

update

MEMO

TO: Senator Cranston

FROM: Senator Tsongas

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

As you will remember, we have attempted 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 side of national service should be maintained as the central theme of the bill.

There are four specific provisions in 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 service to youth jobs and training programs and "assess the cost of alternative and existing programs." I have always felt that national service should not be a CETA-type program. In fact, 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 would be unwise to have any mention of the draft in this legislation.
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 places 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 too much emphasis on the military.

Basically, I am arguing that we should not change the focus of this Commission. If we do, the public, and especially young people, will perceive it as another military draft proposal. If this in fact does occur, I believe we will have a very difficult time gaining public acceptance and support for our proposal.