

directors, pursuant to this National Security Council memorandum, states in part:

"Each local board (is left) with discretion to grant, in individual cases, occupational deferments based on a showing of essential community need."

This is clear evidence that occupational deferments are not ended at all—rather, they are continued, and left to the discretion of the 4,084 local boards. There will, consequently, be 4,084 different sets of rules governing occupational deferments. This may well be a step backward: in the past, only half of those with occupational deferments received them based on the unguided judgment of local boards; the other half were in jobs listed as essential or critical. Now, however, there is no national guidance, in direct opposition to the National Security Council recommendation.

The effect of this broad discretion is clear. A high-ranking officer of a defense contractor said this week that about 800 of his company's 90,000 employees were affected by the new rules. But he added that he expected the local draft boards to continue the deferments of many of these affected employees.

Part of the reason for this officer's assurance is a little understood quirk in the way the system today operates. Although a registrant cannot change his local board if he moves, a man with an occupational deferment can use the appeal board in the area where he is employed. It is very easy to visualize this picture: a man now living and working in another city is denied an extension of his occupational deferment by his own local board. He then takes his case to the appeal board serving his new community. Because the appeal board is sensitive to the economic needs of its own area, it would probably view of the continuation of the occupational deferment as essential to its own community need. Statistically, appeals boards in industrial areas reverse local boards by reinstating occupational deferments taken away by the local boards far more often than any other reversal action.

In sum, there can be only one conclusion: so long as we continue occupational deferments, special privileges granted to some individuals but not others will protect the former from equal exposure to the draft.

One other important factor militates against continuing occupational deferments: they can be the vehicle for pyramiding deferments into exemptions. This loophole exists right now, as it has in the past. Until it is corrected, we will not have a fair draft system.

My bill would discontinue occupational deferments, except upon a Presidential finding that a particular skill or occupation warrants deferment on a uniform national basis. This would preclude the occupational deferment from becoming the protected haven it is to day.

MILITARY YOUTH OPPORTUNITY SCHOOLS

Each year, some 700,000 young Americans are found unfit for military service. This is about one-third of all the young men examined. About half are disqualified because of health deficiencies, and the other half because of educational deficiencies.

The Marshall Commission called these "alarming statistics, affecting directly our national security." Few could or would question that judgment.

These failures reflect inadequate education, poor medical facilities, poverty, discrimination—the litany of social ills which we as a Nation are committed to overcome. The problem we face is eliminating the conditions causing the reasons for rejection. To do so, we must reach far back into each individual's years of development and training. We cannot expect the military services to do this.

But the Department of Defense is making determined efforts to reduce the number of rejectees. Foremost among these efforts is Project 100,000. Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris described Project 100,000 in these terms when he testified on the manpower implications of the Selective Service:

"Under this program, we have made revisions in our mental and physical qualification standards. Under these standards, our objective is to qualify 40,000 men in the 12-month period ending September 1967, and 100,000 per year in subsequent years. These men would not have been accepted under the draft standards or enlistment policies previously in effect. They are, typically, men who, because of lack of educational opportunity or incentives, have done poorly in formal classroom achievement. It is our judgment that these men can best be trained, therefore, in our established training centers and schools, along with