

raises enacted, data collected and analyzed, and the draft extended for the 2-year interim.

Representative RUMSFELD. Fine. Now Mr. Wool, following this line of questioning, we have had in your statement indication that you fully agree that we are going to have a compulsory system, and in your statement you specifically say it should be used as little as possible, that we should maximize volunteers.

Do you agree with the first part that both the other gentlemen stated? With respect to the pay, you have commented that that is for the Congress and for the administration to work out and we have set that aside and recognized that to the extent anyone believes that pay should be increased, that the blame must be shared by the Congress and the administration for the fact that it is not being done.

On the third point you again fully agree, as you did on the first, that we need more information, that we should try to fill the information gaps; correct?

Mr. Wool. Correct, sir.

Representative RUMSFELD. In your statement you make your fourth point which says:

Fourth, and perhaps most important—

These are your summaries of Mr. Morris' testimony—

that there would be very limited flexibility under an all voluntary system to increase military strengths even moderately within a short period, should the need arise.

Now I must say you have said this much better than the President did in his message to the Congress, where he said he would not want to gamble with the Nation's security, but it is the same point.

You and the President are suggesting that having a volunteer system is inflexible, might not meet our national security needs, and to use the President's words, is "gambling with the Nation's security."

I don't believe that is the case, if you have, as Mr. Schelling suggested, as Dr. Oi suggested, as anyone I know who has suggested moving toward a voluntary system has suggested, retained a compulsory conscription mechanism to be available, to be triggered in to the extent it is needed, but not as a crutch and not as a need, solely because we are paying salaries that are considerably lower than necessary. Now do you see any flexibility in the problem or do you stand on this statement in your testimony?

Mr. Wool. I think that we in part have a semantics problem. The President's message and the statements of the Department of Defense are in the context of legislation requesting extension of the authority to induct men into service. In other words, now if you are talking about—

Representative RUMSFELD. You mean to not pass the act would be gambling.

Mr. Wool. Certainly.

Representative RUMSFELD. To not provide any mechanism.

Mr. Wool. The authority for induction, which is the context in which these statements were made.

Representative RUMSFELD. Ah, thank you.

Mr. Wool. In other words, not to have the authority to draft men when and if you needed it would be gambling with the Nation's se-