Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Blackwell, Morton: Files

Folder Title: Veterans – Policy Matters

(5 of 6)

Box: 51

To see more digitized collections visit: https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit: https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing

National Archives Catalogue: https://catalog.archives.gov/

•

to have those funded external to the Department of Defense, too, as well, but if they could not be, I think we could rationalize them being included in the DOD budget.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you. Does the Air Force agree with the results of the educational assistance test program?

*Maj. General Usher. We had quite a number of reservations about it. It demonstrated certain things, but I do not think we ought to get carried away with its results.

I think the two basic assertions have been that an educational assistance program, of course, helps the Army, and I am certain that it would, but also that a strong educational benefit for one service to the exclusion of the others would not hurt recruiting to the other services, and it is with that second one I find particular difficulty.

I have concern about the way the test was designed, how it was implemented, some of the variables that were associated with what was happening at that time, and how they were analyzed out of the problem, if you will, and the strength of the evidence that supports the conclusions drawn. I just do not think it is there. We just should not rely on it.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to put in the record a statement that I received from David Schuckers,

who is the Director of Government Relations as Penn State
University, and he shared a Comptroller General report on
the new GI Bill with Brian Clark, who is the Coordinator
for Veterans' Affairs at Penn State, and he put together
an informal memo which, I think, illustrates the point that
you are making, but also that we have heard from others,
and I would like to read from this report, while we will
put the whole statement in the record.

[The material appears on page .].

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

*Mr. Edgar. Listen to these just several paragraphs.

The Comptroller General's report asserts that the Department of Defense test program was, although somewhat flawed, an indicator that some, underlined, benefit in the form of increased enlistment could accrue as a result of the high cost educational program. They contend that the Department of Defense test program was well designed though under-publicized. In fact, based upon the Department of Defense's complete mishandling of the current VEAP program, I would maintain that any positive results from these three additional programs makes a strong case for the efficacy of educational benefits as a recruitment tool.

Our experience is that virtually no one in the military establishment understands VEAP even though it has been in effect for five years. The recruiters misapprehend it and even those enlistees who opt for it can typically find no one to explain its intricacies. To include three even more complex options in select areas is to plan for failure.

To say that these test programs were under-publicized is to say the least. When you sent me the authorizing legislation, I attempted for two months to find someone who knew anything about it. The VA knew nothing; the recruiters knew nothing; ROTC knew nothing. In frustration, I directly contacted the Chief of Manpower and Training for the Department of Defense, after failing to unearth anything

at the educational headquarters of all of the services. I
was told by this individual that the programs were in effect
and that I probably had not heard of them because
Pennsylvania was not a test area. The third largest
recruiting State is excluded. How this jives with the
Comptroller's report which states that the entire country
was tested is beyond me.

The statement goes on to say the following.

A large point in the Comptroller's argument is to study the issue for a couple of years and test further, particularly since the economy is having a salutory effect on enlistment. We should, they contend, be careful and not commit to a permanent GI Bill. This is, of course, absurd since:

- A. No GI Bill has ever been permanent. The time limit is discretionary by congressional fiat.
- B. What we have now, the VEAP program, is as permanent as any has been. VEAP participants have ten years to use their benefits. If we were to discontinue VEAP today, any participant would have ten years from discharge to use his benefits.

VEAP has received little publicity and is terribly inadequate as an educational voicher. In spite of this, increasing numbers of vets are opting for it only to find upon discharge that \$75 to \$225 per month does not pay the

freight.

The arguments against a new GI Bill are weak. In light of the needs of the services, the proven effectiveness of educational benefits in recruiting high quality youth, the elimination of general student aid by the Reaganites, and thus the more pressing need for an avenue of educational opportunity, the social benefits realized by an educable military and an educated citizenry, it is no wonder that H.R. 1400 had 123 signatures and nearly unanimous support.

Sorry for all the editorializing. I have see too many veterans benefit by the GI Bill not to believe that it represents the best investment in national defense ever conceived.

I took the time to read that because Dr. Korb's satement before indicated that the VEAP and the super-VEAP or ultra-VEAP were super programs, and I think there is at least some body of evidence and data that indicates that that may not be the case and that it may be time to stop the testing programs and get to the long-term program.

Let me ask Admiral Cueronni to answer that one question that all of you have, and then I have just a couple specific questions for the rest, and we then can move to our second panel.

*Admiral Cueronni. Mr. Chairman, on the aspects of the positiveness of H.R. 1400, we like it in all respects.

We like the fact that it is good for recruiting and retention and has the transferability clause.

On the negative side, we particularly have concern about the kicker. We would rather see something that is non-discriminatory across the board, and let me just, as an example, we have been going through some rather trying times in my service, and we have had to take some actions which unfortunately have hurt our personnel, but we are not in the same let me use the term luxurious situation that my colleagues are in.

One single factor that we are finding in our service is in the application of the selective re-enlistment bonus where it is on the basis of not performance, not particular rating or -- I am sorry -- but on the basis of a particular rating those critical skills are getting higher bonuses. That is the biggest source of frustration and irritation in our crew.

It is awfully difficult, and Admiral Zech alluded to this, awfully difficult on a ship when you are out to a cook to say that an electronics technician or a fire control technician is more valuable than he is, and so we would like to see it non-discriminatory.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you very much.

This question is for all of you, and the next two questions are actually for the record. I hope that you can

. .

submit this information.

ı

I realize that you probably do not have this information with you, but could you all supply for the record a list of all current educational programs for active duty personnel and reservists currently being funded by the Department of Defense, a breakdown of the cost of those programs both for Fiscal Year 1983 and projected cumulative costs down the road to 1994, much the same that we have costed out for H.R. 1400? We will make sure that the specific question is shared with you and your staff, and we could like that information provided for the record.

Also for the record, we would like to know what are the manpower needs facing your branch of service during the next three to six years, and then into the 1990s.

Finally, General Thurman, a recent study entitled

"Profile of American Youth," released by the Department of

Defense, indicates that even after the banner recruiting

year and what was called a favorable economy, the services

produced a crop of recruits that scored in mental categories

about on par with their civilian counterparts in Fiscal Year

1981, but the study showed that even with this success, the

military is not drawing as many above average youth as it

used to.

Since 1955 the number of category one enlistees, the highest mental category, has dropped from 9.6 percent to

2.2 percent in 1981. Are you satisfied that the Armed Forces can continue to rely on only meeting the standard of mediocrity, or should the services draw on a more representative cross-section of mental groups and social classes; and would the GI Bill help in the recruitment of those persons in a little higher mental category?

*Lt. General Thurman. Mr. Chairman, I would not refer to anybody as mediocrity, but the statistics you cite are correct. Now, I have a chart which I would like to provide for the record. I have anticipated the current recruiting year, 1982, against those same statistical data that may be of interest to you, but in mental category one, for example, test category one, while the youth population of America is 4 percent, this year we will get about three, and for the upper half, one to three A, that is running about 53 percent in the youth cohort of America and will come in about 51 or 52 percent this year.

So as contrasted with the statement that you read or the letter that you got, I will not defend all of it, but I will say, and I think this is the underlying cause of the statements that you have had from the Department of Defense at the time, the current ultra-VEAP is helping make that switch in the Army.

From the period of 1981, we only had 39 percent upper half scoring youngsters, and this year we have got 51

percent.

*Mr. Edgar. Can I interrupt you at that point?

*Lt. General Thurman. Yes.

*Mr. Edgar. It seems to me that almost what the Army is saying is that they have invented a GI Bill, calling it ultra-VEAP, and it is working to meet their recruitment needs, and you know, I can agree with that statement for the short term, but I think you are almost using or the Department of Defense, not you, but the Department of Defense is using the success of ultra-VEAP as one of its decisions as to why we do not at the present time need GI Bill, and yet, in fact, it is a GI Bill.

*Lt. General Thurman. Of course it is, and the point is it does not enfranchise the other people in the service nor the reservists and all the rest of the service people here. So I just say to you that the powerful notion I want to echo one more time is that an educational benefit does, in fact, draw upper scoring youth, and we have to have one of those in the long term.

General Bronars, Admiral Zech, General Usher and the rest, we all have to have high quality youngsters to assure that we operate the system that we are going to operate on the battlefield we perceive tomorrow. We need the GI Bill to undergird that in order to attract those people.

*Mr. Edgar. Does anyone have any comments given

[1]

the broad spectrum of questions that were asked?

1 .

*Vice Admiral Zech. I think, Mr. Chairman, if I may, from the Navy standpoint, although we are making our recruiting goals and our retention goals at the moment and we are very pleased with the success we have had and the support from Congress, I think it is important that we look ahead. I think that is what you and your committee are trying to do, and I believe that although in the Navy we have been very successful this past year and we project success in this coming year, the economy has been helpful to recruiting, and the Congress, in their support, has given the compensation that we felt has been lacking.

So although we are at the moment in the short term in a relatively good position in the Navy, my personal concern is for the future, again, looking ahead, and I do think that as we look ahead, recognizing the tremendous benefits of an educational bill to the Navy and to the other services, that our country needs a GI Bill, and I think in the long haul we are doing the right thing to bring in the quality people that we foresee we need in the Navy and the other services in the future by addressing, as soon as possible, if not this year, as soon as possible an educational program that will bring in that cross-section of America and the talent we need for all of our services.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you. All of you are put in a very

difficult position, and that is you either have to hope for a terrible economy or the passage of a GI Bill because while you say you are being helped in your recruiting goals by the economy, what you are really saying is because we are going to face by July 1st 10 percent unemployment and cutbacks in educational programs, there is an economic incentive to perhaps look at some of the military service, and I do not think any of you are hopeful that the economy stays in its stagnant position and helps your recruiting goals.

We all have a common cause, and that is to have the best military that we can conceivably have, given the resources that we have, and I think you have made a strong case for the fact that personnel may be equal to some of the sophisticated equipment that you get, and that in order to have a strong military, we need a well-rounded military force.

Thank you for your statements today. They have been very helpful.

*Lt. General Thurman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

*Mr. Edgar. The second panel will include a number of recruiting commands. Let me ask the Army recruiting command, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force and the Coast Guard to come forward.

Gentlemen, thank you for coming, and thank you for

your patience today. I would like each one of you to do as we did with the first panel, and that is to give a very brief opening statement, if you have one to make.

We heard last year specifically from the recruiting commands, and they had some strong statements to make, and in fact, they and those who were here last year invented the phrase "make it equitable, make it simple, make it permanent" in terms of their concerns.

We are very pleased that you have taken the time to come and participate today, and we are very pleased that you have been willing to share your views and your concerns given your experience as people involved in the process of recruiting.

We will first hear from Sergeant First Class James Eagle, Jr., Minneapolis, Minnesota District, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command.

STATEMENT OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS JAMES D. EAGLE,

JR., MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY

RECRUITING COMMAND.

*Sergeant Eagle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your support in the recent pay raise in the last couple of years. It has done a lot for the morale of the serviceman and the quality of the life in the Army at this time.

The only opening statement that I have is I do agree

along with the other services and the current bill, H.R.

1400, that we do need a permanent sort of education system
to attract higher mental category people into the service.

*Mr. Edgar. Master Chief Adams.

STATEMENT OF MASTER CHIEF JOHN M. ADAMS, CHIEF RECRUITER, RECRUITING COMMAND, U. S. NAVY.

*Master Chief Adams. I would like to echo the

Sergeant's thanks to all of you and all of Congress for the

recent pay raises and benefit changes that have helped us,

and particularly to recruiting and to better the retention,

and the easier it may make our job.

I personally am looking from a recruiting viewpoint.

I am looking at the decline in male American youth,

particularly in 1985, when that decline starts sloping

rather steeply. A GI Bill would be beneficial to recruiting

in that, number one, it is a door opener to our educators,

to get us into the high schools, to the junior colleges,

to where we actually recruit for the quality youth.

Secondly, it helps us work better with the parents.

This is a benefit that they can see for their child, that they perhaps have earned, maybe the fathers did during the Korean War or even earlier, and it helps us target ourselves into the brighter student and allows us to provide an opportunity to look further down range on not only will our service, and we are all service-unique for the type of

training we offer, but there is something even beyond that that is going to help you become a better citizen.

So the necessity of it, if we are serious, and I know you all are, about building a quality Armed Forces, all volunteer Armed Forces, in the future, I believe it is absolutely imperative that we have something like H.R. 1400.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

Gunnery Sergeant Taylor.

STATEMENT OF GUNNERY SERGEANT ROBERT M. TAYLOR,

NON-COM OFFICER IN CHARGE OF RECRUITING SUB-STATION,

HYATTSVILLE, MARYLAND, U. S. MARINE CORPS.

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. I would just like to say
thank you for giving us the opportunity to come and to speak
to you about this subject.

From the recruiting standpoint, we definitely do need a permanent GI Bill. The Veterans' Education Assistance

Program has not worked as far as recruiting.

On the other hand, the super-VEAP or the ultra-VEAP that the Army has I feel is unfair for one service to have and not the other three. A lot of young men and women who come into my outfit have spoken to the Army first, and then they stop by and check all the rest of the services. They do mention from time to time this ultra-VEAP.

It is hard for us to come back and say that we have something similar because we do not. What we have to offer

is the Veterans' Education Assistance Program. So I feel it is unfair that one service has it and the others do not. Either give it to all four branches or take it away.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you very much. Master Sergeant Jacques.

STATEMENT OF MASTER SERGEANT ROBERT E. JACQUES,
AIR FORCE RECRUITING SQUADRON, U. S. AIR FORCE.

*Master Sergeant Jacques. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for inviting us here today.

On behalf of the United States Air Force and its recruiters across the United States, we would like to thank you for the recent pay raise in the last two years.

I have no formal opening statement to make, but being a recruiter for over 10 years, I was there when we had the draft. I was there when we had the recession in 1975, when recruiting was good. In 1979 things started to get kind of worse. In that year the Air Force did not make its goal. In 1980 and 1891, we started to kind of see the unemployment situation help us quite a bit.

I would like to see a GI Bill established at a front end for the new people coming on board and also to extend the 1989 deadline for the people that are presently on active duty that may retire in the future, and see the transferability clause in there also.

*Mr. Edgar. Tiank you.

Master Chief Petty Officer Love.

2

STATEMENT OF MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICER LOVE,

3

RECRUITING, U. S. COAST GUARD.

4

*Master Chief Petty Officer Love. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your invitation to testify before the subcommittee

5

appreciate your invitation of the same

6

on behalf of the Coast Guard.

7

I would also like to thank you for the pay raise that

8

we got in the last couple of years.

9

*Mr. Edgar. You all should take time to go over to

10

the Armed Services Committee and thank them, too,

11

particularly Bill Nichols who chairs the subcommittee that

12

this H.R. 1400 was referred to. Thank you and then also

13

ask him to report the bill out.

afford it out of its current budget.

14

[Laughter.].

a successful force.

15

*Master Chief Petty Officer Love. Some educational

16

programs have always been popular with members of the Armed

17

Forces. I think we should have one in order to maintain

18

I have reviewed H.R. 1400. I think it is a good bill,

19 20

but at this time I do not think the Coast Guard coald

21

*Mr. Edgar. What was the last sentence?

2223

*Master Chief Petty Officer Love. I do not think the

24

Coast Guard can afford H.R. 1400 out of its own budget.

25

*Mr. Edgar. I appreciate your opening statements.

Let me go back to Master Sergeant Jacques. I had a chance to look over your biography, and was really quite impressed with your background, and I have just a couple of basic questions.

Why did you join the Air Force?

*Master Sergeant Jacques. I joined the Air Force, sir.

My dad was a veteran of the United States Navy, a disabled

veteran. He died when I was 20 years old, and I was brought

up in an atmosphere where service the military, service the

country was a big part of my life, and that is why I became

a member of the Air Force.

*Mr. Edgar. You will have been in the military for 20 years in 1985. Do you plan to continue an active duty career after that point?

*Master Sergeant Jacques. Yes, sir, I do.

*Mr. Edgar. You made a statement about the transferability that I thought was important. You suggested that transferability was an important provision to keep in the legislation. Can you define why?

*Master Sergeant Jacques. Well, sir, I look at my son and my daughter who are right now -- my son is a teenager and my daughter is going to be 11 years old, and having the career in the United States Air Force, I feel that I have been given the opportunity to go ahead and expand my horizons. I would like to go ahead and give them the opportunity also

12/

I believe with the transferability that that opportunity would be available to them.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

Sergeant Eagle, what type of recruits are coming in to your office, into the recruiting offices?

*Sergeant Eagle. The type of people, recruits, that
we are getting in our office at this time are basically your
high school seniors, high school diploma graduates, looking
for education. Minneapolis, the area that I am presently
working in, they are very college oriented. The parents
want to see them get an education.

*Mr. Edgar. What is bringing them in? They are motivated to go to college; their parents want to see them achieve. They are coming now to the military and coming to the office. What is bringing them to those offices?

*Sergeant Eagle. Primarily the recruiters offering them the ultra-VEAP at this time, sir. Your high school seniors and your graduates within the last three or four months, they all have jobs. Both of their parents work.

The unemployed person is not the people that we are looking for. Competition, being that we do have an ultra-VEAP to offer them, it is very successful. For example, we have a delayed entry program when a person swears in.

My office at present has 34 people in the delayed entry

3

2

4

6

5

7

8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

I would say that most of those went for the ultra-VEAP.

They are looking for an education.

*Mr. Edgar. Let me ask the same question of the Navy. You do not have the opportunity of using the ultra-VEAP. What kind of reaction are you getting at your offices?

*Master Chief Adams. Mr. Chairman, no, we do not offer the ultra-VEAP, but we do offer education, and we feel it is the best education that any of the four services offer for enlisted training, our six-year programs, and as a matter of fact, travel and adventure and all that kind of stuff the Navy is supposed to be, that is not the primary motive of the young American today. They are after education.

So if they are mentally qualified, and we are talking your top cut, we will offer them nuclear power training or advanced electronics training, advanced technical field training, which by the way, requires a six-year enlistment, and we would see an earning of benefits at the six-year point detrimental in that we are unique. We are the only service that recruits 13 to 14,000 of those individuals a year. We are talking a two-year training pipeline for them, and to maximize their benefits at the six-year point would be detrimental.

I think the Marine Corps recruits a few thousand for their aviation, but in the spinoff of that, that is our

2

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

best sales tool, other than we have some in-service education.

*Mr. Edgar. Why do you think a few more people came in in the last couple of years?

*Master Chief Adams. Mr. Chairman, I feel unemployment has helped, not that I am sure -- the 17 year old that dropped out of high school, he had a tough time finding a job in 1956 as well as 1982. If the parents are out of work, pop has probably told him, "Hey, it's tough and don't get into the factories. Find something different for yourself."

So unemployment has had a help, but I feel the attitude of the American public as we have left Vietnam further behind us, and that has been further enhanced by leaders within the Administration and in Congress speaking out that the military service is an honorable thing to do for American youth. I feel that attitude is really coming on strong across the country.

I feel very strongly that our recruiters are professional sales people, and they are aggressively trying to point out and contact and let the individuals know what benefits await them if they should choose to enlist in the Navy. So I think those three things.

*Mr. Edgar. Sergeant Taylor, what kinds of people are coming into your offices, and what are you finding in the recruitment area? What is bringing them in?

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. High school seniors and high school graduates are basically. We have a number of activities we go through to generate activity to find these respective applicants. We work the high schools through ASBAB, high school visits, career talks, things of this nature.

My station, in particular, is in a suburban recruiting area and is more or less a walk-in station. I have 111 in my program in my pool, and they also bring in referrals.

We school them on what type of person it takes to be a Marine, what type of person that can pass the physical and things of this nature, and they bring us referrals. So there are a number of ways to get people in the outfit.

*Mr. Edgar. Sergeant Taylor, if you were going to stand up in front of this room with all the people here in this hall and teach them how to use the VEAP program and go through the 16 different categories of VEAP, would you be able to do that at this point?

- *Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. No, sir.
- *Mr. Edgar. What would be the problem?
- *Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. You mentioned 16 categories of VEAP?
- *Mr. Edgar. Well, somebody showed me a chart. There are 16 or so different ways you can use the VEAP program and the test programs that are out there. The variety;

A

let's not use the term 16. The variety of different options under VEAP, could you explain it, and I am not giving you a test. I am trying to point out the fact that it is a little confusing to some people how the system works.

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. Yes, sir. For every one dollar that the individual contributes to this educational program, the Marine Corps or the U. S. Government will give him two to one, and at the end of a four-year period, it could end up to \$8,100.

*Mr. Edgar. Yes, it is different in a different service.

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. That is my understanding of the way it works in the Marine Corps, sir.

*Mr. Edgar. All right.

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. And that is the way we portray it to prospective applicants.

*Mr. Edgar. Do you find that your prospefctive applicants get excited about that?

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. No, sir, they do not.

*Mr. Edgar. They do not?

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. Eight thousand one hundred dollars is not very much money. I believe the national average for a year of college is \$9,000. I believe that is the national average for college per year. Eight thousand one hundred dollars, and these young kinds know that. They know that. So it is very hard to portray to them that this

. 4

is a super program and they should take advantage of it and this is why you should join the Marine Corps.

But then again, we do not sell programs and we do not sell education in the Marine Corps recruiting service. It is there as a tool. We sell the Marine Corps, and the bottom line is the Marine Corps will sell itself because, sir, if you asked me why I joined the Marine Corps, I joined because I wanted to be a Marine. There was no so-called job. I thought a job was to be a Marine when I came in, and I understand the situation.

*Mr. Edgar. That is why you have succeeded.

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. Yes, sir.

But the attitude of the generation nowadays has changed, and we have to have those tools and we have to have that education to entice these young people to join the Marine Corps.

*Mr. Edgar. Let me ask all of you a question, and perhaps, Sergeant Taylor, you might begin by answering it. We received some testimony out in the field last year that it is nice in specialized skills to get a cash bonus, but there is a different value put on education, particularly if we think of it as an entitlement program.

Do you feel that there is a different impact of bonuses versus the GI Bill as a recruiting tool, a permanent, consistent entitlement versus a cash bonus? Is there any

value given to those that are different?

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. Yes, sir. The way I understand it, the bonus is for once you have served a number years for your first-year enlistment, first term of enlistment. If you are in a critical MOS, you are entitled to a bonus, a re-enlistment bonus.

An entitlement, to me, is similar to a benefit, be it medical or education or something of that nature, but a bonus, I myself have received a bonus. I got \$15,000 for reenlistment for six years, which I greatly appreciate, but then again, there is another man, a Marine, that sits by my side that is the same rank at the same time in the Marine Corps, but he is not in a critical MOS, and he only got \$3,000, and he has served honorably alongside me.

*Mr. Edgar. Sergeant Jacques.

*Master Sergeant Jacques. Yes, sir. I believe that
we need a GI Bill, but I also believe in the bonus area that
we have to be, I guess, kind of flexible, like you say, that
we are flexible because as the economy changes and as the
world is, we may have to be competitive with a lot of
different industries to retain our people on board in the
services, and I would like to see that it is flexible so
as the times change, if we have the need for a critical job,
that we can be able to go ahead and use that incentive or
the bonus to retain them.

*Mr. Edgar. That is a point that has been raised. I have no problem with that, to give a cash bonus for a critical skill. I do have a problem in using educational benefits as a bonus for critical skills, and some of the proposals that have been before us say if you work in a particular field, you get an educational incentive, you know, and causes the problem that Sergeant Taylor was mentioning.

Here are two people that have served honorably. They have come into the service at the same time, and he has pointed out the difference between a \$15,000 bonus and a \$3,000 bonus for what is perceived by the Marine Corps as more critical than another skill that they have had.

If, on top of that, the gentleman who only got the \$3,000 bonus for re-enlistment also got less educational benefits because he did not fit into that particular category, he would feel further put upon by the service, and I guess I am assuming that it makes sense to keep the bonuses on the salary side, but to limit the educational area to entitlements and not play the bonus game with that.

*Master Sergeant Jacques. Yes, sir. I would like to see an equitable process as far as the education process.

*Mr. Edgar. I appreciate that.

Congressman Dowdy, who has joined us, who is on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and on the subcommittee, we appreciate your taking the time to join us.

Do you have any questions of the recruiters here before I continue?

Mr. Dowdy. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. I appreciate the input, but I have no questions.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

I wonder if the Coast Guard might tell us a little bit about your recruiting offices and what kinds of people you are finding coming to the Coast Guard.

*Master Chief Petty Officer Love. Mr. Chairman, we always need substantially smaller numbers than the other services naturally. For instance, in FY '81 --

*Mr. Edgar. You will have to speak right into the microphone, sir.

*Master Chief Petty Officer Love. In FY '81 we only recruited slightly over 5,000 people. So we are not looking at the great numbers that the other services need.

Most of the people that come into the recruiting office are looking for some type of educational advancement. Most of the people or some of our people come in looking for some of the things the Coast Guard has to offer, such as humanitarian services and some of the services that apply to the public.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you for that.

Let me ask each of you to think for a moment. As you

in your tool chest right now to recruit people within the service, if the economy turns around, if we do not have 10 percent unemployment, if we do not have the kinds of pressure on the economy that we presently have, what kinds of things are you going to need in that tool chest three or four years down line in order to recruit quality people within the service?

look at the next five years and the tools which you have

Let's start with Master Chief Adams.

*Master Chief Adams. Yes, sir. As I stated earlier,

I feel very strongly we have a professional sales

organization, and two things we are going to need to recruit

quality people or anybody, one of them is we are going to

need money so we can better support our recruiters.

We are one of the services that took an advertising cut this year and other support items.

As I stated earlier, if you are going to recruit quality people, you have to pique their interest. Should the economy change, and I know the Navy, in particular, is going to need larger numbers over the next five years with the CG-47 and the FIGS coming out and the F-18 aircraft. I can see nothing but our manpower needs increasing.

If you want to recruit somebody of quality, and the primary interest of our youth in America today is improving their education, we are going to have to offer them something,

whether it is in service or after service, and from everything I have seen that is available today, I think H.R. 1400 comes pretty close.

I do have the reservation with the six-year kicker because, again, I look at retention, the better the retention, the easier our job becomes at the front end. I lost my train of thought there for a second.

*Mr. Edgar. Well, I think you have made a good point, you know, that there is going to be a need, and you have got specific things you need in your tool chest to be able to get the quality people to man the equipment and the service needs you have within your service.

*Master Chief Adams. Yes, sir. One thing that has come up is the bonuses, and just like the Navy, for some of those people that we desire for critical skills or seaintensive skills, we have offered then 1,000 to 1,500 to \$2,000 bonus, but that is just a short-term thing, and everybody can figure that out, and that will not even make you a down payment on a good car any longer.

Here if you want to recruit trainable people, and they are not all going to be nuclear power types, I would like to address myself to the GI Bill being equitable across the board. You can take what would normally be associated to be a support type person, a supply petty officer or a cook. When you put them on a ship and that ship deploys, she is

combat ready, and they are no longer support personnel. They are a part of a combat unit. They earn something just like the gunners mate, the fire control technician, the sonar technician, everything else. Their worth in value to us, it is equal across the board.

But I see this as the only long-range solution coming up here in the eighties, to go after and recruit quality personnel and help convince their parents and the educators that we have got something to offer because we compete today against Honeywell and IBM and what have you as far as sharp young people.

*Mr. Edgar. One of the things that we learned last year was that part of your job as a recruiter is to have something you can explain to parents and counselors in high schools that is simple and easy to understand. Would you agree that it is important if we move to a GI Bill that it be simple, understandable, permanent, something that parents and counselors could easily understand?

*Master Chief Adams. Yes, sir, and like our EATP that we had scattered all over the country, you had a high school student living across the State line or some arbitrary boundary, maybe down the middle of the State. You had a recruiter over here that could talk, "Well, we can give you this," and the recruiter on the other side of the county said, "Well, we really do not give you very much," and it

was so complicated. Recruiters talked to one another all over the country. They just confused one another, and how do you interface with America when you have got, number one, the recruiter confused; and you are confusing educators and parents all over.

It has to be simple and understandable and across the board, yes, sir.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you for that.

Sergeant Taylor, I confused you in my earlier question, and I want to apologize. I was confusing in my head the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program with the educational assistance test program, and my question came out confusing, but the whole issue is somewhat confusing.

Of course, the VEAP program that is provided is pretty simple, and you explained it very well, for your service. The program that I was talking about with all the different varieties was picked up by Master Chief Adams when he talked about county lines and different jurisdictions who had the educational assistance test programs and all of the complications and confusing aspects of that, and so I want to apologize to you.

Let me just ask you all to be very brief at this point.

You have got five years. Looking out at those five years,

what kinds of things do you need in your tool chest to get

people to be excited about being a Marine?

*Gunnery Sergeant Taylor. Well, number one, sir, for whatever benefits that we have or whatever tool that Congress approves or gives to the Marine Corps or all four branches, the Marine Corps is going to make the mission with whatever we have to work with.

Number two, we need a GI Bill, sir. We need a simple, non-contributory participation education program.

I personally would like to see transferability because down the road I would like to transfer some of the benefits to my children.

We need a requirement for honorable service. When a young man does his time and does it honorably, then and only then he should rate the GL benefits, education benefits.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

Sergeant Eagle, could you respond to that question as well?

*Sergeant Eagle. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I feel that the Army definitely needs a permanent education program, along with bonuses.

I would like to comment on the education program GI

Bill. I was in the recruiting command when we used to have
the old GI Bill. In the month of December of 1976,
the recruiting station I will refer to as Brooklyn Center,
Minnesota wrote an average of about 15 contracts a month.

In the month of December they wrote 52 contracts to beat

the deadline of the GI Bill, and I think that is evidence enough to show that we do need something permanent.

Along with this, I think that the Army needs the kicker. The propensity to enlist into the military, the Air Force and the Navy are a little glamorized. People seem to think that in the Army you live in a tent and in a fox hole. So the kicker would give us the equal edge that we need, the competitive edge.

I feel as part of the tools the education program, training, short-term bonuses for highly skilled technicians, that is what I feel we need.

*Mr. Edgar. I had a fantasy about better tents and fiberglass fox holes as an image that you advertise. I appreciate your statement, and I think you have said it well

Master Sergeant Jacques.

*Master Sergeant Jacques. Yes, sir. In Southwestern
New York and Northwestern Pennsylvania where my recruiters
cover -- I cover two areas -- there are many schools that
are beginning to close, and I believe in the 1990s that we
are going to be looking probably at this point from one out
of every three individuals to look at the military. I
think we have to keep pay comparable with the civilian
sector. I think that is a big part.

The education, a lot of the civilian industries today pay the individuals to go to school and work for them. I

believe with the GI Bill with the transferability clauses, the \$300 for the initial enlistment, \$600 after a point there, I believe we will retain many people in the United States Air Force, as well as the rest of the services.

But I also believe that the American people in general are very patriotic. They want to serve, but they also want to get back something for doing their part for their country.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you very much.

Finally let's hear from the Coast Guard in terms of what tools you need in your tool chest.

*Master Chief Petty Officer Love. Mr. Chairman, again, because we need such a small number, I think that the pay equivalent to that in the civilian sector and with high unemployment, we will probably do all right in the next five years. I think that we all have reasons to hope that the economy will improve though. So if there would be an improvement in the economy, I think we would probably need some type of an education bill and have adequate pay, a bill that is relatively simple to understand, a bill that is funded outside of the service budget, and a bill that we could all explain relatively simply and easily to prospective recruits.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you very much for your statement.

All of you have been helpful, and we held this hearing this

morning to kind of reaffirm what was said a year ago, and while we do not have a lot more questions for all of you, you have in a sense reaffirmed the strong statements that were made a year ago about the need for GI educational benefits, the need for recruitment, and the need to fix the roof when it is sunny out and not when it is raining, and the fact that our economy may not stay in the shape it is in at this point, hopefully, and that you may find it difficult to meet your recruiting needs at some time in the future, and you may have the need for some additional help.

One of those additional pieces of the puzzle besides pay increases, which we have moved on in the last two years, is this educational component.

Thank you for your time today.

Our third panel includes Staff Sergeant Greenwell,

Master Chief Trentham, Master Sergeant DePersig, Master

Sergeant Kelley and Master Chief Petty Officer Bonnet.

Before you begin, my staff is briefing me and underscoring the fact that Master Sergeant Kelley was born in Darby, Pennsylvania. Is that correct?

*Master Sergeant Kelley. That is correct, sir.

*Mr. Edgar. Darby happens to be in my congressional district.

*Master Sergeant Kelley. I moved before I could vote.

*Mr. Edgar. I was born in Yeadon. I think you know

where that is.

*Master Sergeant Kelley. I have ridden by there many times.

*Mr. Edgar. That is right. Thank you for coming and thank you for your patience in sitting through this morning as we listened to the first two panels.

I am going to ask each of you to think about the questions that were asked. There are a number of different aspects of this whole question.

I note from your resumes and from the list of people we have represented on this panel that we have career counselors, we have people in charge of re-enlistment, we have career planning branch people, we have people who are advisors to persons thinking about leaving the service as well as people thinking about staying in the service.

The last group of gentlemen were focused primarily on the recruitment aspects, how do you recruit somebody to serve in your branches, and what we are hoping from this panel is for you to teach our subcommittee something about retention. What are the ingredients in retention? What does it take to retain somebody within the all volunteer military? Can education be an helpful tool to that retention? What kinds of problems do you have with H.R. 1400 or other educational bills? What kinds of positive aspects could they be to retaining people within the

service?

Also, what is the impact of the 1989 delimiting date pressure? While it would be nice to lift that deadline, there is some hesitancy and resistence on the part of the House and Senate in lifting that ten-year delimiting date, not because it would not be helpful, but because there is a whole lot of questions it raises in terms of lifting it for every, including all the Vietnam Era veterans who bumped up against the ten-year delimiting date and were unable to use their benefits.

so with that backdrop of questions, I would hope that each of you would give us your honest views and comments, and again, if we do not ask you a lot of penetrating questions, it is only because we are focusing in on the questions we think are important this morning, and this is the eighth in a series of hearings that we have had.

Let me ask Staff Sergeant Greenwell to begin and talk from the point of view of the Army, and then we will move to the others.

STATEMENT OF STAFF SERGEANT GERRY I. GREENWELL,
CAREER COUNSELOR, U. S. ARMY.

*Staff Sergeant Greenwell. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that we do need a new GI Bill to enhance retention especially with the two tiered system and also the transferability. I think these are the major points as

far as we in the re-enlistment business are concerned.

individual out of the service in order to use the benefits,

We have to have a GI Bill that does not force the

and I think the two tiered system is in the right direction.

I personally would like to see in-service personnel
be able to use their benefits while still in service, in
other words, collect the monthly allowance just as we do
when we get out of the service. I think this would influence
many people to stay in rather than get out of the Army and
the other services because they would not be losing anything
by getting out.

The Air Force General echoed this sentiment also, and he brought up the idea of people being able to collect the monthly benefit after 12 months of service, and I agree with that completely.

As far as why people re-enlist in the Army, through my experience it is a combination of pay and benefits, and also the spouse has a great deal to do with it. I do feel with the transferability clause that the spouse would play an important part because if the spouse and/or children felt that they could use the benefits, they would encourage the service member to re-enlist.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you for that helpful statement. I am going to come back to you on a couple of questions that your statement raises.

Master Chief William Trentham.

STATEMENT OF MASTER CHIEF WILLIAM J. TRENTHAM,
COMMAND CAREER COUNSELOR, U. S. NAVY.

*Master Chief Trenthan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity to come up here today, and I would also like to say that we in the fleet appreciate the generosity of Congress recently that brought our pay and benefits up to a level that was much more desirable.

with regards to the GI Bill, I have some personal priorities that I have developed, I guess, over the years. The first thing I would like to see happen is an elimination of the 1989 cutoff date. Perhaps some period after separation, five to eight years to take advantage of that, but eliminate the 1989 cutoff date. It is a very strong dissatisfier among the very people that I am trying to keep in the Navy.

I am supportive, very supportive, of House Bill 1400 with some minor exceptions, or maybe they are not so minor. The six-year feature is very unpalatable to me because we have an awful lot of people who we try to keep beyond six years, specifically the six-year obligor. We bring in about 12 or 14,000 people a year, and we try to keep as many of them as we can into the advanced electronics, nuclear power field.

If we give them maximum benefits at the precise point

where they have completed their obligation, I can see that they are liable to go out the door in even greater numbers.

*Mr. Edgar. Can't you use bonuses for that?

*Master Chief Trentham. Yes, sir.

*Mr. Edgar. Pay bonuses?

*Master Chief Trentham. Bonuses are a very good tool, but I would just like to see it moved up to, say, eight years, at least eight years just to remove that temptation, as it were, and give us a little bit more reason for keeping them.

These people are generally seeking education. They are very intelligent, highly trained, and they are interested in education.

I would also like to see any new GI Bill, such as
House Bill 1400, only apply to honorable service. It is
a major irritant to sailors to see somebody kicked out of
the Navy as unsuitable and receive some sort of GI Bill
educational benefits, and it is personally an irritant to
me.

I think that the retention increase that we have seen in the Navy is attributable, in large degree, to the increases in compensation, recent increases. I think also though that the effect of the economy has definitely been positive with regards to retention.

*Mr. Edgar. Let me ask you a question before we move

on. I am just speculating. Suppose we had a two tier system where we had \$300 for the first tier, \$600 for the second tier, and let the service determine when the second tier kicked in so that those services that felt six years was applicable could kick the second tier in, and those that felt they had to wait until eight years could kick it in.

*Master Chief Trentham. Well, I think that the Navy probably would definitely opt for the eight-year point.

However, I think it might also give us a slight disadvantage in recruiting.

*Mr. Edgar. Okay. I have got the message.

Let me move now to Master Sergeant DePersig, who is in charge of the Elisted Section at the Career Planning Branch of the U. S. Marine Corps.

STATEMENT OF MASTER SERGEANT MARCEL J. DePERSIG,

IN CHARGE OF THE ENLISTED SECTION, CAREER PLANNING

GRANCH, HEADQUARTERS, U. S. MARINE CORPS.

*Master Sergeant DePersig. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, we need the GI Bill, and only for one reason.

One, it is going to help the economy of this country because

I look at the GI Bill not as a cost, but as a benefit, a

benefit to, one, the service member, one, to the community,

also the different units of our education, your colleges.

Economically speaking, if we look at it today, we can see that a lot of institutions of higher learning are

shutting their doors, and that is because the people cannot afford to get into the institutions because of the cost of tuition, and also it would be due to the fact that a lot of the federal grants and everything else have been cut off.

By having a GI Bill and affording the service member the opportunity once he leaves the service to avail himself of this opportunity to go to college, one, he is going to be a benefactor to the community, increased tax dollars, skills. He can assist the community in many ways.

By having a GI Bill, either the one we presently have extended beyond 1989 or by having a new GI Bill for everybody equally can share in this GI Bill, just like the Master Chief said, with honorable service to utilize the in-service benefits while they are in the service.

One, myself, was afforded the opportunity to do this, and I am going to continue to do this until the day I leave the service.

Also, the transferability clause, I think that is a necessary feature of the bill that is needed. One, again, it all comes down to basic economics. The service member has received additional pay raises in the past two years, but with the economy the way it is and inflation, by the time he leaves the service and he wants to put his children through college, the man almost has to be a millionaire in

order to do it. So by having the transferability, he can use part of it for himself and part of it for his family, and I think, one, as a retention tool it would be a good selling point.

The VEAP program, what I am faced with as far as retention, we lose a lot of people out of the VEAP program for the simple reason that they just feel, you know, it is not, you know, economically sound for them. The amount of money that they put in there, they do not feel that they receive any benefit from it at all, and again it gets down to the basic bucks. It is not the cost of the education. The money that they put aside and what the Government is going to give them just will not pay for the education. So a lot of these people just opt to drop out of the system or out of the program.

One thing I think that the GI Bill should be equitable; it should be for everybody, both enlisted and officer. We should not define either one because just like on, you know, a Navy carrier or in a fox hole, an officer is going to be beside me.

*Mr. Edgar. Like a health care benefit is for everyone.

*Master Sergeant DePersig. That is right exactly. It

should be across the board.

But, again, you know, I cannot emphasize the honorable portion of it. A man must have faithfully served honorably

i

in order to, you know, avail himself of the opportunity.

*Mr. Edgar. The whole concept of honorable is included in H.R. 1400, and your point is well taken.

Any additional points?

*Master Sergeant DePersig. Yes, sir. One, I think
that it should be VA funded and administered because the
old GI Bill, that was all part of the Veterans' Administration,
one, because the majority of the people that would be
utilizing the GI Bill would be veterans.

*Mr. Edgar. We take the position that it should be both, that the first tier benefit is a basic VA traditional funded benefit similar to what you had in the GI Veterans' Bill and others, and that the second tier benefit, the kicker benefits, leave of absence benefits, those kind of things, really should be cared for as a retention feature paid for out of the Department of Transportation -- the Department of Defense. Excuse me. I am also on the Transportation Committee, and my mind went mush yesterday.

*Master Sergent DePersig. One thing, Mr. Chairman.

I know as far as the educational leave of absence in regards to the bill, I do not think we need that for the simple reason that most of the services -- and I can speak for the Marine Corps myself -- is we have our own in-service programs where individuals where individuals are for the opportunity to, one, get a college education while they are in the

service, and it is a pay-back. In other words, if they have to go to college for two years, then they have to agree to sign up for an additional years of service, and it has paid off well.

I mean our numbers are limited because of fiscal constraints and the number of seats available, but as far as tying this in with the GI Bill, I do not think -- I mean, just like General Bronars said, it would be disruptive.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

Master Sergeant Kelley.

STATEMENT OF MASTER SERGEANT JAY G. KELLEY, CANNON BASE CAREER ADVISOR, CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO, U. S. AIR FORCE.

*Master Sergeant Kelley. Mr. Chairman, first of all,
I would like to thank you for having us all here. This has
been a very valuable experience for all of us, I am sure.

I certainly echo most of the things that have been said here today, and basically I like the provisions of H.R. 1400.

Obviously the Air Force is doing pretty well right now with retention. The last two pay raises had a lot to do with that, but I think right now the major factor is the job market.

I have had many people sitting at my (esk that they make the decision right in front of me that the job market

is such on the outside that they are just afraid to take a chance. Also we have many people that get out and do take a chance and it does not work out, so they come back in under the delayed re-enlistment program. So we know that it is bad out there right now.

Retention will certainly be a big challenge when the economy improves, and with private industry we need the incentives to compete with private industry for the people that we have trained in the Air Force. It is a shame to lose these people, and we have many training dollars going down the drain.

One point I would like to make is I feel that we need a blanket GI Bill. There seems to be a perception out there that many of the benefits that have been traditional with the military are being eroded, and by a blanket GI Bill, I mean a simple one that pertains to everybody and not one that is selective as in the bonus system and some of the other programs that exist.

I think it is very important that they apply to everybody. This will help re-establish credibility. You may be surprised when you talk to some of the younger people and some of the older people also about the overall feeling that -- I would not say it is running rampant, but it is quite widespread -- about the eroding benefits.

We read articles in the newspaper, particularly the

•

Air Force Times and the other service papers, and I think all this discussion over the current GI Bill with very little action being taken is just another nail in the coffin, so to speak. It keeps this feeling building.

Just for your information, when I found out I was coming, I sort of ran frantically around and performed a grass roots survey. I talked to as many people as I could. I did not take any statistics. Obviously all the military people I talked to were in favor of some sort of a GI Bill, but I was very interested to find out the many civilians that I talked to that had actually no connection with the military. I even talked to some people in the planes as I came over here. All of them, with no exceptions, felt very strongly that we should have a GI Bill, and quite frankly, they were surprised that we did not have one. Not having any connection with the military, they were not aware that we do not have one right now.

I feel that it is incumbent upon all of the military services to provide some sort of a blanket GI Bill.

*Mr. Edgar. Sergeant Kelly, your last statement is really helpful. You know, I came to this a little bit open ended in terms of my opinion. The chairman had introduced H.R. 1400 before I became chairman of this subcommittee, and when we set out for our hearings last year, while I am a strong supporter of education generally, I figured that

we would have lots of opposition to reinstating the GI Bill simply because of the cost and those kinds of things, and I was really surprised that we could not find very many people, if any, who were opposed to a GI education bill.

There were some who would say, you know, "We want one, but we are not going to pay for it" or "we want one, but you know, let somebody else carry the cost of it." But when you talk to civilians, when you talk to enlisted personnel, when you talk to officers, when you go out in the field and talk to over 100 people and cannot find anybody that does not see the value in having an educational benefit, it gets quite startling.

That is why we were so startled at Dr. Korb's testimony and why we felt a little uneasy at the backing away of the Administration's strong position, as expressed by the President of the United States and as expressed by Secretary Weinberger, for the need, and I think we have demonstrated today -- in fact, this hearing today is probably stronger in its underlying statements than any of the other hearings we have had -- of the need for a GI Bill.

I really appreciate not only your statement, but your willingness to go out and ask civilians and others about it. There is a great deal of the populus who do not understand that it was terminated in December of 1976. Many people have not recognized the test programs that are out

there. Many people do not understand the VEAP or the ultra-VEAP program and who is able and who is unable to use the program.

I think you are echoing the statements of last year that it should be equitable, permanent, across the board and specific. That is why we shaped the direction of the bill, H.R. 1400, as we did.

Thank you for your statement.

*Master Sergeant Kelley. You are welcome, sir.

*Mr. Edgar. We now move to the Department of
Transportation. I guess they will have some responsibility
in funding a piece of this bill, and I was not too far off
in my slip of the tongue.

STATEMENT OF MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICER BONNET, REENLISTMENT COUNSELOR, U. S. COAST GUARD.

*Master Chief Petty Officer Bonnet. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for inviting me.

I am not sure it will even cover us, but I know they will not pay for these guys.

Thank you for inviting me here today. If you are looking for a supporter of H.R. 1400, I am one. We definitely need another initiative, such as H.R. 1400, to keep our people in the Coast Guard in the second and third areas or stages of their careers.

Right now there is an awful lot of indecision on most

of the people's part, particularly in the Coast Guard, regarding the delimiting factor of the old GI Bill in 1989, the fact that their benefit will terminate with that, and they feel that they have to leave the military before that time to take advantage of this benefit.

The other younger folks that are involved in the Veterans' Education Assistance Program, VEAP, are kind of up in the air. They are not sure which way that program is going to go. They know it was supposed to have been canceled recently. There has been an extension placed on that. They are just not sure which way to go.

H.R. 1400 appears to be the answer to both of those groups of people, with some minor changes. H.R. 1400, I do not think that there is a military person presently serving that would vote against it.

The discrimination against critical abilities and particular ratings and MOSs I think is a bad feature of the bill. I think bonuses can cover that.

The selective re-enlistment bonsues along with the other benefits of H.R. 1400 can take care of those critical folks. The more standard ratings, such as my own in the Coast Guard, that of personnelman or yeoman, the bill has everything that I am looking for, particularly with the transferability clause for my spouse or my dependents.

When this was first publicized last year, I got

numerous telephone calls from individuals to say, "If I can transfer this to my dependents, I'm re-enlisting tomorrow for six years." Unfortunately at that time the bill had not been approved, passed or anything else. So I see it as the way to go, particularly for the Coast Guard, and we are up against some other odds that the other services are not.

We need everything we can get.

*Mr. Edgar. Thank you.

Is anybody here opposed to transferability?
[No response.].

*Mr. Edgar. Is there anyone here who is opposed to the leave of absence provision?

*Staff Sergeant Greenwell. Would you explain that for me, Mr. Chairman?

*Mr. Edgar. Leave of absence provision in the bill provides that you can have up to a two-year leave of absence at the discretion of the Secretary of the service if you commit yourself to four years additional service within the military. It is an option at the discretion of the Secretary to use your education benefits either the first tier or the second tier, but still stay in the service.

*Staff Sergeant Greenwell. That would be similar to the old boot strap program?

*Mr. Edgar. Yes.