

MEMO

update

TO: Senator Cranston

FR: Senator Tsongas

RE: PROPOSED CHANGED IN TITLE II, S. 1843, PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON
NATIONAL SERVICE

As you know, we have tried to keep the focus of national service on the civilian aspects rather than the military. Congressmen Kramer and Panetta, I believe, have shifted this focus. I am sure you will agree that the civilian part of national service should be kept as the central theme.

There are four specific sections of the bill, as it is currently drafted, which I would like to see changed.

1. Section 3 (2) stipulates that the Commission should compare national national service to youth jobs and training programs and "assess the cost of alternative and existing programs." We have said all along that national service should not be a CETA-type program. This provision would require the Commission to evaluate the "cost effectiveness of CETA and Jobs Corps," which could require a full-year study of its own.
2. Section 3 (8) stipulates that the Commission should "examine the necessity of drafting individuals into any national service program." I think it is unwise to have any mention of drafting any individuals into national service.
3. Section 3 (10) stipulates that the Commission should examine how national service can "meet the manpower needs of the Armed Forces, the National Guard, and the Reserve components of the Armed Forces." This provision placed the emphasis on the military aspects of national service.
4. Section 4 (4), as it has been proposed, must include three individuals from the military establishment. Again, I believe this places the emphasis on the military. ~~n of the military issues.~~

Basically, I am arguing that we cannot change the focus of this Commission. If we do, the public, and especially young people, will perceive it as another military draft proposal and we will have tremendous difficulty gaining widespread public support.