

that "... college students are deferred so that they can serve the Armed Forces more capably when they enter later on ..." Is it possible under present law by administrative directive or Executive Order to expand the 1-D classification, which is now restricted to enrollees in the ROTC program? I feel that students desirous of pursuing graduate education, regardless of area of concentration, should be given the option of signing a contractual enlistment agreement which would delay induction until after the completion of graduate training.

The program could be devised so that persons graduating from college be allowed 60 days in which to sign the legally binding contract specifying a date for induction immediately succeeding the completion of a graduate program of one, two, or three years' duration.

At any time that progress is unsatisfactory or the terms of the agreement violated, the student would be subject to immediate induction, as also would be the case if a national emergency were declared by Congress. Thus the conscientious graduate student would be benefited by an uninterrupted educational experience and the Armed Services would be benefited by the additional education obtained by the enlistee. The graduate students participating in the delayed induction program do not escape the giving of their sophisticated talents and the Services would have a concrete indication of the number of specialists entering their ranks. Those students electing to take their chances with the draft, of course, would still be permitted to do so.

The delayed induction program could also be utilized in extraordinary hardship cases of a temporary nature. For example, a family owning a farm or small business which depends largely on a draft-age son requires time to liquidate or make other arrangements. Under the delayed induction program, the individual could settle matters of personal concern and yet insure the Armed Forces of his desire to meet his military commitment after a deferment of specified length, possibly up to a year.

Statements made before the House Armed Services Committee, while not in response to this proposal, seem to support the plan. First, while considering how officers could be secured if student deferments were eliminated, George Reedy, Jr., of the National Advisory Council said that a major revision of the 1-D program could satisfy officer needs. He mentioned the possibility of confronting students with the alternative, "You can be a doctor, will you take a 1-D deferment and agree to serve as a doctor or dentist after you graduate from college, after you graduate from graduate school, after you have all the professional training that is essential to make you a qualified doctor or dentist." While Reedy dismissed such an alternative as impractical when addressing 14 years olds, it seems that such an arrangement could be offered potential graduate students who have just received their baccalaureate degree without jeopardizing the fairness of the Selective Service System.

A second remark by Mr. Reedy revealed the reason for granting medical and dental deferments to be, "The point still remains that a very large percentage of all medical students will serve in the Armed Forces. In fact, this is the real reason for granting them the deferment, not because they are more essential to the society than a physicist or a chemist or perhaps a Latin scholar." These remarks justify graduate deferments purely on the basis of eventual likeliness to serve. A delayed induction program which requires a firm commitment from the student should be acceptable because "a very large percentage," and as a matter of fact, 100%, will serve their country.

Third, the Honorable Burke Marshall, Chairman of the President's National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, explained that the most serious manpower problem raised by abolishing the college deferment is officer procurement. "The Commission majority recommended, as an exception to its policy on college student deferment, that the Defense Department be encouraged to continue these (1-D) programs and even to devise new ones, so long as the commitment to serve be made a firm commitment by the student."

In response to the one possible objection that could be advanced, "Wouldn't such a plan enable a student to defer himself out of a hot war," I offer the reply of George Reedy, Jr. "It is true that at the present period of time a man faced with such a choice might defer himself out of trouble. I believe there are quite a few people who accepted deferments in 1962 or 1963 and who found they deferred themselves into trouble."

I concur with Mr. Schweiker that not every graduate student is a willful draft dodger. Because I believe that conscientious students who recognize their military obligation should not have their education interrupted, and because I believe