

This bottom group down here are the college dropouts, people who were deferred in fatherhood and then were divorced, people who have been deferred for agricultural reasons and lost the deferment, or deferred in occupational deferments, 2-A; all of these people are now available and would be in the pool for this 1 year. Then the theoretical plan is that the following year it would move to the prime age group provision which would mean that these same men would not be as liable again as they are this year. The prime age group would then consist of the men completing the baccalaureate, the men who have dropped out of school but have been in 2-S since June 30, 1967, when the new law took effect but have lost their student deferments, plus all the available men from, probably at that point, men born in 1950. A prime age group cannot by the law that is passed be 19-year-olds; it must be men born in a calendar year and, under present provisions, whatever call is made by age group, prime age group, or as it now stands, must be oldest first within the pool.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLNBORN. If you would yield for just a moment, I would like to develop this point. You are talking about a plan that has not yet been adopted?

Mrs. VETTER. That is true.

Mr. ERLNBORN. The present provision is the oldest in chronological age will be drafted first?

Mrs. VETTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ERLNBORN. If there is no change in this, if no new plan is adopted, it would mean that, each year, those who had lost their student deferment by graduating from undergraduate school would be the oldest in chronological age.

Mrs. VETTER. Yes.

Mr. ERLNBORN. And would be drafted? In other words, without any change in the draft law, if no new plan is adopted, we will be drafting the entire eligible group of graduating seniors every year.

Mrs. VETTER. That is true.

Dr. TRYTTEN. Plus those in the graduate school.

Mr. VETTER. Which we will have for only 1 year.

Mrs. GREEN. So this would be true for every year if we continue under current policy?

Mrs. VETTER. Yes.

Dr. PUSEY. Except you will not have any first year graduate schools after that.

Mrs. GREEN. Yes, but it would be your college graduates?

Dr. PUSEY. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. You would still be putting a military premium on college graduates. As you said, you would be sure to go.

Mr. ERLNBORN. If you would yield further, I would just like to make the comment that this would seem to give us the best educated army in the world and I am not certain that this is going to be in the best interests of the country. The uncertainty that faces the graduate schools today would seem to me to lead them to a policy of admitting women, the halt, and the lame.

Dr. PUSEY. And the foreign born.

Mr. ERLNBORN. And the foreign.