

to happen in the world and when is the safe time to be in the Army, will loom too heavily for them.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Oi?

Mr. Oi. I am in favor of holding to rigid rules on this matter. I have been favoring a lottery with 2-year liability between the ages of 19 to 21, the oldest being drafted first, 21 down. All students who want deferments can have them, but their age is held say, at a draft age of 20. No matter what their chronological age is upon completion of the bona fide educational program that they signed up for, they enter the pool at a draft age of 20 and take their chances in the pool with no opportunity for occupational or dependency deferments, other than hardship.

This is a stand I would propose.

Senator PERCY. The next question I would like to address myself to is the question of the quality of our military forces. Do you think that the volunteer Army would mean a lower quality Army, and do you think that a lottery pool Army would mean a lower quality Army? Mr. Wool?

Mr. Wool. I believe there would be a strong likelihood that an all-volunteer Army, with the pressures to try to somehow accomplish this in terms of some numerical objectives, would have a lower educational level distribution and a lower mental aptitude level distribution if you measure quality in these ways, as we would, than would an Army which is staffed in part at least on a more representative basis of the population of military age.

The survey data I cited in my statement showed clearly, and for obvious reasons, that the young men who have the greatest opportunity in civilian life, the most training, the most education, are the least likely to volunteer for service as enlisted men.

To some extent the same principle applies to officers. The most acute problem of trying to maintain an army voluntarily would be in the case of our physicians, where at least 70 to 80 percent of those who enter service do so because of the draft, and this is the precise analogy in the officer corps to the problem, we would have at the enlisted level.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Schelling?

Mr. SCHELLING. I do not altogether disagree with Mr. Wool, but part of the answer to your question is that you will get the quality you pay for. We do not worry about whether we can get the quality of motor-pool managers in a civilian agency. If we need good ones, we pay for them.

A lot of the skills that the military services need, if they try to acquire them the way they would try to acquire civilian skills, will prove to be available.

If, in addition to the skills that get induced into the young men after they are in the Army, we can have a system that keeps people for longer periods of time so that we do not put them through a 2-year period in which in the first 6 months they are in training and in the last 3 months they are lameducks, we may get more quality through a greater career service than we get with a draft system.

I suspect that under the lottery, if by quality you mean general education, mental ability, probably yes, because at the present time