

Mrs. VETTER. This would not protect him if he stayed in 1-A.

Mr. ESCH. I think, Madam Chairman, we are at the heart of the matter pertaining to the vocational students. First of all, as evidenced by some testimony here, the 2-A classification will not be clarified in any way in terms of needed occupational skills. At least, we have no evidence that such clarification will be forthcoming. So, there is confusion as to what is a necessary occupational area under 2-A. There is confusion with local boards as to what we mean when we put a person in 2-A who is going to a technical school and, therefore, there is confusion among the young people we are trying to help the most.

It is inconsistent that within the last month or two we have had emphasis placed upon need for vocational and technical training and that we are, at the same time, discriminating against those people who are taking technical and vocational training. I believe it was not the intent of Congress to discriminate in any way against those who are in community colleges and involved in technical training.

We must have an immediate clarification.

Mr. MORSE. I would not disagree with Mrs. Vetter, because whenever I do, I find I am wrong, and in this particular instance I believe it fair to say that the legal counsel for Selective Service does interpret the law as Mrs. Vetter described, but that there is a considerable body of legal opinion in HEW and I believe in the Attorney General's Office that the law could be read at the present time to provide a 2-S deferment for those students who are not in a baccalaureate program, because one of the criteria outlined in the Draft Act is that a student is subject to call when he ceases to pursue a full-time course of study, and in that phrase there is not mention of the baccalaureate degree.

None of us here is a lawyer, but I do know there is dispute among the lawyers as to the meaning of that law.

Mrs. GREEN. We are talking in terms of protection. I do not know whether that is the right term. As I understand it, the technical student or the student who is not enrolled to get a degree has more protection than the college graduate or the freshman and sophomore graduate student. Is that not right?

Mr. MORSE. Sure.

Mrs. GREEN. They have no protection. They are in.

Dr. SHANNON. Assuming that the National Security Council does not declare some particular fields in the national interest and others not. We have no assurance whatsoever that students of police science or business courses, many of the engineering-related or health fields, will be in these particular areas. There is a great deal of uncertainty. We have not been given any assurances by anyone that they will even be considering this.

Mrs. GREEN. I understand that, and I agree with it.

For the benefit of Congress, do any of you people at the table know if a recommendation has been made? Has the National Security Council made a recommendation, to the best of your knowledge?

Mrs. VETTER. Not officially, at any rate.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Dr. Shannon, would you go along with having 2-A considered the same as 2-S and taking the recommendations being made by the other people testifying here that then they would come into some sort of random selection for the draft, which it is estimated means one of four would be called?