

kids and helping them with their physical ailments is a cost-effective way of producing additional military manpower, as against all of the other options we have: Taking kids out of vocational school, and college, and teaching positions, and what-not?

Don't you think, looking at the four corners of the experiment itself, you could present a *prima facie* case of being encouraged to go to the cost-effective study to see how it compares with the investment of resources in the other ways of getting military manpower?

General HERSHEY. This study is already being made. The cost of training one of the men in the 100,000 project as opposed to the man who comes in from the draft, but you won't know the answer when you get through.

It costs more to train a man in this project than a regular inductee. On the other hand, the cost of letting this man not be used in the Army is not calculable.

If he is capable of doing something else, and he would probably be employed at something else, that is one thing. If he were standing on a street corner or raising a riot, that is another thing.

So the cost of making a soldier out of him is greater than the cost of making a soldier out of a boy who is not deficient, but in terms of national cost, I don't think it can ever be assessed.

But I think most of us think it is a price well worth paying.

Mr. SCHEUER. It seems to me we ought to try to assess it, because of this assumption. You have a negative cost of getting him into military service, of getting him through the sound barrier, so to speak, but a positive cost-effectiveness implication of getting him out from where he would have been.

Whereas with the chap who is the university instructor, you have very little cost getting him into the manpower pool, but you have a negative cost of taking him out of where he would have been.

In other words, he was performing positively in society, so it has cost something to take him out. It cost very little to make him an effective component of the military forces.

With the kid we are talking about in Project 100,000, it costs us substantial resources to get him functioning effectively in the military service, but we have a positive saving in removing this lad from the point where he was about to present a serious cost to society, and himself, of staying as a civilian without training, education, and health that would make him function effectively, and positively, and independently in American life.

It seems to me that it is obvious that we ought to have some kind of cost-effectiveness study of the implications to society, concentrating on getting these kids into effective roles, both for the military and subsequently for the civilian society, as against the cost to society of taking that young kid doing graduate work, or perhaps engaged in teaching at universities.

Does anybody else on the panel want to respond to this general area of inquiry?

I yield, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Brewster.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam Chairman, I simply wanted to comment on what I think was an extremely important and I think highly promising statement by General Hershey.