

The majority on that Commission felt that offering some young men at a given age, such as 19, a choice as to when to serve, particularly when we were engaged in active hostilities, and not making that same choice available to other young men, did give them a privileged status which could only be justified if there were a clear-cut national need for continuing college student deferments.

The majority of that Commission did not feel that there was such a clear-cut national or educational need.

The position of the minority and of General Clark's panel might be paraphrased as follows: that at least under normal conditions, if the young man going to college has the same exposure, the same probability of serving when he completes college, as the young man who does not go to college, equity is achieved.

It has some advantages in terms of continuity of education, perhaps debatable, but at least the individual would be making that judgment.

So that this was the feeling of those who felt that undergraduate college student deferments should be continued, so long as the pyramiding of deferments, the opportunities which had been available to move easily from undergraduate to graduate to occupational deferments or to dependency deferments is eliminated.

I think there was a unanimous conviction that that should be done away with on the part of all those who studied it, and so the President approved it.

The only issue is this rather knotty one, particularly during a Vietnam conflict period, the moral issue as to choice of time of service in relation to age. I am just summarizing the points of view as I have seen them.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Mr. Schelling.

Mr. SCHELLING. On flexibility, we have to distinguish between flexibility under the kind of lottery system that has been recommended and flexibility under something like the present deferment system.

As I mentioned earlier, I am attracted to a lottery that would provide some flexibility. I think it better if the flexibility has to do with the year in which one submits to the lottery rather than, having been chosen at the earliest age, choosing then the year to serve.

My strongest caution would be, keep the flexibility to within a narrow range of years. It is not healthful to have young men speculating on just when a war is going to start or stop, or when the law may change again, and make their decisions on these grounds.

If a young man decides it in terms of whether his mother needs him at home, whether he would like to get 2 years of college before taking off for the Army, I would say this is his business.

You would probably discover that people are more able to hope for deescalation than to anticipate emergencies that may arise; and a lot of the flexibility would simply be taken advantage of on what you might call speculative military grounds, rather than personal grounds. If those are going to be the grounds on which they do it, then I would be inclined to take them in at the earliest possible age.

I doubt whether the age range should be wide enough to allow a boy the choice between completely finishing college or going in before college. If you allow a 4-year span, these questions of what is going