

be obliged to fight a war he does not believe in: eliminate the draft. There are also those who say the Government should not be free to have any war it can hire people to fight: keep a draft and make it a universal lottery. I believe there are many whose views about the draft flow, not in a direct way but in an important way, from their feeling about the war in Vietnam. I doubt whether there are many whose feelings about the war in Vietnam are related to the kind of military manpower system that we have.

Chairman PROXMIRE. I would like to get back to your initial testimony, Dr. Schelling. Are you saying that you favor the draft, but also favor adequate pay? That it would be fine if we did not have to have a draft, but if we have to have it, we also ought to have pay that is comparable and competitive?

Mr. SCHELLING. When I say we have to have it—

Chairman PROXMIRE. I mean you ought to have it in terms of equity, in terms of size, affluence of our economy, in terms of any kind of value judgment that you think is justified.

Mr. SCHELLING. I do not think we ought to feel obliged to use it. Nobody can guarantee that we will not need 6 million men in the services sometime in the next decade, and if we need 6 million men, I have a hunch that we are going to have a draft no matter who wins the argument between Mr. Oi and Mr. Wool.

I also think that we ought to lay the legislative base for that kind of draft, so that we do not have to improvise it rapidly.

Therefore, in principle, there potentially is a draft. If it is not on the law books, we will get it in a hurry. There is no constitutional provision against it, and there it is. The Government will get the men it needs.

I also suspect that the market system, even within the range of say up to 4 million men, may frequently just be not quickly adaptable. I doubt whether Congress is going to leave it up to the executive branch to reexamine several times a year just what the market requires, and to raise pay as flexibly as a business firm might.

So we are bound to have a system that is at least somewhat rigid. And there may be months, quarters, even years, when we do not use the draft we have. I anticipate that we shall have a draft on the books, that it may have to be used, and that it probably will be used.

Then I would turn around and say it would be a splendid idea, irrespective of these supply questions, to pay the men the Federal minimum wage. It is not easy to calculate—you have to calculate the tax advantage, how to handle subsistence, and so forth—but there is an opportunity here to make an experiment. That is, if for reasons other than getting more soldiers we think it makes sense to raise military pay, we have an opportunity to do it, and see what results it leads to.

As a byproduct, we will get some new data for Mr. Wool and Mr. Oi. And since this problem is going to be with us for 10 or 15 years, we can watch and see what happens in the next 2 or 3 years. If there should be a significant change in military pay, we may be able to draw some conclusions about how much further to go in the interest of inducing a greater supply to come forward.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Of inducing what?