers or social workers or construction men—if we could find enough of them—to do what these volunteers could also do. The cost may vary from a few hundred dollars per volunteer to the Peace Corps' annual per-volunteer cost of about \$3,000. It is the cost of adding a year or two of essential public education for all American students.

This may seem high to Congressional armed service committees. Their legislative center of gravity is on defense rather than on matters concerned with education and development. Even Secretary McNamara might feel ill at ease making his case that defense is development before them—as ill at ease as Allen Ginsberg telling Congress about LSD. But Burke Marshall is a lawyer of far-ranging vision and he has a Commission of opinion-making men. They should appreciate the "fundamental question" that Secretary McNamara said he was asking:

"Who is Man? Is he a rational animal? . . . He draws blueprints for Utopia. But never quite gets it built. . . . Coercion, after all, merely captures Man. Freedom captivates him."

THE BRAIN DRAIN

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have recently received a most thoughtful and provocative letter on the brain drain, a subject to which I have addressed myself increasingly in recent months, from Mr. Frank L. Mott, a manpower analyst in the Labor Department's Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training. The views he expresses are not intended to necessarily represent

those of his Department, but rather, as he states, he is providing some of his "own personal, unofficial thoughts on the subject."

I believe that this letter is worthy of a much wider audience, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, OFFICE OF MANPOWER, AUTOMATION AND TRAINING,

Washington, D.C.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In response to your letter of September 9, I wish first of all to compliment you on your excellent exposition of the complex problems generated by the "brain drain" of talented individuals from some of the less developed nations of the world. As you noted in your statement, this problem does not lend itself to easy solution. However, I am happy to give you some of my own personal, unofficial thoughts on the subject.

There is unquestionably a basic conflict between our desire not to inhibit the inherent right of individuals to move freely among the nations of the world while at the same time encouraging the continued development of the technologically less advanced nations—a development clearly dependent on a continuing supply of highly skilled technical manpower.

My personal feeling is that the only truly permanent solution to this problem is a long-range one which would involve basic institutional changes in the secondary and higher educational systems of many of these countries. As you noted in your statement, many young men and women who come to this country for their higher education pursue fields of study which are not in great demand in their home country and then, quite naturally, on completing their education have no desire to return to a home which offers them no chance to practice in their chosen profession. Ultimately, the solution to this specific aspect of the "brain drain" problem must come from the countries themselves—through an intelligent restructuring of their secondary school programs to encourage more youth to enter fields of study more closely related to their occupational demands.

There are some things, however, which I believe we can do in this country, which might have a more immediate impact. These suggestions relate principally to those youths who enter this country on temporary student visas, but then change to permanent status and never return home. These are the youth who must be their country's "leaders of tomorrow" if the high hopes of these less developed countries are to be fulfilled.

I think in certain situations it would pay for this country to expedite the building of technical institutes for sub-professional study in underdeveloped countries even if these institutes do not match up to the quality of an established institute in this country. We might even supply many of the key personnel to run these institutes. It would be an investment well spent as the needs of many of these countries are basic and it may be better at this time for them to turn out large numbers of sub-professional workers who then are immediately available in their home country than a much smaller number of very highly trained engineers and scientists who on receiving their training in this country often do not even go home.

Analogously, perhaps we might put a larger part of our funds in this area into expediting the construction of two-year colleges in these foreign countries. In this way a relatively large number of youths would be able to receive some college level training which they would immediately be able to put into practice. The alternative, which we have at present, is in many cases "overtraining" a smaller number of youths in this country to a skill level above most technical tasks in their home country.

Another possible way to cut down on this drain of young scholars would be to stipulate that all youth who come to this country on a student visa must return home for a specified period on completing their education before being eligible for immigrant status. While this might work hardships on individuals in some cases it nevertheless would be relatively equitable to the extent that all youth would know of this stipulation before they come to this country to study. In all likelihood, once these youth did return home for, let us say, a year or two, many would remain. I think that a provision of this nature, if implemented, should be complemented by intensive efforts by private and public sources to provide adequate "reindoctrination" for the youth before he goes back home to a culture which in many ways may have become more "foreign" to him during his absence than our own.

Also, I wonder what the possibilities would be for allowing foreign students to participate in our Peace Corps, or other advisory type, programs and then serve either in their home country or in a similar country with which they surely have a greater familiarity than most of their American counterparts?

In general, I would favor methods which are of a voluntary nature to solve this problem rather than legislative provisions, as being more in keeping with our traditional policies favoring the free international movement of individuals.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK MOTT.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HART in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its