

has been to minimize reliance upon involuntary induction, when you are paying the unrealistically low wage scales that are being paid. So, in addition, not only are you requiring people to serve through the compulsory system, you are in addition taxing them as has been testified on, and requiring them to serve for less than they could be earning in the private sector.

What is interesting to me, is that you can say that is your intention and still yet have a pay policy that is premised so much lower than the competitive situation.

Do you follow me?

Mr. WOOL. All I can say in that regard is that the levels of military pay are not uniquely established by the Department of Defense. They are established by the Congress in the last resort, and I think this in fact has been the pay policy of the Government over a period of years.

Representative RUMSFELD. Has the Department of Defense made recommendations to the Congress to the effect that the pay curve should be straightened out so that we would pay people during their early year periods of service a wage that would roughly approximate a competitive position with respect to the private sector?

Mr. WOOL. No, I do not think so, but, on the other hand, Congress has always had the discretion of making its own decisions in that respect.

Representative RUMSFELD. Let me assure you I am hopeful the Congress will exercise that discretion. I am also hopeful that the Department of Defense will show a little initiative in the area.

My time is up. I have dozens of questions, but I will yield.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Congressman Curtis?

Representative CURTIS. Thank you.

Let me see if I can continue on this theme of manpower utilization. Possibly, Mr. Wool, you have some comments to make on what work might be in being or has been done in this area of correlating military skills with the skills that exist in the private sector?

Mr. WOOL. I am pleased that you did quote from an article appearing in the Monthly Labor Review, which I wrote, referring to this 80-percent relationship. I should clarify this, and the article did.

Although there is a broad relationship among the type of skills performed for perhaps 80 percent of our personnel, and types of skills in the civilian economy, that the distribution of these skills is very different indeed in the military service. We require a far higher ratio of our personnel to be mechanics—aircraft mechanics, for example—to be electronics maintenance personnel and other types of skills of a specialized type, than are found proportionately in the civilian labor force.

Moreover, the specific content of these skills, the equipment they work with, the operating procedures, are in many cases significantly different, although some, of course, are very common.

Representative CURTIS. Let me comment here that the Seabee enlistment system in World War II was along the line of trying to compare the skills that existed in civilian society. If they had need for a bulldozer operator, instead of sending a young kid of 18 years old for 6 months of training and then to bulldozer operating school for 3 months, they got a fellow even if he was fat and 40, and put a uniform