

As the majority of that commission recommended, I would, myself, still favor the abolition of all student deferments, at least under the present circumstances and present levels of draft calls and force levels.

Now, this is not obviously because I am against college or against graduate school or against students but it is because I think it is bad education and bad national morality to have a class exemption or deferment of this kind unless it is very, very clearly related to some pressing priority national manpower requirement.

At present, force levels, at present levels of draft calls, I do not think the case has been made for deferment for manpower reasons other than in the health and dental fields.

But assuming that we are talking within the ambit of the present legislation which builds in a deferment for undergraduates, then my next preference would be for a pool into which college graduates join those who do not go to college and all are treated alike on a random selection basis for induction.

I realize that although not totally prohibited there are special legislative inhibitions which have been imposed on the resort to a random selection system.

So, moving to the third level of feasibility less desirable it seems to me would be, as I was saying in answer to Congressman Quie, that I think instead of having the impact of the abolition of graduate school deferments fall immediately on those in the first 2 years of graduate school or those who are just graduating from college, it would be far better, both for education and for the graduate schools and in terms of equity, to have that liability spread more evenly by age groups.

I realize that General Hershey and his people have very good practical reasons for worrying about the administrative feasibility of quotas by age.

But I think if more effort and ingenuity could be devoted to this question to see whether by enlarging the age groups, not to expect the quota to be year by year but one quota for age 20 to 22, and another quota for age 22 to 24, it would be administratively workable.

Finally, if none of those things can be done, it seems to me there is a very powerful educational argument in favor of a great deal of willingness on the part of draft boards to permit a college year or a graduate school year, once undertaken, to be completed.

General Hershey, over the years, has, on the whole, been extremely sensitive to this need for minimizing the interruption of academic work, once undertaken, and I am simply saying that I hope that same sensitivity will be applied in the case of graduate schools under the proposed regulations so that a person, once accepted for admission, a person who once registers for admission, will be permitted to complete the year for which he is admitted, or a person renewing his enrollment in the graduate school at some point would be told his deferment would again apply for 1 year and then he would go back into eligibility for induction.

It just seems to me that the worst aspect of the present uncertainty is that neither schools nor the students can count on being able to pursue the course for which they are finally admitted or continue the course which they have undertaken.