

This is as against 2-S deferment for students who are aiming for the baccalaureate degree. But there is a great deal of uncertainty about the 2-A deferment, because as of this time the National Security Council, which is supposed to designate the critical areas, has not done so, at least has not set up a new slate of critical areas so that the student who is aiming for a technician's job after a year or 2 years in a junior college is not sure whether his deferment is going to hold up while he is a student.

The law calls for a deferment of students until they reach 24 years of age, until they drop out of the program for some reason, or until they attain the baccalaureate degree. It seems to us that the present regulations are not a correct interpretation of the law. They seem to be an interpretation which is slanted toward the baccalaureate student but giving a rather discriminatory approach, using a discriminatory approach to the 2-A student or to the occupational student. This has caused a great deal of uncertainty on the part of the students. They do not know what fields they might engage in. In a sense, it puts the pressure on the student as to whether or not it is advisable to enter the baccalaureate program because there is practically an assurance of 4 years of draft deferment. This can create an unnatural situation in the community college where, for many years now—and in the technical institutes—we have been trying to encourage students to go to the technician field and the occupational world, take their training, and then go out into the manpower pool which at the present time is depleted of many of the persons that we need for our industry and technology.

Now, we have tried, as I said, over the past 6 months to get a reinterpretation of the regulations. We have met with General Hershey and his staff. We had met with persons from the White House. We have tried through the Office of the Commissioner of Education to achieve this objective but we have been unsuccessful thus far. We have had interest expressed by many Congressmen and others in this particular cause, but this is our first chance to state our case publicly except for a press release which went out a month ago and which received very favorable response from the colleges and from the press itself. Editors around the country were quite sympathetic with this point of view, but thus far we have not been able to achieve or to obtain any change in the regulation.

I would like to come back to the point Dr. Pusey mentioned about teachers and the relationship of their problem in the undergraduate institution and graduate institutions. Last year 74 new community colleges were opened up. We see a tremendous increase ahead in enrollments from 1.6 million this year to about 3 million within 5 or 6 years. We need many, many teachers. One estimate is that we need 100,000 full-time teachers within the next 7 or 8 years, we need the same number of part-time teachers. Now, most of the junior colleges require or call for or recommend that a teacher have a master's degree in the subject matter, plus some additional graduate work. If the graduate schools are going to have their flow of students cut off in anyway, the flow of teachers to the junior colleges will be severely impaired. This is of particular concern to us as these colleges are multiplying in number and like amoebas, splitting up into multicampus students, and thou-