

you feel need to be filled that you could pretty well pinpoint here?

Mr. SCHELLING. I mentioned one in my written statement, which is looking at the whole question of GI and veterans' benefits, particularly in the way they relate to what the States do, to see whether in terms of either equity or efficiency the whole pattern makes sense.

I particularly recommend examining where the line ought to be drawn between men in uniform and civilian employees. This has to be done sympathetically; there is a lot of habit and tradition and way of life that gets disturbed when you begin to shake up the whole system.

One could go further and perhaps distinguish more clearly between those in uniform who ought to be treated as combat available and therefore soldiers in the more traditional sense, and those that may need to be subjected to military discipline but who are not combat troops and don't need to be treated in that fashion.

If we had such a system, we might then have to raise the question which kinds of personnel can you use a draft for.

Part of this I think would require making the services slowly and patiently become much more cost conscious in the real sense. What are they wasting when they use a drafted man, or an enlistee, to do the kind of work that they aren't allowed to hire civilians for?

Then a couple of other related features. It may well be that at the low rate of pay of a draftee there is a tendency to underuse machinery in favor of manpower. There may also be, because of the underpaying of the draftees, an insufficient appreciation of what they are doing to these people when they train them and what it is worth to keep them when they have invested in their training.

If you can draft a replacement and train him irrespective of cost, you are not nearly as concerned about finding a pay system that will somehow induce the man in whom you have made a great investment to stay around. The dramatic example of this at the officer level is the Air Force's problem of keeping pilots with airline wages what they are.

With respect to reenlistment, it ought to be recognized that when the Army has trained a man so he can earn perhaps higher wages outside than he used to be able to, it is going to cost more to keep him, and even though he has enjoyed a lucky windfall, still it is bad economics not to keep these people.

Just a final point, in view of what Senator Proxmire said about duty, honor, and service. It seems to me that a man doesn't have to have less loyalty to his country to care about how he is paid, particularly in relation to how people are paid when they don't get drafted. When we turn not to draftees but to reenlistees, it is going to be hard for a man to explain to his wife why they should plan to raise a family on substandard wages just because he likes Army life.

Representative RUMSFELD. You responded to Senator Proxmire that you would be happy to supply any evaluations that your group comes up with to the committee. In that, will you give some clue as to what you would propose if you were to devise an ideal Selective Service System and an array of military manpower policies?

Mr. SCHELLING. I can't promise that because it depends on whether we can reach enough unanimity in the group to present a single recommendation. I hope we can. It will probably be a compromise. But