

[H.A.S.C. No. 117-34

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY,  
NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

---

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

HEARING HELD  
MAY 19, 2021



---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

47-820

WASHINGTON : 2022

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

ADAM SMITH, Washington, *Chairman*

JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
RICK LARSEN, Washington	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
JIM COOPER, Tennessee	MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut	DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
JOHN GARAMENDI, California	ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia
JACKIE SPEIER, California	VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri
DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey	AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
RUBEN GALLEGO, Arizona	MO BROOKS, Alabama
SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts	SAM GRAVES, Missouri
SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California	ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York
ANTHONY G. BROWN, Maryland,	SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee
RO KHANNA, California	TRENT KELLY, Mississippi
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts	MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin
FILEMON VELA, Texas	MATT GAETZ, Florida
ANDY KIM, New Jersey	DON BACON, Nebraska
CHRISSEY HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania	JIM BANKS, Indiana
JASON CROW, Colorado	LIZ CHENEY, Wyoming
ELISSA SLOTKIN, Michigan	JACK BERGMAN, Michigan
MIKIE SHERRILL, New Jersey	MICHAEL WALTZ, Florida
VERONICA ESCOBAR, Texas	MIKE JOHNSON, Louisiana
JARED F. GOLDEN, Maine	MARK E. GREEN, Tennessee
ELAINE G. LURIA, Virginia, <i>Vice Chair</i>	STEPHANIE I. BICE, Oklahoma
JOSEPH D. MORELLE, New York	C. SCOTT FRANKLIN, Florida
SARA JACOBS, California	LISA C. McCLAIN, Michigan
KAIALI'I KAHELE, Hawaii	RONNY JACKSON, Texas
MARILYN STRICKLAND, Washington	JERRY L. CARL, Alabama
MARC A. VEASEY, Texas	BLAKE D. MOORE, Utah
JIMMY PANETTA, California	PAT FALLON, Texas
STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, Florida	
STEVEN HORSFORD, Nevada	

PAUL ARCANGELI, *Staff Director*  
DAVE GIACCHETTI, *Professional Staff Member*  
GLEN DIEHL, *Professional Staff Member*  
EMMA MORRISON, *Clerk*

# CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS	
Rogers, Hon. Mike, a Representative from Alabama, Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services .....	4
Smith, Hon. Adam, a Representative from Washington, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services .....	1
WITNESSES	
Heck, Hon. Dr. Joseph J., Chairman, National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service; Hon. Mark Gearan, Vice Chairman for National and Public Service, National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service; and Steve Barney, Commissioner, National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service .....	4
APPENDIX	
PREPARED STATEMENTS:	
Heck, Hon. Dr. Joseph J. ....	47
DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:	
Hon. Peter A. DeFazio Testimony and Congressional Record Excerpt .....	71
Ranking Member Rogers Statement Submitted by Mr. Gaetz .....	82
Service Year Alliance Statement for the Record .....	83
WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:	
[There were no Questions submitted during the hearing.]	
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:	
Mr. Khanna .....	95
Mr. Kim .....	100
Mr. Langevin .....	93



**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION  
ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, Wednesday, May 19, 2021.*

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 11:02 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Adam Smith (chairman of the committee) presiding.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ADAM SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM WASHINGTON, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. We will call the meeting to order.

It is a full committee hearing on “Recommendations of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service.”

We have three witnesses here. The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck, who is the chairman of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service. It is good to see you again. The Honorable Mark Gearan, who is vice chairman for the national and public service, National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service. And Mr. Steve Barney, who is commissioner on that same thing.

So we thank you all for being here. Again, we are at a virtual hearing, so I have to read the rules. Sorry, not a virtual hearing, a hybrid hearing. It is both virtual and real.

Members who are joining remotely must be visible on screen for the purposes of identity verification, establishing and maintaining a quorum, participating in the proceeding, and voting. Those members must continue to use the software platform’s video function while in attendance unless they experience connectivity issues or other technical problems that render them unable to participate on camera. If a member experiences technical difficulties, they should contact the committee staff for assistance.

Video of members’ participation will be broadcast in the room and via the television/internet feeds. Members participating remotely must seek recognition verbally, and they are asked to mute their microphones when they are not speaking. Members who are participating remotely are reminded to keep the software platform’s video function on the entire time they attend the proceeding.

Members may leave and rejoin the proceeding. If members depart for a short while, for reasons other than joining a different proceeding, they should leave the video function on. If members will be absent for a significant period or depart to join a different proceeding, they should exit the software platform entirely and then rejoin it if they return. Members may use the software plat-

form's chat feature to communicate with staff regarding technical or logistical support issues only.

And, finally, I have designated committee staff members to, if necessary, mute unrecognized members' microphones to cancel any inadvertent background noise that may disrupt the proceeding.

I want to, first of all, thank our witnesses and the commission. They were charged with, you know, examining the Selective Service program, and more broadly the question of public service. Appreciate that work. It is a subject that has long been discussed in America, pretty much ever since we got rid of the draft. And there are a lot of issues swirling around this. It may seem simple at first glance, but there are challenges.

Number one, since we are moving towards equality in military service between men and women in terms of their ability to serve—as we know, way back in the 1970s we created the Selective Service—it requires any man between the ages of 18 and 26 to register with the Selective Service. I gather the theory behind that being that, if we needed to have a draft, we would be able to find you and that was set up.

But it did not include women. Now that we have achieved equality, we want to make sure that if a draft happens, it has that same equality. Sorry. Now that we have worked towards equality—we would not want to say we have achieved it—we have to make sure that we include women, and that is sort of one set of issues.

You know, how do you do that? How do you reset the system, so that women now, presumably between the ages of 18 and 26, would also have to register?

I also want to put into the record a statement—sorry, I have got a lot of paper flying at me—here we go, from Congressman Peter DeFazio, who was apparently working in the Carter administration when this was put into place and has significant concerns with the entire Selective Service concept itself, regardless of whether or not you are—it is not about whether or not women should be included. It is that the system itself, as it was set up, Mr. DeFazio does not think should be law.

So I ask unanimous consent to include into the record all member statements and extraneous material. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix beginning on page 71.]

The CHAIRMAN. And I have spoken to Congressman DeFazio about this, and the gist of his point is, this is a very cumbersome, very difficult-to-implement system, and a lot of people are unaware of the fact that not only do you have to register for the Selective Service, but under the law you are required to basically let the government know where you are between the ages of 18 and 26, which I can assure you virtually nobody does.

Virtually nobody? Absolutely nobody might be a better way to put it. I moved quite a bit between the ages of 18 and 26, and I didn't have anybody working for me at the time, so I am absolutely certain that nobody told the government where I was living.

And so let's say that this system had to be implemented. How are we going to find people? Okay. What is the purpose of registering if you are not—alternatively, and this is an ironic fact that

I just learned yesterday about this, so if we were to include Selective Service in the defense bill this year for women, it would have a mandatory score. I am kind of going into the weeds a little bit here, but there is a reason for this. That mandatory score would actually save money.

Well, how could this possibly save money? Because there is also a whole set of laws that if you don't tell the government where you are between the ages of 18 and 26, there are a wide variety of Federal benefits that you are not supposed to qualify for as a result.

So, in our strive towards equality, we will go ahead and deny women those benefits, too, apparently between the ages of 18 and 26 if they have not followed the rules.

Now, off the top of my head, I have no idea if anybody has ever made an attempt to implement this, if, you know, some 23-year-old has applied for a grant or a loan to go to grad school, and they say, "Sorry, you didn't tell us when you moved apartments, so you don't get the money."

I don't know if that happens or not, but it is actually listed as a score. And if we were to get rid of the Selective Service entirely, it would score the other way because then you would have to give benefits to people who presumably you were going to go ahead and deny. Again, in the real world, I doubt much of that would play out.

But all of that points up Mr. DeFazio's central point that the Selective Service itself, regardless of whether or not it applies to men or women, is extraordinarily problematic if you peel back the layers at all and take a look at it. So I am very curious to hear your judgment about how we implement the system.

And I get the idea, and it makes sense. We don't want to have a draft, but we want to make sure if there is an emergency, we need to bring people into military service, we have a way to find them. Selective Service has some issues. I am curious what you have to say about that.

And then there is the broader issue that we have been working on for a long time, which is the notion of national public service. And there are a lot of people that think that the country would be better off if everybody had to serve in some capacity for at least a year, maybe two, between the ages of 18 and 26, not necessarily in the military, but if you wanted to volunteer for some sort of public service.

And there are a lot of other people who really don't like that idea. But it is something that has been debated for some time and there are, you know, both Republicans and Democrats who have advocated for it.

So that is kind of the three layers that I am interested in. We have got the basic equity issue. How do we make this equal in our effort to make sure that the military gives equal access to people regardless of—well, regardless of a whole lot of things?

You know, two, does the system itself even work for anybody, regardless of gender?

And then, three, how does it fit into a broader narrative about what we would like to put in place for public service?

So look forward to your testimony and the questions.

With that, I will turn it over to Mr. Rogers for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE ROGERS, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM ALABAMA, RANKING MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Joe, welcome back to the committee. I welcome you and your commissioners, and I appreciate the work you all have put into this report. I know you all have made some significant recommendations on how to improve public service.

Encouraging Americans, especially young Americans, to share their talents and improve their communities is incredibly important, and I appreciate your work on those issues.

As far as our discussion this morning, I am interested in your recommendations on how to improve military recruitment and retention. I have always been a big believer in an All-Volunteer Force. I think our military should be made up of men and women who want to be in the military, but we need to think of new ways to bring talented individuals into our armed services. In this age of rapid technological innovation, we need a professional core of service members with advanced skill sets. Building and retaining that core will enable us to stay ahead of our adversaries, especially China.

I know one of the commission's recommendations focuses on the need for competitive compensation for critical skills areas like cyber, IT [information technology], and mathematics. Another highlights the need for the military to provide additional support to students pursuing certain technical degrees and certificates. I look forward to hearing more about those specific recommendations.

Another important topic we charged the commission with was reviewing the Selective Service System. We haven't had to rely on the Selective Service for conscription since 1973. It hasn't undergone any significant review since 1980.

While some of the recommendations may be controversial, I appreciate the time the commission has spent looking at ways to modernize the system, and I look forward to our witnesses' testimony today.

With that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Dr. Heck.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DR. JOSEPH J. HECK, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE; HON. MARK GEARAN, VICE CHAIR FOR NATIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE; AND STEVE BARNEY, COMMISSIONER, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

Dr. HECK. Thank you, Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Rogers, members of the committee. On behalf of all of the commissioners, my colleagues and I thank you for the opportunity to discuss the findings and recommendations of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service.

Congress charged the commission to review the military Selective Service registration system and to identify ways to increase Americans' participation in military, national, and public service, in order to address the needs of the Nation.

Last March we submitted our report "Inspire to Serve" to Congress, the President, and the American people. At your desk you should have a copy of the full report, an executive summary, and a legislative annex. The report includes 164 discrete recommendations and reflects 2½ years of extensive research, public hearings, and conversations with Americans across the country.

The commission traveled the country to 22 States across all 9 census districts. We visited urban centers, suburban neighborhoods, and rural towns; spoke with elected leaders, nonprofit organizations, faith-based communities, military officers, and enlisted; middle school, high school, and college students; with those who serve and with those who don't.

We engaged with 530 organizations, held 11 public meetings and forums, analyzed thousands of public comments, leveraged multiple surveys, and convened 14 public hearings to discuss and analyze a wide variety of policy proposals.

As we begin to exit the current nationwide crisis, we bring a good-news story. America's extraordinary and longstanding spirit of service continues to shape the life of our Nation. We also bring an opportunity. In a country of 330 million people, only 11 percent of the adult population engages in sustained national service, leaving an extraordinary potential largely unpacked.

For the sake of time, I will focus on the recommendations within the committee's jurisdiction, but we are prepared to go into detail in the questions and answers on any of the recommendations.

As a nation, we must improve the readiness of the national mobilization system through whole-of-government leadership, regular exercises, and improved public awareness. One piece of this is the Selective Service System. The Nation must be prepared to address unforeseen existential threats.

After extensive research, deliberation, discussion with experts and the American public, the commission recommends that the United States maintains the Selective Service. It is a low-cost insurance policy to supplement military personnel requirements in the face of an existential national emergency.

However, the system does require modifications. Most significantly, in the event of a draft, the Nation must leverage the skills and talents of all Americans, regardless of gender. Including women in Selective Service registration is what the national security interests of the United States demand.

This decision ultimately comes down to two factors: standards and equity. At a time when nearly 70 percent of the 17- to 24-year-old population failed to meet initial military accession standards, we cannot afford to exclude half the population—the female half—from the potential pool of inductees.

If a draft is enacted, we should want to ensure that as many people of the highest quality can serve, those who are more likely to complete training successfully and be more proficient at their jobs. Additionally, the rights and freedoms that come with being an

American citizen are accompanied by responsibilities, including the defense of the Nation.

The disparate treatment of women in the context of the Selective Service System unacceptably bars women from sharing in this fundamental civic obligation. Hence, requiring women to register, and perhaps be drafted, affirms registration as a common civic duty. America is simply stronger when we all engage in the obligations of citizenship.

We also recommend measures to enhance the tradition of voluntary military service by creating a continuum between the routine recruiting mechanisms of the U.S. military and a dire situation that may require activation of the draft. For example, creating a critical skills individual ready reserve of Americans without prior military experience who would immediately join if their skill sets are needed; creating a national roster of individuals ready to volunteer in a national, State, or local emergency; and a formal Presidential call for volunteers to join the military prior to initiating a draft.

We also identified critical trends that indicate a deepening of the civil-military divide and raise questions about the long-term viability of the All-Volunteer Force. First, gaps in understanding and interaction between civilian and military communities have grown as a smaller percentage of Americans participate in military service.

Second, enlisted recruiting remains uneven across the United States with certain geographic regions furnishing a disproportionate share of recruits.

Third, less than 30 percent of American youth are eligible to join the military without a waiver, and even fewer are interested. Among our recommendations are for the Department of Defense to increase investment of recruiting resources in underrepresented markets and hometown recruiting programs; expand youth citizenship programs, such as JROTC [Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps]; and encourage broader use of tools such as the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Career Exploration Program.

These and other recommendations would increase awareness of the realities of military life and engagement between the military and the broader American public, enhancing the military's ability to attract and retain qualified personnel. Our recommendations also provide a blueprint to grow national service, promoting awareness and linking recruiting efforts between military and national service, such that aspiring individuals who are ineligible to serve in one program can learn about opportunities in another.

Our report recognizes that public servants are vital to the security and well-being of the Nation and offers a roadmap to attract the next generation to public service, proposing ways to transform recruiting, improve internships, attract and retain critical talent, modernize benefits, and create new pipelines to public service.

When we began this journey, we did not expect to hear passionate calls from Americans across the country to improve civic education, but we did and loudly. And we also learned about the dire condition of civic education in America and the promise of integrating service learning methods into teaching.

To that end, the commission recommends that Congress make a significant financial commitment to jumpstart a nationwide revital-

ization of civic education and service learning to ensure young people are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to actively participate in civic life and understand the importance of serving one's nation and community.

In closing, on behalf of this commission, we call on the Congress and the President to invest in the American people and the security of the Nation by taking action—bold action—to ensure every American has a clear and supported path to service. We believe that now is the time to build a new culture of service and strengthen our republic, one in which every American is inspired and eager to serve.

Thank you, and we look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Heck can be found in the Appendix on page 47.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. And, again, I appreciate your service on this issue. It is a complicated issue with a lot of different layers. And as you alluded to, Dr. Heck, very strong opinions from a lot of different people who we need to hear from.

On the Selective Service point, Congressman DeFazio's basic point is we should do away with Selective Service because it doesn't work. It doesn't add that much. As I said, it has got penalties in it that few people are aware of. It certainly could be unfairly implemented if people chose to do so. And does it really help us? Does it help us be ready to, you know, draft people if necessary?

Could you, or any of the other commissioners, walk us through why you think Selective Service, despite all of that, should be maintained?

Dr. HECK. Yes. Thank you for the question. So in discussions with the Department of Defense, as well as other experts on the issue, including Bernie Rostker, who helped reimplement the Selective Service registration under the Carter administration when President Carter reimplemented registration, we came down with the fact that the Selective Service System registration model serves multiple purposes, not just the ability to have a ready pool of potential inductees.

One, it sends a message of resolve to our adversaries that the Nation as a whole is ready to respond to any crisis. It also provides recruiting leads to our military services. So when the individual at the age of 17 or 18 registers for the first time, that information is then provided to the military services.

So it is not by chance that somebody at their 17th or 18th birthday gets that postcard that says, "Have you ever thought about joining the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, or now Space Corps?" So it provides generating leads for potential recruits.

But certainly most importantly it provides for that low-cost insurance policy at a cost of \$26 million a year, which was the fiscal year 2021 budget. The Selective Service registration system allows for us to be able to respond to an existential threat that far exceeds available military manpower, which right now stands at about 2.1 million individuals in uniform, if you include all Active forces, Standby Reserve, and Ready Reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how it is enforced if people don't comply either with the initial registration or with the follow-up requirements?

Dr. HECK. So previously the two major penalties were the inability to obtain employment within the Federal Government or to qualify for Federal financial aid. So, for instance, when you were filling out your FAFSA [Free Application for Federal Student Aid], and you were doing it online, if you checked the block that you were male, ultimately there would be a question that asked whether or not you were registered with the Selective Service.

If you checked no, you would be directed to the Selective Service registration site to register. If you failed to register, then you would not qualify for Federal financial aid. Likewise, later on, if you were to apply for Federal Government employment, you would be asked whether or not you were registered with the Selective Service, and if you answered no, you would not be eligible for employment.

The CHAIRMAN. But on the issue of people moving, and not being able to be found, I mean, that is the whole point is to know where people are, not just that they register. How does that work in practice?

Dr. HECK. Yeah. That is a great question, Congressman Smith. And, in fact, you are correct. While there is a requirement to notify the system of changes of address, there really is at this time no enforcement mechanism.

And we believe that part of that is due to the fact that very few males know that they have even registered with the Selective Service System, because it has become a passive process, which is why one of our recommendations goes to reinvigorating the process by which one would register, so that you truly understand the solemn obligation that you are making to respond to the defense of this Nation in times of crisis.

Right now, most States will automatically register you with the Selective Service when you apply for a driver's license. And so because people don't know they have registered, they don't know that they need to update the system when they move.

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah. Final question is on the All-Volunteer Force. A lot of headlines have been made about how many, you know, people of eligible ages are not medically qualified.

Now, and I didn't know this for a long time, but there are a lot of things that presumptively, you know, take you out of the military. If you have had any kind of surgery, as I understand it, you know, if you got a nose job when you were 16 for one reason or another you are presumptively disqualified. Now there are waivers, and a lot of times these waivers are given. A laundry list of things.

So when we hear that scary 70 percent figure, you know, most people envision that, you know, everyone is out of shape. But what is sort of the real figure in terms of, you know, what—how to ask this question. A lot of people get waivers, okay? Is there any way to calculate, okay, it is 70 percent, but of that 70 percent half of them would routinely receive a waiver.

Dr. HECK. Right. Another great question. So let me put it in roughly absolute numbers, because these numbers do not include those who get the waiver. It includes those that, you know, that are not eligible for waiver. So if you think about it, in any given

year, there is about 32 million individuals in the 17- to 24-year-old age group, which is the prime recruiting category.

If you look at those that are no longer eligible, not just because of medical but because of fitness, because of behavioral health, because of prior law enforcement issues, because of psychological problems, because of drug addiction, we are down to a pool of 9 million, right?

Of that 9 million, if you look at those that are considered highly academically qualified—that is, roughly an A/B student in high school or a score greater than 50 on the Armed Forces Qualification Test—

The CHAIRMAN. Forgive me. So not me, but—

Dr. HECK. You are now down to 4.5 million out of that pool of 32 million. And then, if you look, of that pool of 4.5 million, how many of them that are now eligible, highly academically qualified, are propensity or have thought about joining the military, you are down to 450,000.

The CHAIRMAN. But just to be clear, the 70 percent figure you are saying is 70 percent of the people who wouldn't even qualify for a waiver.

Dr. HECK. Correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. So it is actually as bad as it appeared.

Dr. HECK. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In my opening statement, you heard me talk about the threats that we have in new warfighting domains that we have to be conscious of. We just created a brand-new military service to try and meet the challenges in one of those domains, and it is a very technical skill-reliant service.

The same thing is true of cyber. This committee is looking at the possibility of standing up a digital service academy to help train our civilian and military personnel in the skill sets necessary to compete in the cyber domain.

I am really interested in what your thoughts are about how the military can better recruit the highly technical skill sets that we need to fight in these warfighting domains. What do we have to do to compete with those people? Anybody.

Dr. HECK. So thank you for the question, Congressman Rogers. One of our recommendations actually goes directly to this issue on cybersecurity by the creation of a cybersecurity reserve force that would be made up of individuals who could serve as a surge capacity, not just for the military but also other Federal Government agencies like DHS [U.S. Department of Homeland Security] and NSA [National Security Agency] who may require additional assets during times of crisis.

The biggest issue—one of the biggest issues that we face is the military manpower caps, right? So it is not necessarily about how do you recruit these folks in. It is about the caps on manpower, you know, the 480,000 total cap on, let's say, Army manpower.

But in order to get these individuals in, especially in the cyber domain, the Department of Defense needs to look at tailored accession criteria, right? Does the cyber warrior necessarily have to pass

the Army Combat Fitness Test? Do they necessarily need to meet the specific grooming standards or height/weight standards, if they are never going to be in a forward operating environment?

And when you look at what precludes many of the individuals with expertise in these areas, it is the accession criteria and the criteria that they need to maintain and keep in order to be a uniform member of the service.

Mr. ROGERS. Yeah. And, fortunately, we are seeing some creative ideas in this new service that we have created about how to deal with that, to let some folks come in, knowing they are never going to be toting a gun out on the ground. They are trying to control the satellite.

So I am really interested in us doing some creative things when it comes to recruitment and retention, you know, letting people maybe get to an O-6 position and want to go private for a few years, make some money, but be able to come back in periodically and bring their skill sets to us.

I am curious to know, what is the biggest lesson you have learned when it comes to attracting people to the military? What we are doing successfully and what we are not.

Dr. HECK. I believe from our travels around the Nation and talking with people from, again, all walks of life, one of the issues tends to be the growing civil-military divide and the lack of true awareness of opportunities within the military, right?

It is just recently that military advertising has changed its tack. Where previously most of the advertising was directed at combat arms—you were jumping out of airplanes, driving a tank—very rarely did you see somebody sitting at a computer screen or providing medical care.

So in order for people to want to be able to join the military and pursue non-combat roles, they need to know that those opportunities are available, right? Any job that exists in the private sector is available in uniform, and we need to do a better job at making that known to the American public.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Langevin.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank our witnesses for being here, particularly Dr. Heck. Nice to see you back before the committee.

So I want to thank you all for your extraordinary work. I look forward to reading the report.

The commission recommends expanding national service opportunities for individuals with diverse ability, so that they may participate in and benefit from national service.

Mr. Gearan, what national service opportunities are currently open to Americans with disabilities? And do you have recommendations where to expand these opportunities?

Mr. GEARAN. Thank you, Congressman. One of the things I think—a major takeaway that we had from our time traveling, as Dr. Heck said, is the tremendous wellspring of interest in service, but the confounding and disappointing thing is the barriers that exist.

Sometimes those are financial barriers, there are access barriers to service, and so one of our—part of our recommendations is a whole stream of pilot programs to allow the Corporation for National and Community Service to explore other ways and streams of service that could be a part of it, certainly.

And while there are some examples, there is no question that the opportunities that are before Americans do not match the interests of particularly young Americans in service.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Thank you very much. You know, I think what we are going through with the pandemic and the shift to remote teleworking, and then also our needs in the area of cybersecurity, and certainly how people with disabilities could have plenty of opportunity to contribute talents there—

Mr. GEARAN. No question.

Mr. LANGEVIN [continuing]. As well. So, in another area, it seems like civics education is being, unfortunately, these days politicized. And, as a result, we end up stalling on civics initiatives. I am sure you experienced this when coming up with the civics-related recommendations.

Dr. Heck, if I could just ask you, how can we reframe civics education to make it clear that it is pro-democracy, not pro-political party, and ensure people know the roles of local and Federal governments?

Dr. HECK. Thank you for that question, Congressman. Certainly, what is the bipartisan, bicameral Civics Secures Democracy Act of 2021 is a good start. You know, we certainly found as we traveled the Nation—and the data clearly show—you know, 22 percent of American adults cannot name any of the three branches of government; 37 percent can't name or don't know any of the rights guaranteed by the First Amendment. Less than 25 percent of eighth graders were deemed proficient on the latest National Academy of Academic Civics Assessment.

And part of the issue: annual Federal funding for civic education declined from \$150 million in 2010 to \$5 million today. The Federal Government spends \$54 per student for STEM [science, technology, engineering, and mathematics] compared to 5 cents per student for civics. And so there needs to be a reinvigoration from the top.

And as we heard as we traveled around and talked to folks, especially communities of color and at-risk neighborhoods, and tried to convince them of the need to provide national service, the answer was, "Well, why would I want to serve a nation that I don't believe is serving me?"

Part of that is because of a lack of civics education and understanding the obligations, the rights and responsibilities that come with citizenship.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Very good. Thank you. Well said. So we have part of the population with critical skills and experience who have the urge to serve later in life. Military services have hiring authorities to directly commission these individuals. However, they are rarely used.

Dr. Heck, do you believe that that is because the military isn't attracting enough candidates, that there is an issue with direct commission process, or is there a different reason?

Dr. HECK. I believe there are multiple reasons. One is that, yes, there are many individuals that are mid-career in technical and critical skills that would like to provide service, but they still don't want to undertake the obligations that come with putting on a uniform. And so that is why one of our recommendations is this critical skills individual ready reserve. That would allow civilians to come in and be utilized in a civilian capacity in times of need.

I think another one of the issues which we discuss more in our public services sector is the multitude of different hiring authorities that lead to confusion not just for the applicants but also those that are trying to do the hiring and being able to get people on in a timely manner in a position for which they are qualified.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Very good. I thank you all for your service, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Wittman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WITTMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank our commissioners today. Thanks so much for what you have done on the commission. It is really insightful to understand some of the things that we need to be addressing.

Dr. Heck, I want to go to you and start with groups like the Civil Air Patrol, the Young Marines. They do some truly impressive things. These are young folks that are instilled with the idea that they can do something that matters. They can have an impact, which is really something I think is incredibly important today, because our younger generation looks to opportunities to have an impact, where they can see the impact, where they can understand the impact.

If you look at what Civil Air Patrol did during COVID-19, the things that they did, they assisted in over 41 States in helping to address the pandemic, to help do logistics in ways that really assisted efforts by the States. I think those things are something that we should be able to build upon.

So I wanted to ask you, how can our military engage these organizations further? What can they do to really make a greater association with what these organizations do? And how do they take the feeling that youth receive from being part of these organizations and doing these things, how can they take that to expand what others understand military service being all about?

Dr. HECK. So several recommendations that we have in our report. One is growing the hometown recruiting program, right where individuals actually return to their own high school, right, to talk to folks from their own community about their service. Right now that is done in a permissive TDY [temporary duty] status, and so it is rarely utilized.

We make a recommendation that it should be a funded status, so that more individuals will participate in hometown recruiting.

The other is actual growth in some of the programs like Junior ROTC. Right now, only roughly 3,000 programs across the country; we call for an expansion to 6,000. Even if it is a citizenship program, not a military recruiting tool, it does instill in those participants a greater sense of civic obligation, which may then lead to them considering and being more propensed to serve in the military.

Another area is an increased public awareness of opportunities. And, unfortunately, what happened in our post-9/11 world is military bases became much more closed due to security reasons, right? So you don't see as many field trips from the local school out to the military base to talk to individuals, to see what is going on on that camp, post, or station.

We need to look at a way, while maintaining security, to increase the aperture, right? When you look at roughly 70 percent of new accessions coming from a certain swath of the United States, primarily the southeast and the west, there are large portions of the United States where individuals just don't have the exposure.

One last one is the expansion of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Career Exploration Program. Only about 15 percent of high school students take the ASVAB because many think that it is an automatic tool by which they are going to potentially be recruited. That is not true, especially the career exploration piece, which allows them to explore their interests and skill sets across a variety of potential careers and professions not necessarily tied to the military.

And, lastly, we have to be able to increase access into schools and recruiters. In certain areas, that is still an obstacle that is being fought.

Mr. WITTMAN. Yeah. Dr. Heck, let me ask you this, too. I am going to address the elephant in the room, and that is for the Department of Defense recruiting folks in the cyber realm, we know where the private industry is going as far as salaries. We see DOD [U.S. Department of Defense] has been able now to compete salary-wise. But there is still a gap in us being able to recruit.

And the question then becomes, you know, what are the elements of public service in attracting folks to work in that cyber realm, to get the best and brightest to say, "Yes, I want to do things that affect, you know, a larger realm than just the company that I might be working for in the tech realm."

Give me your perspective on what we can do to really address recruiting those individuals, aside from salary. I think we can match that, but there are other aspects that need to be addressed.

Dr. HECK. There are. One is appealing to the sense of service to the Nation, especially for those that are mid-career, which is really the sweet spot, right? Just coming out of college, you have got to pay off your student loans, odds are you are going to take that high-paying job.

But once somebody is established, they have got a skill set and they are mid-career and a little bit better situated, they are more prone to want to participate in these types of programs.

The other piece, as was alluded to by Congressman Rogers, is the flexibility to come in and out of government service. When you talk to millennials and Gen Zers, they are not looking for a long-term career as you would expect most people going into the military wanting to do their 20 [years].

They want the flexibility to come in and do one thing and then be able to move on and do something else and then maybe come on back. We are very reluctant within the Department of Defense to provide that type of flexibility.

Mr. WITTMAN. Very good.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Garamendi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the entire commission, and particularly for the three of you, thank you very much for your service, not only on this commission but in many, many other roles.

It would be normal and natural that we would be focusing on the Selective Service and the service in the military, but I want to take this in a slightly different way. First of all, your comments with regard to civic education are absolutely correct.

I was looking at this map in your report, and I am unhappy to see that California doesn't bother with civic education. We have education in virtually everything else, but we missed that one and that is a mistake.

My question really goes to other service beyond the military, as important as it is, and my question really goes to Mr. Gearan. You and my wife worked together in the Peace Corps some years back. Could you describe to us the role—international role of service of many kinds, the Peace Corps being but one, and the way that interacts with the military on the soft power side?

Mr. GEARAN. Thank you, Congressman, and thank you for your Peace Corps service, most importantly. It was an enormous privilege to serve as director of the Peace Corps, because I was able to see the extraordinary Americans who volunteered in that way and the difference they made bringing their skills and peace and friendship to countries that need and want our help.

If I may, what was a particularly frustrating dimension of it is that we had, during my time as director, 10,000 applications to serve as Peace Corps volunteers, and we accepted 3,500 due to budget limitations. So we had to get our head around the fact that we are saying no to 6,500 Americans who have raised their hands in this way.

And what we found over the course, as Dr. Heck said, of our commission is like de Tocqueville traveling the country. The great news is Americans want to serve. There is a predisposition, as de Tocqueville said 200 years ago, for service. I saw that with the Peace Corps. I saw it on the corporation board. But we are not honoring that with the opportunities.

So what we have called upon here is a really bold, integrative plan to increase it to 1 million positions of national service opportunities full-time for young people. Now there would be 80,000 when you combine AmeriCorps and Peace Corps today.

This is significant. Over the next arc of 10 years, so on the 70th anniversary of President Kennedy's important call to action in his speech, we would have that kind of bold vision. I think what that would mean is the experience of Peace Corps volunteers, like yourself and your wife and others, would come back to the United States in many ways for all of the good work that Peace Corps volunteers do in the developing world.

In many ways, the domestic dividend to our own country is every bit as great. In public service that is recognized, in education and medicine, across careers, family life, and community building. So there is a whole thread of service. The Peace Corps is part of it.

In the past 25 years, sort of AmeriCorps has led this way domestically.

But it integrates very much, and that was the wisdom of this commission for the first time ever to integrate military, national, and public service. There has never been this holistic charge by the committee and by the Senate. And I would offer the kind of recommendations that are before you, to integrate all of these streams of service, in a very big way responding to needs and integrating service both domestic and foreign.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you for that. In a hearing, actually a meeting, with the former commander of the Pacific—Indo-Pacific region, he said that we should send out to the Pacific Islands—re-send Peace Corps volunteers as diplomats to establish the presence of America on those islands, Palau, New Guinea, et cetera, because the military couldn't do it as well as volunteers, and Peace Corps being but one that could serve that purpose.

Finally, Mr. Heck, or Dr. Heck, you said about service, not wanting to serve. And this goes back to Mr. Gearan's work. Ask not what your country can do for you but, rather, what you can do for your country. JFK [President John F. Kennedy].

Thank you very much. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gallagher is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to pull the string on the civics education recommendations. First of all, thank you for your work. I co-chaired a cyber commission for the last 2 years, and so I understand what a difficult undertaking it can be and really look forward to digging into the report more and grappling with the recommendations.

I would be curious—and I consider myself a supporter of civics education—I think the problem you lay out is a really stark one nationally. But I would be curious, in your analysis, because I believe the recommendation is ultimately to increase the amount of money, to the tune of \$200 million a year that the Federal Government provides to State and local educational authorities, I guess two questions.

What in your analysis led you to believe that this is primarily a problem of insufficient resources? And then the second one is, would it be fair—second related for us to—now that we have just had a massive infusion of Federal resources to State and local educational authorities, would it be fair for us to sort of think about how those resources might be leveraged for civics education? If either of those makes sense.

Dr. Heck.

Dr. HECK. Thank you for the question. So the issue regarding resources, if you look historically, as Federal funding for civic education was decreased, so was the amount of education that was taking place. As we shifted more focus to the STEM fields, there is only so many hours in an academic day, and that is why you see other things like physical education and shop class falling by the wayside, because the money was coming for STEM education; therefore, school districts were going after STEM education to get the money.

So there is a question about resources, and that is why we proposed the \$200 million civic education fund to provide grants to

school districts, local education authorities, higher education, to reinvigorate civic education.

Now, we don't delve into dictating curricula. Obviously, that is the domain of the States, but there are certainly many models out there that have been successful. The Sandra Day O'Connor Act in the State of Florida is but one.

And so that is the issue regarding the lack of resources. When you have a lack of resources, there is a lack of attention paid.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yeah. I think we confront this dilemma. And, admittedly, this is probably outside the jurisdiction of HASC [House Armed Services Committee] and more for the education committee. But, you know, at least measured against our international competitors, by the PISA [Program for International Student Assessment] score and some other international scores, we have gone down and down and down. We are mediocre in math and in reading right now, but we still crush the competition when it comes to spending per pupil.

So I have a bit of skepticism that it is a function of money, but, again, I will look forward to looking into your recommendations.

And does the legislative annex contain an assessment of how much these recommendations would cost as well, or is there an overall assessment of what—if we took everything, what the cost might be?

Dr. HECK. For the entire report from—

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yeah.

Dr. HECK [continuing]. All the recommendations?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yeah. You are batting, you know, perfect.

Dr. HECK. No. So we did not have the expertise recommended to do that. Now we did certain cost analyses for certain recommendations. Many of the recommendations were cost neutral as they are policy issues. But for those that do come with a potential price tag, we did some analysis, and I can address those on specific recommendations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. And then finally in the—what remains of my time, I think the problem of physical fitness is a very important one. We have an obesity epidemic in this country. And as I think you laid out, Dr. Heck, at the start we have, you know, a sizeable portion of the young population which is just ineligible for service due to mental and physical health problems.

And I think notwithstanding any advance in technology, you know, in my experience, you know, physical fitness is the foundation of individual and unit readiness in the military.

So I would be curious, particularly in your report you recommend expanding JROTC programs. Is there an opportunity to maybe standardize a PT [physical training] regimen into JROTC, much like we do with ROTC cadets? Or how could we start to get at that fitness issue that we have?

Dr. HECK. Well, certainly, that is within the purview of the enabling legislation for JROTC, right? Just for instance, in the fiscal year 2021 NDAA [National Defense Authorization Act], there was a provision that required JROTC programs to provide an introduction to military national public service opportunities as part of the curricula.

So Congress could mandate the creation of a physical fitness curriculum to be included within JROTC programs to be eligible for funding.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yeah. I think the challenge we will confront is that the variables driving obesity and the lack of physical fitness are—they are multiple and they are just—they are very hard to tackle. And it is not as if we are going to convince Americans all to start, you know, eating a paleo diet and, you know, lifting weights, though we might consider that.

So thank you for your work, and look forward to taking in and engaging with you further.

I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Actually, Mr. Gallagher, we were thinking of putting that in the bill this year, just as a simple straightforward requirement. So we will work on that. [Laughter.]

Ms. Speier is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Thank you, Dr. Heck, and to all of you who have participated on this commission. I wholeheartedly endorse the commission's recommendations. I actually was very supportive of an amendment that was put into the NDAA to require that women register for Selective Service. It was taken out at some point during the process.

But I am curious, if you don't now sign up as you are supposed to, as a male, how many are—outside of losing benefits, has there ever been any kind of actions taken against those individuals who do not?

Dr. HECK. So thank you for the question, Congresswoman. So the Selective Service System claims that they have a 92 percent compliance rate with registration, again primarily because most of the registration is done passively, usually when somebody goes to get a driver's license or goes to complete their FAFSA form for Federal financial aid and doesn't check the box that they are registered.

So there would be roughly 8 percent of the population that is not—of the male population in that age group that is not compliant. We do not—the Selective Service System, right, does not know who has not registered until they try to apply for a benefit for which non-registration has a penalty. So it would be either applying for a government job or applying for Federal financial aid.

Ms. SPEIER. So there is no kind of action taken against them. They just lose the benefit; is that correct?

Dr. HECK. Correct.

Ms. SPEIER. Okay. As you engage with opponents of maintaining Selective Service around the country, what did you hear? What was the opposition to uniform Selective Service registration?

Dr. HECK. So the opposition fell primarily into two primary categories. One are the war resister community, which they are against war; therefore, they don't want a Selective Service System, because we should never go to war and should never have a Selective Service System.

The other was the conscientious objector community who, through deeply held religious convictions and moral convictions, feel that registering with the Selective Service program actually violates their moral beliefs.

So those were the two groups primarily that had opposition to Selective Service and certainly to Selective Service registration expansion.

Ms. SPEIER. But in terms of national service, did you get push-back from those same groups about a requirement that everyone participate in a national service program for a year?

Dr. HECK. Not from those two groups because, I mean, there was opposition to making national service mandatory in general, right? Not from any one segment of the population more than another.

Many who are against the concept of mandatory national service believe it is because service should be voluntary, that there is an intangible benefit that comes from voluntary service, and that if you make it mandatory, is that person gaining that same benefit and are they similar to conscripted military service? Are they putting into it their all because they are being mandated to do it?

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Barney, military service has become a family business for all intents and purposes. Everywhere I go, when I visit bases, it is typically a family member has served before. How do we somehow enlarge that universe, make it attractive for families that have not had a member be part of the military?

Mr. BARNEY. Well, thank you for that question, Congresswoman. The main thrust of our commission's report is to elevate all forms of service, both the military service that we recognize and is so solid within the jurisdiction here of this committee, as well as the national service as evidenced by Peace Corps and AmeriCorps, and then public service, the public servants at Federal, State, local, tribal level.

Our approach is to construct an expectation so that people would understand that at some point in their life they will be provided the opportunity to serve, to serve their community in a way that would be meaningful to them. By building on that spirit of an expectation of service, we believe that we will elevate all forms of service and it will expose individuals who might not have a family member who have served in our Nation's Armed Forces to that service opportunity to explore and to see what kind of a role they might play.

Ms. SPEIER. You know, the Superintendent at West Point has gone around the country and the numbers at West Point now for African Americans as cadets has jumped to 18 percent, far in excess of the African-American population in the country.

So I do think as we move out, we need to find ways to connect young people with those who serve and help them recognize the opportunities that they can avail themselves of.

My time has expired. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Gaetz.

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Barney, let me follow up on what Ms. Speier was asking about. This multigenerational service seems to be rooted to some degree in the values that are observed and appreciated for military members.

And I note in the letter from commissioners you guys take on challenging issues, and you wrote, "We heard from passionate advocates on both sides of complex and controversial topics, such as

expanding registration for the Selective Service to all Americans, and deliberated those matters with civility and respect.”

How should we think about the importance of civility and respect as ways to recruit people into a wonderful, value-based system like the United States military?

Mr. BARNEY. Well, Congressman, one of the things that we heard when we met with people who had served—had served in our Armed Forces, including those folks who came from a generation where the draft was in effect, and many people who did not want to serve had their first opportunity to serve alongside people who were different from them, from different parts of the Nation, and to do something together in a way that was totally outside their experience.

The experience of service does that, sir. And we believe that by providing more opportunities for people to learn about service we can open up opportunities for all Americans. One thing I might say is that when we talked to family members of young people who are planning their future, and we talk about things like military service, we sometimes heard, “Well, I really don’t see my son or daughter being a trigger puller in the military.”

We need to do a better job as a nation in informing people of the broad opportunities that exist within our country to serve—

Mr. GAETZ. Well, let me—

Mr. BARNEY [continuing]. And that every—I am sorry. Every population or every occupation in our Nation is represented in some way in our military services.

Mr. GAETZ. I don’t want to be disrespectful by cutting you off on a question about civility and respect.

Mr. BARNEY. I apologize.

Mr. GAETZ. We are limited in time, though. But I totally agree with that statement. I think that it embodies what inspires so many people to service, and it is why I am so deeply troubled at what I am currently seeing from the Biden administration and the Pentagon.

Bishop Garrison is currently a senior advisor to the Secretary of Defense, and he tweeted, “Calls for civility rather than shouting down falsehoods and misinformation shall be the death of this Nation. #impeachment trial.”

And then I think to myself, well, gosh, I hope nobody is taking the advice of this senior advisor because we should be embracing civility, not saying that it could be the death of the Nation.

And then I see what is happening to people who serve, particularly Lieutenant Colonel Matthew Lohmeier, who was relieved of his squadron command because he presented scholarship on Marxism and critique of critical race theory, which is an ideology that trains our service members to hate one another based on identity.

And then I think to myself, well, you know, maybe it is just that Lieutenant Colonel Lohmeier was relieved of his command because he was being overly political, using the military to make a political point. And, gosh, then I thought about the last lieutenant colonel that we seem to give a lot of attention to here, and there is Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, who precisely used his role in the military to be able to advance a political impeachment.

So I think that in my discussions with commanding officers in my State, in my community, there is a real problem with the morale of a lot of our service members who believe that now, under this like Bishop Garrison world where there is no nuance to perceive Trump supporters as anything but a threat to national security, and civility has to be rejected, that that really does impact how these people view their service.

And if they feel targeted, if they feel like, you know, they forwarded the wrong joke, liked the wrong meme, sent the wrong tweet, that somehow their career will be over, that is going to impact our recruiting as much as any of the issues that we are discussing today.

And maybe we wouldn't be in a position, you know, missing our recruiting requirements, having to even talk about forcing women in a compulsory way to register for the Selective Service, if we were treating the men and women who volunteer for military service a little bit better than we are now.

And I am grateful that the chairman has held discussions about the extent to which these new paradigms and ideologies are impacting our service members, but we cannot possibly have a discussion about recruiting and the values of the military while people who feel like they might have a conservative perspective or a pro-Trump perspective are in fact targeted by military leaders who are rejecting the civility that you expressly call for in your letter.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Carbajal. Sorry. Mr. Moulton is recognized for 5 minutes. I apologize.

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel compelled to respond to the remarkable lecture on civility from Matt Gaetz about what men and women are forced to do.

I am a Marine Corps combat veteran myself, and I would never claim to speak for everybody in the military. But certainly speaking for myself, as a veteran, I can say how refreshing it is to have a Commander in Chief who truly honors our military service. He happens to be the father of a veteran himself, and he is someone who understands what it takes to serve in the military and the sacrifices that a family makes as well.

What a contrast to the previous President who, of course, dodged the draft and called our troops losers and suckers. I am happy we have Commander in Chief Biden.

Now on to the topic of the day. In your report, you note that awareness, aspiration, and access are the keys to national and public service. Now, as a student myself, I was fortunate enough to have someone in my life, the Reverend Peter Gomes, a good friend of Mark's as well, who reminded me of my duty to serve. And I am grateful that I had that push that led me to join the Marine Corps.

So I commend you for your mission to make service an expectation for the next generation of young Americans. It is certainly something I believe in strongly. But I want to ask you about the access piece, which remains a challenge. Everyone should have the opportunity to serve, but not everyone can afford to deviate from the traditional employment pathways that you laid out before them, especially if they are dealing with huge college loans.

So we should be willing to invest in those who will invest in our country, and I know you have looked at financial benefits of service. But rather than asking students to take out enormous loans in the hopes of receiving public service loan forgiveness, did you consider building a pathway to college through GI Bill-style tuition assistance for more than just military service?

I am happy for anyone to answer that.

Mr. GEARAN. Thank you, Congressman. Let me start on that. You're absolutely right. And this I alluded to in response to Congressman Langevin, what we found was the barriers to service that exist, and a significant one is the financial barriers to service. It creates the kind of inequities that one would rightfully be concerned about.

As you will see in our recommendations, we urged an increase in the AmeriCorps and Senior Corps living allowances. Far too many conversations we had across the country members were speaking of the very tough financial circumstance they were faced with.

The Segal AmeriCorps Education Award, for reforming that to make sure that it was tax exempt to allow for cashing out options. There is a myriad of recommendations on the financial side that I would commend to you. Promotion of in-state tuition opportunities for alums of AmeriCorps. There are specific things that could be done in addition to raising the allowance that would really limit the kind of barriers that exist.

So for all of those reasons, I think it is long past time where attention is brought to this. There is a very successful range of service, clear difference that American members are making in communities, but the barriers—financial ones—results in this limitation.

Mr. MOULTON. When I first spoke about national service on the budget committee, a colleague on the other side of the aisle said that, you know, why would we be paying volunteers? And he gave a big speech about this, and then I noted that I was paid when I volunteered for the Marine Corps. I don't think he had thought of that.

But given that the report recommends increasing financial support for national service volunteers, can you talk a little bit about what you found with regards to the return on investment, the ROI that we get if we make these investments in our young people?

Mr. GEARAN. That is a great question, Congressman. Well, first, I think what has to be observed is—and particularly AmeriCorps programs are focused on evidence and results. It is a competitive process for organizations to have the kind of benefits and opportunities and called upon to demonstrate results.

AmeriCorps was set up as a private-public partnership, and history has shown the leveraged results financially for AmeriCorps programs that have leveraged \$1.2 billion in outside resources were that a billion-dollar agency. It also leverages our volunteer capacity, what AmeriCorps members have done, generating interest in communities, building the kind of civil society that we hope for.

So for all of those reasons, both leveraged resources—

The CHAIRMAN. I apologize. The gentleman's time has expired. If you can just wrap up in the next couple of seconds.

Mr. GEARAN. Let me just do one last thing. Return on investment, to the Congressman's question, is for every dollar invested. the latest study was 17.3 dollars increased that are returned in terms of the return on investment specifically.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bergman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERGMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was a surprise. According to the sheet I got from my staff, I was way down the totem pole. So thank you.

You know, gentlemen, a year ago, over a year ago, you released your report, just about the same time we shut down for, you know, COVID response. And I had a chance to study it for the first 3 months. I think it was like—well, it was a lot of pages, but 120-some were data and the rest was the bibliography.

But thank you for all you did.

Usually life gives you—when you study it, it is going to give you more questions than answers. So, Dr. Heck, early in your comments, in your opening statement, you talked about standards and equity. Could you give me an example of standards and equity, what you are referring to there?

Dr. HECK. Historically, when the Department of Defense has difficulty in meeting its end-power requirements, it lowers the standards to increase the pool.

Mr. BERGMAN. Okay. Let's just go right to, give me equity. Give me—you said standards and equity? Did I get it right?

Dr. HECK. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BERGMAN. How about the equity piece?

Dr. HECK. So the equity piece is allowing individuals to fully participate in their obligations of citizenship, to include defense of the Nation. And so by discounting half the population from even being considered to defend the Nation provides an inequity to the population at large.

Mr. BERGMAN. Okay. I am going to have to think about that a little bit more. I am going to have some follow-on there.

You talked about JROTC increase. Okay. That is pretty much in the K [kindergarten] through 12 realm, obviously, as we know, JROTC in high school or junior high. What about—did you consider any kind of ROTC increase? Because now we have, especially public institutions, who are shaping the minds of our young men and women? What about ROTC?

Mr. BARNEY. Congressman, thank you. We looked at the great success that our Nation has seen with ROTC programs, and we observed that there was a great opportunity as we look to increase the participation by the next generation in public service by establishing programs similar to ROTC, but would be focused on developing the types of skills to get people to enter into public service careers.

Our report also talked about introducing a cohort of civilians into the military service academies. This would be an opportunity, as we think about the reported civilian-military divide, to have both young people and—

Mr. BERGMAN. I hate to cut you off. I know you have been trained to answer a question in many words, and I appreciate that. Okay. I am a Marine. The fewer the better. What is the incentive for an individual to take advantage of any of these programs? Anybody can answer that. What is the incentive? We lay all of these things out there. What is the incentive?

Mr. BARNEY. For many people, it is the incentive to reduce their cost of that post-secondary education that is the gateway to service either in the military or in public service.

Mr. BERGMAN. So it is okay to use money as an incentive.

Mr. BARNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BERGMAN. Absolutely. Okay. Free market. How about the minimum age to engage? Fifth grade? Third grade? Tenth grade? What do you think?

Dr. HECK. So, Congressman, we lay out what we term a kind of cradle-to-grave pathway to service. And we believe that the sooner you engage individuals in service, at the earliest possible age, the more likely they are to then want to serve again in the future.

And so, for instance, we talk about potentially at the middle school level a well-defined service project, that they engage with in a finite project with their classmates. Of course, civic education begins in kindergarten and should be not one class on U.S. history but—

Mr. BERGMAN. Doctor, I hate to cut you off because my—I know we try to stick to the time here. Have there been any deliberations that you have had in your work with the K–12 educational leaders? Whether it be school boards, academic—you know, teachers unions, et cetera. Did you work with them at all to see about their reluctance or support of infusing into a core curriculum opportunities for kids?

Dr. HECK. Yes. I mean, as we traveled the Nation and met with folks from all walks of life, that included school board members, teachers—

Mr. BERGMAN. And what was their response overall?

Dr. HECK. They, to a person, universally support a reinvention of civic education in the K–12 system.

Mr. BERGMAN. Okay. Good.

With that, my time is up. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Carbajal is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you to all of you that are here today and who did a lot of really extraordinary work on this report. I applaud the commission.

Before I delve into my questions, I wanted—as somebody who served voluntarily in the United States Marine Corps, I wanted to address some of the things I have heard from a number of my colleagues, one in particular who has never served.

You know, when I signed up in the military and served, I would look to my left and to my right and it was never about ideology, conservative or liberal. It was never about people's background. It was commitment to mission for the best interests of our country. Voluntary service.

So I find it concerning that in light of what has happened on January 6 and finding that a number of our military personnel have been associated with white supremacist ideology, that we would somehow confuse weeding out those individuals who have those views with conservative values.

You know, there is a conflation, I let that up to other people, of conservative values with white supremacists. But I will say that for those of us that serve voluntarily in any capacity, being the military or any other—the Peace Corps or any other public service—we do it voluntarily because of the common goal and interest and principle that binds us as a country and for the common good, not to become white supremacists, not to spew ideology as a dividing factor, but rather to serve for the best interests of our country.

But yet you have people that want to focus on their conservative values being attacked. Well, I would say put forward the interests of our country before some silly ideology, as I have done and many other people that have served.

So I will say, moving on from that statement to address what was said earlier, I applaud what the commission has done to inspire, to serve, the report and the recommendations that have come forward.

At the end, it is about cost, and I know you have touched on that a bit. To that end, though, if we were to move forward, what are you envisioning? New agencies, offices, departments needed to stand this effort up? What do you envision to be able to do that?

Dr. HECK. Thank you, Congressman. So, I mean, I can give some examples of some of the cost factors associated with some of the recommendations. One of the recommendations is to create an overarching interagency council on military, national, and public service. It is estimated that that would potentially cost about \$5 million per year based on similar councils.

Expanding JROTC to 6,000 programs by the year 2031 would cost about \$900 million in 2031, \$400 million more than the projected status quo.

Again, I can go through a list of some of the ones to which we have put price tags to. Certainly, increasing the AmeriCorps stipend, adjusted by geography, cost of living, and inflation, would be a one-year cost of about \$31 million. So some of these more discrete recommendations have a price tag. And as I mentioned earlier, some of which that are—just require changes in policy come at no cost.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Thank you. How could you balance a differing stakeholder viewpoint in the recommendations?

Dr. HECK. So we held open meetings around the country. We advertised them, did local outreach to make sure that we had a diverse cross-section of the U.S. population present at our public meetings, and we also, which as far as I know is not common to congressional commissions, at the end of every public meeting we provided a large block of time for public comment, to allow individuals to come up and to speak on the topics that were directly addressed or any of the commission's mandates.

After we went around—the first time around the country doing that, we then went back around the country again with formal hearings once we came up with some potential policy discussions

where we had subject matter experts from across a diverse universe come in and provide their expertise, both pro and con, and again allowed public comment.

In addition, we solicited public comments through our website via a Federal Register notice. We received over 4,000 public comments that we went through and culled as we then, as a commission, met to go over our potential recommendations and ultimately vote on what was included in the final package.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Again, thank you for your work to harness the best of the American people. Thank you so much.

I yield back, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mrs. McClain is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My question is, in the executive summary you provided to the committee, you highlighted the need for greater educational outreach to students in K–12. In addition to this committee, I am actually a member on the House Education and Labor Committee. So my question to all is, is what message should I be taking back to my colleagues on the Education and the Labor Committee to ensure that your commission has the resources to reach our Nation's youth? How can I help?

Mr. GEARAN. Thank you, Congresswoman. I think there are two messages for your committee. One would be the importance, as has been touched upon, about civics education. It was not an initial charge of this commission. But as Dr. Heck has said, it came through loud and clear across the country, and I think that would be very important for the committee.

Secondly, as we talked about the importance of service learning, we recommend a service learning fund. It had been part of initial efforts, but it is a reflective component to civic education that I think would be really important, and I would commend for the education committee.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Okay. Thank you. And then what are you finding to be the greatest roadblock in the education establishment that is preventing you from better informing students on their post-high school options in either military or public service? What are your roadblocks?

Mr. GEARAN. I think some of it has been referenced—is the lack of awareness. It is rather stunning. One of our recommendations calls for a one-stop shopping opportunity platform that would expose students, organizations, to the various streams of service. And I think that would be a very innovative effort to broaden the awareness.

Secondly, calling for an awareness campaign, resources put into exposing the streams of service of young people.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. I am sorry. I missed—a campaign to do what? I am sorry.

Mr. GEARAN. An awareness campaign about the various streams of service.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Okay. So more of a partnership with the educational facilities. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. GEARAN. Well, there is a recommendation certainly to highlight, to have a roster of particularly higher education institutions

that are recognized for their work. And that was recently done by the corporation in December.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Wonderful. I just think we get—if we focus on what unites us, and we provide a positive message for our youth and a positive vision, we would just get a lot farther.

So thank you all for your time. And with that, I yield back.

Ms. SPEIER [presiding]. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Brown, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you to Chairman Smith for hosting this excellent hearing today.

I want to thank Dr. Heck, Mr. Gearan, Mr. Barney, for the work on the final report, “Inspire to Serve,” and for your appearance and testimony before the committee.

So the commission noted that, and I am quoting, “Widespread use of deferments, particularly those for college students who are more economically advantaged, created a feeling that black Americans were disproportionately drafted and sent into combat, fostered a sense of inequity that today still strongly influences public perception of the Selective Service System and the draft.”

And my question is directed to you, Dr. Heck, but certainly any member of the panel may want to weigh in. In your work, did you identify any other notable issue that led to different perceptions of service across our diverse communities? Were these a barrier to service, and perhaps even a barrier to retention and a long career?

Dr. HECK. Thank you for the question, Congressman. As you rightfully pointed out, through the Vietnam era and the use of the draft, deferments, waivers, and exceptions were perceived to be disproportionately geared towards those of higher economic/social caste. That is why one of our recommendations includes, as a modification to the Selective Service registration system, a review of the current deferrals, waivers, and exceptions, to better reflect what is now a 21st century world.

Other obstacles were alluded to by Mr. Gearan, especially in communities of color. It is the lack of financial support to be able to volunteer, and that is why our recommendations include increasing the living stipend. I mean, this is not a wage; it is a living stipend in order to have the person be able to afford to live someplace while they were volunteering their services. And when you look at return on investment in that regard, if you just look at like fiscal year 2018, Forest Service volunteers were equivalent to 2,885 full-time employees with a value of \$128 million of service that was volunteered to the Nation and their communities.

So we need to look at ways that the living stipend allows an individual to actually subsist while they were volunteering their services. Same thing for those that participate in the Senior Corps program where they get roughly the equivalent of \$2.85 an hour to go tutor an at-risk youth or to go sit with a homebound senior.

So, many of these issues revolve around removing those financial obstacles to participation.

Mr. BROWN. Let me also say that, you know, an issue was raised by one of my colleagues earlier about how we treat people in the military and the perceptions it creates, and whether or not that encourages or discourages participation.

I would suggest that the way that we treat women, and if this Congress doesn't address issues of sexual assault and sexual harassment, that certainly sends a clear signal and shapes the perception that our military service is not inviting to women.

If we don't address the mistreatment of black and brown soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and guardians under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, where if you are black or brown you are twice as likely to be prosecuted for an offense than your white counterparts, that sends a message and creates a perception that the military is not inviting to those communities.

So if we want to attract a diverse and inclusive cadre of enlistees and even officers, I think the point made earlier in one sense is accurate. We need to look at how we treat people in the military, and there is real data that suggests that we are not doing the best that we can and there is work to be done.

Let me ask about the Junior ROTC issue that was raised. I really am pleased to see that finally it included a focus on fostering our youth to consider service, military service, and talk about expanding Junior ROTC from 3,400 or so to 6,000 in 10 years.

Can you talk about, since you did mention, Dr. Heck, in your testimony, sort of like the obstacles for the military to engage at the high school/middle school levels? Are there any thoughts or recommendations about what Congress should do to change authority or their authorities to better engage our middle schools and high schools?

Dr. HECK. So, again, thank you for the question. So, first, certainly the expansion of JROTC is all simply a matter of funding issues and the amount that DOD needs to put into the program vice the local school district. So certainly an increased appropriation to the Department of Defense specifically for JROTC growth.

The other issue really revolves around recruiter access. And in certain geographical areas, there are still significant obstacles because of a perception of recruiters coming into the high school. But we want to expand that. We think that when a military recruiter is going to the high school that there should be somebody from the Peace Corps or somebody from AmeriCorps, that somebody is representing public service jobs.

That this really needs to be a cross-cutting, integrated approach to recruit for service across the spectrum, so that an individual who may not want to serve in the military, but wants to serve, knows what their available options are. And it goes back to this increased awareness program.

Ms. SPEIER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Ms. SPEIER. The gentlelady from Oklahoma, Representative Bice, is recognized for 5 minutes. Representative Bice?

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Waltz, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALTZ. Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you—I also want to second your comments in wholeheartedly endorsing this report. I have had some great engagements with you, Dr. Heck. And as we have talked about, there is a lot of handwringing I think across the Nation on the divides within our society.

I am convinced that a lot of that is a byproduct of us moving now generations away from service, where in previous generations at 18 years old you learned leadership, discipline, followership, teamwork. And importantly, and I think this is a point often missed, you did it with people that didn't look like you, didn't have the same backgrounds, didn't come from the same parts of the country, but you are all forced together.

And you learned to overcome those ingrained biases or differences for the common good and for the country, and then went back out in society. I think we are deeply missing that now in the country.

I want to commend the work of the commission under your leadership. I think the recommendations are fantastic. My colleagues, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Bacon, Ms. Houlahan, and I were honored to introduce the commission's recommendation into legislation, the Inspire to Serve Act, last Congress and again this year. But today we are—because of the jurisdiction of this committee—focused more on military service. And I think we can agree that that culture of service is critical to the sustainability of an All-Volunteer Force.

Dr. Heck, you recommended increasing youth service opportunities, expanding educational pathways. As a means to this end, in the fiscal year 2021 NDAA, Mr. Brown and I included two provisions, one requiring DOD to develop a plan to sustain at least 6,000 JROTC units. I would certainly ask the chairman and the committee staff to help us in pressing DOD to respond with this plan, and then also to include STEM education in JROTC training.

And building on those provisions, I plan to offer with Mr. Panetta and Ms. Houlahan related policies from the Inspire to Serve Act and this year's NDAA. These policies, amongst others, will include scholarship opportunities for community colleges, technical skill—to provide the technical skills the military needs to civilians coming in, but then also to service members to update their technical skills, as we have talked about both with Space Force, with cyber, and others that are desperately needed.

We are also going to work to include in the JROTC curriculum the full range of opportunities available. I would—Mr. Chairman, I commend adding physical fitness requirements to that, and I would posture that we should also add civic education requirements.

And then, finally, to expand the Cyber Institutes Program, the universities with ROTC, including universities that focus on aviation and aerospace and cyberspace.

So, Mr. Heck, can you discuss—you traveled the country with the commission. You held multiple hearings, heard from a lot of stakeholders. How would these policies incentivize service within our youth?

DR. HECK. Thank you, Congressman Waltz. And, likewise, the commission thanks you and your other chair and co-chairs of the For Country Caucus for your leadership in this area.

Certainly, as we travel the country and we identify the obstacles to getting more people aware, inspired, and access to service, the policies that you just outlined that are included as part of our recommendations are targeted at breaking down those very barriers, right?

So you can't be what you don't know, and that is why we need to increase awareness. And that awareness has to begin earlier, and we have got to be able to provide a service opportunity that is meaningful to the participant, because we know that if they participate in a meaningful experience, they are more likely to serve later on or throughout their life.

We saw that when we talked to Peace Corps volunteers that left Peace Corps and went into the military, military service members who left the military and went into Peace Corps, started Team Rubicon. When we met with seniors in the Harrisburg area, those that are participating in the Senior Corps, women were primarily teachers or nurses; the men were primarily public safety or prior military. They had served previously.

So this is all about increasing awareness, trying to inspire more people to want to serve. Part of that is the incentive process. It may not just be financial, about paying off student loans or getting an education, but by getting the soft people skills that you are able to gain by participating in some of these opportunities. And then we want to make sure that everyone has a clear and supported pathway to access those service opportunities, hence growing to 1 million positions by year 2031, hence increasing JROTC to 6,000 programs by 2031, hence creating public safety—public service academies so that we can get the next generation of best and brightest wanting to become a Federal, State, local, tribal government employee.

So, again, in the 164 discrete recommendations, we lay out this bold blueprint of how to reinvigorate the current existing service of spirit in America and morph that into a culture of service where by 2031 it will not be uncommon for someone to ask you, where are you going to serve, not if you will serve.

Ms. SPEIER. All right. The gentleman's time actually has expired, even though it doesn't reflect that on the clock. So—

Mr. WALTZ. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I urge my colleagues to support these measures.

Ms. SPEIER. All right. The gentlelady from Pennsylvania, Ms. Houlahan, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I wanted to speak—before I began, I wanted to really thank Chairman Smith for holding this very important hearing and for drawing attention to this issue that I personally care deeply about.

As Mr. Waltz was mentioning, I am the co-lead of the Inspire to Serve Act, which would implement the recommendations of this commission, and I believe the hearing timing is really very critical at this point in time.

I also happen to be a veteran who, in my forties, joined AmeriCorps in the Teach for America organization, and service is very much central to who I am. I think it has shaped me in ways that I can't begin to explain, one of them being why I am here right now.

So I am grateful to the commission for the work that they have done and the outline of the shape of what national service should look like. I am not certain if my question is necessarily for Dr. Heck or for Mr. Gearan. I am trying to figure out where the contours of your expertise areas are in this.

But my question—my first one has to do with the kind of consistent thing that I am hearing through this hearing, which has to do with one-stop shopping and recruitment and awareness campaigns about the breadth of national service opportunities that are available to people that are not just about wearing a uniform but maybe about AmeriCorps or Senior Corps and those kinds of things.

Can you speak a little bit more about those recruitment and awareness campaigns, like recruiting individuals who are potentially interested in service but who may not qualify for military service? How are we kind of encouraging them to maybe consider other opportunities? Is there something concrete that we can be sinking our teeth into to make sure that we are catching the spirit of service everywhere that it is?

Mr. GEARAN. Thank you, Congresswoman, for your many streams of service. Yes. You have tapped into very much a thread that we saw throughout our travels and try to encapsulate into this report. First is to fund an awareness campaign, because of the stunning lack of information and awareness that exists.

Secondly, to urge the Department of Defense, the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, to collaborate on marketing and branding and recruitment efforts, and to imagine a one-stop platform where all of this information could be brought together for those to learn about different streams of service as well as for organizations to be aware of it.

So it is the theme of this collaboration, coincident with the very nature of this military, national, and public service focus of our commission.

Ms. HOULAHAN. And, Dr. Heck, can you also articulate a little bit about what this one-stop shop or sort of seamless warm handoff between the organizations could look like?

Dr. HECK. Yeah. That is a great question. I will give you some concrete examples of what we propose. So when we met with military recruiters, we asked them, well, what happens when somebody comes in to want to join the military but you realize they are not going to qualify? They just turn them away. We are like, well, why can't we have you hand them a brochure or a pamphlet about other service opportunities, so that there is some joint recruiting? You have somebody who is willing to serve. They may not be able to serve in the military, but don't turn them away. Let's direct them towards another service opportunity.

When the military sends out its flyers that are generated from Selective Service registration, why can't there be one sheet in that same envelope that talks about other service opportunities? The platform that Mr. Gearan refers to is envisioned to be a website where individuals can go to explore opportunities within their communities, so they know what is available to them and what is needed in their own community.

Likewise, we look at the expansion of the ASVAB CEP [Career Exploration Program] program that allows high school students to explore, based on their interests and skills, what types of service opportunities would be best suited for them. So all of these are outlined as recommendations within the final report.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you. And that is very useful, but I would also like to kind of associate myself with the remarks that have been made about the inadequacy of the pay for people who are in organizations like AmeriCorps. I think it is an atrocity that in my forties when I did join AmeriCorps I was told how to apply for food stamps effectively. So I would advocate very strongly for increasing the compensation for these volunteers as well.

With the last seconds of my time, I wanted to talk about the service for women, making sure that they can—are encouraged to include—be included in Selective Service. As you noted, and I agree, there is a lot of debate about this. Can you speak a little bit more about what percentage of those who supported it, or didn't support it, were women? What do women think about Selective Service for women?

Dr. HECK. If you look at the publicly available polling on this issue, there is a small majority of individuals who support expansion of registration across genders. However, males do support it more than females, but the majority, again, is very small, about 52, 53 percent support expansion from the publicly available polling.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you.

And my time has expired, and I yield back, Madam Chair.

Ms. SPEIER. The gentlelady yields back.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Fallon, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Chair, thank you very much. You know, I am listening to this, and I find this interesting. And I know a lot of very hard work over a couple of years has been done here. And, you know, I think it breaks down to a core of, you know, I am a military veteran as well. And I will tell you all, and share with you, exactly why I served, the number one reason why I decided to serve. And I am not trying to be sanctimonious at all.

It was love of country. That is the reason I did that. I decided in the fourth grade that I was going to be in the military. At the time, I thought I was going to go into the Army to follow in my dad's footsteps, but he convinced me to serve in the Air Force for reasons we don't have time to discuss today.

But serving in the military was the best decision that I have ever made, and it shapes you and molds you when you are very malleable and you are young. But, again, it boils down to love of country, and that is why I am very concerned when we see from some quarters the focus on the dark parts of our history, and only focusing on that with projects like The 1619 Project, which is being embraced by a lot of folks, a lot of progressive folks. And I think that is really a horrible idea to do, because we are besmirching the greatness of America.

By no means am I saying that we should gloss over the dark parts of our history. We have many, unfortunately, but—and I think that all students should be taught comprehensive American history and taught the contributions of all Americans, because we have had great Americans from all shapes, sizes, and shades, and from all ethnic backgrounds.

And diversity is incredibly important, and it is our strength. But the most important diversity is diversity of thought. We shouldn't have any monolithic, you know, thinking.

But getting back to our teaching about the—we should be teaching the good and bad in American history, because in context, the good overwhelms, overshadows, and dwarfs the bad.

And getting back to the reason why so many serve, if you don't love your country—in fact, if you are just indifferent to your country, the odds of you serving it in any capacity diminish greatly. And if you dislike or hate your country, the odds of serving are nil. But if you love your country, I think they go up dramatically.

So I wanted to ask, Dr. Heck, you know, in that vein, would you agree that we should be celebrating the great American experiment, celebrating American exceptionalism, and really fostering and encouraging patriotism in our young people?

Dr. HECK. Well, so that question directly relates to our recommendation about reinvigorating civic education in the K–12 system, because as civic education has been supplanted because of the finite number of hours in a school day by other subjects thought to be more important, we believe that the youth of today have lost touch with the very principles upon which this Nation was founded.

And if you don't know where you came from, you don't know where you are going to go. And so that is why—again, and we did not initiate that discussion. It was not even one of our charges. That came to us from the individuals that we spoke with. When we talked about trying to get people to serve, they are the ones that said, “If you want people to serve, you have got to teach them about what it is to be an American. You have got to teach them about civics at an earlier age than it is being done today.”

Mr. FALLON. Well, Doctor, I mean, that is why I love the—Hollywood sometimes does services to the country, and one of which is, you know, these recent movies about the Tuskegee Airmen, and things of that nature, to really encourage—you know, and when you say something good like that, you have to—we also have to be cognizant of the fact that a million African Americans served in World War II, and then when they came home they were not treated as equal citizens again.

I mean, we need to be talking about all of that history. But, again, the good overshadows the bad greatly.

I had another specific question, for you, Doctor. How do we incentivize service for young people to meet the stated goal of your commission of the expectation of service by 2031? Specifically, how do we go about that?

Dr. HECK. So we lumped those recommendations into our aspiration bucket, right? After we made people aware of what the opportunities are, how do you get them inspired to want to participate? As we said, for some it may be the love of country. For others it may be the financial benefit associated with an education. For still others it might be the opportunity to try something that is outside of their comfort zone to see whether or not it is what they want to do for the rest of their career, or to gain the soft people skills that they might not otherwise have that will benefit them in future careers.

So we have got to look at, how do you tap into what the need is of each individual and be able to provide them with a reason to

want to serve, and that is what the bulk of our recommendations attempts to do.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield back.

Ms. SPEIER. The gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Escobar, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to follow up a bit on where one of my colleagues, Representative Houlahan, left off in her questions about women and Selective Service. And it is interesting to me that more men favor women being—having to register with the Selective Service, and here is what I am interested in exploring.

This is my first question. I have a second question on another topic. With regard to women, one of the things that I have learned in my 2½ years on the Armed Services Committee and 2½ years of having in-depth conversations with women across the services is that in many respects a lot of women in the military right now feel like the military and the Federal Government have failed them.

When you look at limited access to child care, limited access to reproductive health; when you look at the rates, the really shocking rates of sexual assaults; when you talk to women about sexual harassment; when you look at even some of the more fundamental components of being a service member, like having the correct body armor; we are not there yet when it comes to creating an environment that values women and that provides avenues for them to be successful in.

And so my question would be, would the commission recommend or what are the thoughts about maybe before really fully exploring having women register in the Selective Service that we hold ourselves to a standard whereby we create a better environment for women where there can be equity before we say you have to register for the Selective Service.

So I would love any feedback on that idea.

Dr. HECK. Well, thank you, Congresswoman. So I think it is important to delineate what the environment is within the All-Volunteer Force versus the purpose of the Selective Service System, which is to induct individuals into the services through a draft in the face of an existential national emergency in which not only if women were required to register would women be involuntarily drafted, but there would be a whole host of men that would also be involuntarily drafted to serve.

So there are two separate environments. We need to provide an environment within the All-Volunteer Force that is—that provides equity, that provides an environment for women to excel. But when it comes to registering for the Selective Service System, to be a potential inductee, that is a separate issue that we did not delve into as the commission.

Ms. ESCOBAR. I appreciate that. I do think that while, yes, it is—they are separate issues, my view is is that we have an obligation to create a standard whereby we are not essentially creating environments that are, as I mentioned, not great for women. And I think we need to examine that standard first and create a standard and meet that standard or exceed it.

My second question—and so I thank you for your response. My second question is about recruitment and the way that we reach

out to young people and the platforms that we use to reach out to young people. And while I agree that the Department of Defense and many other Federal agencies need to do better when it comes to conveying their purpose and opportunities available to the American public, I am concerned about how this advertising could be predatory in nature for younger Americans.

Platforms like Instagram, Twitch, YouTube, and others are filled with young people who are well below the allowed enlistment age. I am wondering if this was taken into account when you included this recommendation in your report.

Dr. HECK. The age of those who participate in some of these social media platforms was not taken into consideration. Our view was that in today's age where many of the target-age population are cord cutters, they don't watch normal TV, that if you want to be able to reach out to them and let them know about opportunities you have to reach them where they are, which are on these various social media platforms.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Dr. Heck, thank you. I am out of time.

Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. SPEIER. The gentlewoman yields back.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for a submission.

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you, Madam Chair. And pursuant to the chairman's allowance earlier in the meeting, I would submit for the record a statement made by Ranking Member Rogers yesterday. Rogers asked that assertions of political bias to the DOD be addressed in 2022 NDAA.

Ms. SPEIER. We have already provided unanimous consent. It is accepted.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 82.]

Ms. SPEIER. Next we will hear from the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Moore, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Appreciate the witnesses for being here today and for the work that you have done to—in this report and this commission. It is an important first step in reinvigorating a national discussion on public service, as we are seeing, you know, issues and attrition here, along with talent retention and increasing opportunity to help preserve high standards of American military readiness.

The majority of my questions will be around retention. I see that as one of the biggest challenges going forward, to make sure that we have a ready workforce. There is cost savings involved with it as well, and there is—in doing so, hopefully we can improve our service men and women's lives and prospects as well.

So I will start with a more specific question, but just in general, I would offer to all of our experts here today just a very simple question. What are the biggest issues that we are facing, and what would one solution be on your end to address it? And I would love to hear that.

But I will start with a question to Dr. Heck. As your report mentions that reforming Federal hiring as a means of addressing critical workforce shortages in public service, how can the Federal Government retain more veterans in the public service following their retirement?

Dr. HECK. Thank you for the question. And it is a great question because currently about a third of the Federal workforce will be eligible to retire in the next 5 years, and only 6 percent of the Federal workforce is under the age of 30. So we have a potential brain drain on one end and a very constrictive pipeline on the other.

Many of our recommendations address specifically trying to recruit veterans that are leaving military service to continue their service in the public sector. Part of that has to do with the veterans recruitment allowance, the VRA, which currently is limited to 3 years post service. But what we have found, especially now, is that many service members want to go on and get an education, to utilize their GI Bill once they leave service.

And by the time they complete their education, they are no longer eligible to exercise the VRA. And so one of our recommendations is to expand that out to 10 years to let veterans who want to get an education upon leaving and utilize their GI Bill to still have the VRA benefit when they want to come back into public service.

Another is the veterans' preference and revamping the veterans' preference to be focused more on recently separated veterans to allow them to use it to enter into public service, whereas right now a veteran who utilizes—enter public service, has now got a career in public service, can utilize that same preference to apply for another job at a high pay grade within the public service. So we should refocus it on individuals that are recently separated and use that as the incentive to get them into the public service sector.

Mr. MOORE. With respect to flexibility, do you feel that existing hiring authorities provide adequate flexibility for agencies to select the candidates of their choosing? Do they feel like they have got a talent pool and they can go and choose who they want to work for them?

Dr. HECK. We have a whole section on revamping competitive hiring, because quite honestly the competitive hiring process is dysfunctional so much that to the point that there have been so many special hiring authorities granted for agencies to get around utilizing the competitive hiring requirements.

And, in part, some of that goes to veterans' preference, it goes to other areas where individuals that are not as highly qualified for the job get moved to the top of a list. And then when that list goes to the agency, they have a long process by which they have to go through to get rid of that list and readvertise and try again.

So certainly we do not have the time in this committee, but I would commend the section on revamping of the public service hiring recommendations to your attention.

Mr. MOORE. Thank you very much.

And to Mr. Gearan and Mr. Barney, anything to add with respect to big picture or the biggest issues? And what are some solutions you might want to add to this?

Mr. GEARAN. Thank you, Congressman. Just briefly, I think the biggest takeaway I have is the lack of awareness that exists that we can go at, but then the wellspring of interest that exists on the part of the American people. This is a time of enormous opportunity that could unite the country.

Thank you.

Mr. BARNEY. Congressman, the process of just giving better opportunities for young people to learn about how to serve will elevate all forms of services, and we believe it will get to the point where the best young people in our country will be competing against each other for the great opportunities that our Nation provides.

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Thank you. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Kahele is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KAHELE. Mahalo, Mr. Chair, and aloha to everyone. Thank you so much for this—for your work on this. I am a proud sponsor of the Inspire to Serve bill. And as someone who still serves in our National Guard, we have many members on this committee that serve, and I think most of us would agree that we wouldn't be in the positions we are today if not for our military service to our country.

My question specifically has to touch on the executive summary and the report that deals with increasing opportunities for youth programs, specifically the JROTC, increasement of those programs to 6,000 or no less than 6,000, within 10 years from now. And I love that idea, and I would love to see more JROTC programs in my district.

But as you all know, the participation in JROTC does not require an obligation to serve in the military, and is not necessarily intended to support the recruitment efforts of the Armed Forces. Several studies have come to conflicting conclusions regarding JROTC participation and enlistment, and any type of positive correlations to that might be self-selection on behalf of the individual.

So given the DOD's budget constraints and this committee's, you know, constraints, could you articulate why you believe the DOD should dedicate additional funding specifically to the JROTC program? Have you looked at the report—those other programs, have you looked at other programs like additional funding for Youth Challenge, additional and expansion of Civil Air Patrol programs across the country?

My colleague, Representative Waltz, talked about aviation and technical training at our community colleges, expansion of and encouraging more high school students to take the ASVAB for career exploration. Can you elaborate on the dedication of funding to these programs, and specifically the JROTC expansion?

Dr. HECK. Thank you, Congressman. So we look at JROTC for what it is, which is a citizenship program. And as we talk about reinvigorating civic education, Junior ROTC is kind of the low-hanging fruit of how we can reinvigorate civic education, at least in the high school levels, by being able to expand the opportunities for high school students to participate in those programs.

And so looking at the roughly 3,500 programs that currently exist around the country demonstrates the deficit in the rest of the country. And so trying to grow the programs to 6,000 by 2031 would increase opportunities in civic education and citizenship through those programs.

Certainly agree with your statement that the studies to date have shown conflicting results as to whether or not participation in JROTC leads to someone joining the military, but that is not what

JROTC is designed to do. It is designed to make the individual a better citizen.

For the other programs that you mentioned, like the National Guard Youth Challenge, we look at any program that has the opportunity to provide a better sense of civic and citizenship to today's youth as a viable pathway in trying to increase awareness and aspiration for a lifetime of service.

Mr. KAHELE. All right. Thank you. Thank you for your reply.

And I will yield back the rest of my time, Chairman.

Mahalo.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Panetta is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry about that. I didn't realize I was up and going. Thank you very much.

Look, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Rogers, thank you for holding this very, very important hearing on what I believe, and as we are hearing from many of our members, what they believe is a critically important topic.

Dr. Heck, Mr. Gearan, and Mr. Barney, thank you. Thank you very much, not only for your testimony but all of your important work that you have done with this commission. I do believe that your commission's report "Inspire to Serve" really is a consensus project that reflects the very backgrounds and experiences and perspectives of the 11 commissioners.

That is why, obviously, after I reviewed your report, and working closely with your team, that I, along with my colleagues—Reps [Representatives] Bacon, Waltz, and Houlihan—introduced the Inspire to Serve Act last term that had the support of many of my colleagues on this committee.

The Inspire to Serve Act, as many of us know, is a bipartisan comprehensive piece of legislation that would implement many of the recommendations that we have been discussing today.

Now, of course, I reintroduced that legislation as H.R. [House Resolution] 3000, the Inspire to Serve Act of 2021, because I do believe that the work of this commission and the passage of this—the legislation that we are talking about is more important now more than ever.

In passing the commission's recommendations, I think Congress would advance America's core principles of service, diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. And of course the bill would support the domestic needs and, yes, the national security of our country.

As COVID-19, as we saw throughout the pandemic, it was necessary and it was critical to have that capacity that public servants provided to our Nation. As we continue to recover from the pandemic, it is vitally important to prioritize policies and proposals that will unlock the full transformative potential of national service.

I do believe that public servants at all levels—Federal, State, and local—really turned out to be the heroes of this crisis and of this pandemic as they work tirelessly to stem the spread of the disease and treat those infected and support our communities' needs.

Similarly, what we saw recently with the recent hack of the Colonial Pipeline, and highlighted by the importance of our commu-

nities' cybersecurity workforce, there is an urgent need for a civilian cyber reserve. That is why, with your recommendations and further opportunities to serve, I introduced the Civilian Cyber Security Reserve Act last month, along with my colleague, Ken Calvert, and over in the Senate they introduced their version thanks to Senators Rosen and Blackburn.

However, as the commission has learned, more must be done to create more opportunities, remove barriers, and enable diverse individuals to serve their country and communities. That is why I believe that acting on the commission's recommendations sooner rather than later with the Inspire to Serve Act will allow our government to utilize the many diverse and varied talents of individuals from across the country in smart and strategic ways to ensure national resilience and preparedness.

Again, I am grateful for the support of many of my colleagues here today in co-sponsoring the Inspire to Serve Act. And I look forward to continuing to work with both sides of the aisle, as well as you, to advance the recommendations of your commission.

So quickly, Dr. Heck, just if you can—and then this is a big softball for you, but I am teeing it up for you—speak to the importance of quickly implementing the recommendations of your commitments, in light of our ongoing public health and cybersecurity challenges, please.

Dr. HECK. Well, thank you, Congressman, but I don't think I can be any more eloquent than you just were. And, again, the entire commission thanks you and your co-chairs on the For Country Caucus for your efforts.

But certainly now, as we see the divisiveness that has manifested itself across our Nation, there is no more pressing urgent time to institute a call for national service to bring this country back together. You know, we have talked about when you start a job and you go to your job training program with a bunch of other folks who got hired on at the same time, you leave calling each other "colleague."

But, you know, when you engage in a national service program, whether it is AmeriCorps, whether it is the Conservation Corps, whether it is the military, and you go to those training programs, when you leave, you call each other "brother" and "sister." And that is what the Inspire to Serve Act is all about.

Mr. PANETTA. Thank you. I appreciate that. And, obviously, I would love to give Mr. Gearan and Mr. Barney an opportunity to answer within 15 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. Correct. I was going to say that opportunity is 12 seconds now, so go ahead.

Mr. GEARAN. I would just double-click what our chair just said. It was well stated. And, again, Congressman, thank you for your leadership.

Mr. PANETTA. You bet.

Mr. BARNEY. And thank you, Congressman, for your important words in support of those public servants who were really at the forefront of addressing the national crisis with this COVID virus.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BARNEY. They are very important.

The CHAIRMAN. I apologize. Thank you.

Mr. Morelle is recognized.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this very important hearing, and to the ranking member. I want to thank Dr. Heck, Mr. Barney, and although some refer to him as Mr. Gearan, I refer to him as Mr. President. A point of personal privilege, he was the president of Hobart and William Smith Colleges in my region, and it is always great to see the former president here. So thank you for all of your service to our country on this really important issue.

I wanted to touch briefly on something that I have encountered back home in just my last few years in terms of recommending men and women for the service academy. And I think Mr. Barney may have started to touch on this, but one of the concerns that I have had in my observation is we have not been able to attract much diversity in terms of young people who are interested in attending the various military academies.

And so I struggled with this. I wonder, although it wasn't talked about at great length in the commission as far as I saw, but I am sure in the course of your deliberations and conversations you have given some thought to this. And I wondered if you could just expand beyond the recommendations on ways that we might reach and inspire sort of non-traditional candidates, particularly communities of color, to apply for service in the service academies.

Mr. BARNEY. Well, thank you, Congressman, for that important question, because improving and increasing the access for people from all communities in our Nation into these military service academies will be to the ultimate benefit of the Nation and to the armed services that defend it.

What we have seen is that there is a great need for awareness of the fact that there are these fabulous national treasures—our military service academies—that are available for young Americans to go to. We have learned as we traveled that many people are unaware that there is actually a military college that they can attend and that they can develop a pipeline to a career that is fulfilling and rewarding, whether that is a career in the military or a career that takes them into other forms of service or into the private sector.

So you are absolutely correct, sir. There is a great need to increase the awareness of this wonderful opportunity, and that is part of the process of building up an increasing knowledge of service for all Americans.

Mr. MORELLE. I wonder if Dr. Heck or Mr. Gearan had any additional thoughts?

Mr. GEARAN. Thank you, Congressman. It is very nice to see you again. I guess my only other reflection is there, in addition to Steve's, is great interplay in our recommendations.

While it can get rather stovepiped into military, national, and public service, I would commend the holistic opportunity that is before you, because I think as we raise all awareness of military, national, and public service, it will rebound to the benefit of many communities across the streams of service that exist.

Mr. MORELLE. I wonder if it—just as a follow-up, are there things that you think that Congress specifically can do to support initiatives to achieve more diversity improvement for all of the different sectors? Obviously, I mentioned my particular concern about

the academies one of which is here at home in New York, West Point, U.S. Military Academy.

Anything that Congress should be doing or thinking about that we can add to to help increase those opportunities for diverse candidates?

Mr. GEARAN. Yes. I think it is the awareness campaign that has been referenced. I think it is the living allowances that has been referenced. I think that it is enhancing the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award. Threaded through all of our recommendations is this very point, Congressman, of broadening access, removing barriers, and broadening the opportunities that exist for all Americans.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you. Well, I am very grateful for your service, to all of you for your participation. This is a very, very important topic, and it is something I hope we continue to get some positive movement on.

So with that, I yield back, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We are a little bit past the time that the hearing was supposed to go to. We have—one more speaker just showed up. I have to go. So I just am going to say thank you very much. Appreciate all of your work on the report and the time you spent today to explain it to us, and I think the questions and answers were incredibly important.

Before I go, I will give Mr. Rogers a chance, if he has any summary. He is good?

So we will introduce our newest member of the committee, Mr. Horsford from Nevada, just recently appointed. I believe this is the first official hearing. We will have a hearing where we formally introduce him to the committee.

But Mr. Horsford is, A, recognized for 5 minutes, and, B, you will have the honor of calling the hearing to a close when you are finished.

So thank you very much, and, again, thank you for presenting the testimony today.

Mr. Horsford is recognized.

Mr. HORSFORD [presiding]. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First, I want to acknowledge you and the ranking member for welcoming me onto the House Armed Services Committee. It is an honor to join, and also to have my good friend and former colleague, Dr. Heck, who I actually served in the Nevada State Senate with and in Congress with. So it is good to have you back for what is my first hearing here on HASC. And I know your service to our country, to this committee, and to this work is really valued. So thank you.

I also want to thank all of our panelists for the work that you have done around this commission, and I really wanted to just hone in on a couple of areas that the commission identified for your recommendations. As someone—my background out of Congress was in workforce development and training, so I am always interested in how we are preparing the next generation with the skills development and workforce training that they need.

And I was excited to see your recommendations to improve coordination and management for critically skilled personnel, strengthening educational pathways for individuals to acquire high-need

skills, and better personnel management to help retain the personnel that we recruit.

One of the recommendations in the report is to establish and appropriate funding for a council on military, national, and public service to coordinate, as you indicated, the whole-of-government effort to recruit and retain individuals with critical skills and to cultivate pathways for Americans to develop these skills.

So I would like to ask, can you elaborate on this idea and what an undertaking like this would look like? Dr. Heck.

Dr. HECK. Well, thank you, Congressman, and it is good to be with you again. Certainly, one of the areas that we identify that was most lacking was a specific emphasis and overarching kind of oversight of all forms of service at the highest levels of the Federal Government.

Now, varying administrations have put in place programs or offices that come and go based on the administration, but we believe that there should be a council on military, national, and public service that is something with longevity and sustainability, that has responsibility for the integration across all service lines, to make sure that we are addressing the national security and the critical skill needs of the Nation.

We truly believe that that individual should have cabinet rank ideally, so that there is a seat at the table, and that there is somebody who is charged with bringing in disparate pieces from the various other cabinet-level organizations, whether it be education or labor or defense, to make sure that there is one key location, one key office, with an individual who is at the table that is helping to shape the future of service in America.

Mr. HORSFORD. [Microphone muted]—career, recently discharged veterans who are transitioning into civilian Federal employment and to ensure that Federal agencies can hire highly qualified workers, including highly qualified veterans.

So can you talk me through the recommendations to focus veterans' preference on recently discharged veterans?

Dr. HECK. Thank you, Congressman. So currently the way veterans' preference works is that an individual who based on their education and skill set who might be minimally qualified for a position, if they are at least 10 percent a disabled veteran, moves to the very top of the most highly qualified list, even above other veterans.

And what happens then is that list will go to the hiring agency. They will see that the person is not qualified. They will need to work through a process to then get the program readvertised, which delays hiring. Worse yet, they may actually hire that person and it is a bad fit for the individual as well as the agency, and both sour on the process.

So we look at utilizing veterans' preference as a tiebreaker. So you have two equally qualified candidates, the veteran wins the tie. The House wins the push, as we would say.

So that is the one piece. The other is the veterans' recruitment piece, the VRA, the veterans' recruitment preference. And right now, as I mentioned earlier, it is limited to 3 years, but most veterans when they leave service they want to go out and use their

GI Bill, get an education, and by the time they get their degree, they are no longer eligible to utilize that preference.

So we want to expand that out to 10 years and, again, focus it on those that are recently separated. Right now, if you are a veteran and you use your preference to get hired, and you have been in, let's say, Federal Government service for 8, 9, 10 years, and you want to apply for another position within the Federal Government at a pay raise, you get to utilize your benefit again. It needs to be focused on those that we are trying to recruit from service in the military to service in the government sector.

Mr. HORSFORD. Well, thank you, Dr. Heck. And thank you, again, to the commissioners. This has been a very enlightening session, and a lot of opportunity to go forward.

So we appreciate all of your hard work, and to the staff of the HASC committee, and it is my honor to say this hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:12 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

---

---

**A P P E N D I X**

MAY 19, 2021

---

---



---

---

**PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

MAY 19, 2021

---

---



STATEMENT OF  
THE HONORABLE JOSEPH J. HECK, CHAIRMAN  
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE  
BEFORE THE  
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE  
ON  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL,  
AND PUBLIC SERVICE  
MAY 19, 2021

Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Rogers, and Members of the Committee, my colleagues and I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (the Commission) and its eleven Commissioners to discuss the findings and recommendations contained in the Commission's final report.

Congress created the Commission in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 as a bipartisan body with members selected by congressional leadership and the President. This is the first time that Congress asked a body to look at all three critical legs of the service stool—Military, National and Public Service—as an overall system. Congress charged us to “conduct a review of the military selective service process” and to “consider methods to increase participation in military, national, and public service in order to address national security and other public service needs of the Nation.” Throughout our work, from the fall of 2017 through the fall of 2020, we embraced and fulfilled both parts of this mandate.

Just over one year ago, on March 25, 2020, we were honored to submit to Congress, the President, and the American people the culmination of our work—*Inspired to Serve*—along with legislative proposals designed to implement many of the recommendations. The release of the report corresponded with lockdown orders and other measures taken to combat the ongoing public health crisis—a global pandemic that has disrupted nearly every aspect of life and the effects of which will remain with us for years to come. It is the Commission's ardent belief that service is integral to responding to COVID-19 and the clear inequities the pandemic has exposed in health care, education, the environment, and more. Many of the recommendations included in *Inspired to Serve*, if acted on, will create a more resilient nation, better prepared to meet the next national emergency, regardless of what form it takes. With 164 recommendations,

*Inspired to Serve* contains a bold vision and comprehensive plan to strengthen all forms of service -- military, national and public service -- to address critical national and domestic needs, invigorate civil society, unite our people in common purpose and strengthen our democracy. The Commission is united behind this report as a consensus product, and every recommendation has the support of a bipartisan supermajority of the Commission.

The recommendations we propose are based on extensive research and an equally expansive effort to learn from a wide spectrum of the American public. We traveled across the nation to learn firsthand about Americans' views on and experience with service, visiting 42 cities in 22 states across all nine census districts. The Commission conducted interviews with individuals from over 530 organizations that have a connection to service, including those who participate in, lead, or study activities included in the Commission's mandate. From experts and leaders with decades of experience in their fields, to mid-level managers who are implementing policies at the state and local level, to program participants who are just beginning to explore what it means to serve, the insights offered by these individuals shaped the Commission's understanding of what service looks like today. In addition, the Commission held 11 public meetings and forums, analyzed more than 4,300 public comments, leveraged multiple surveys with partner organizations, and convened 14 open hearings with 68 policy experts to discuss and analyze a wide variety of policy proposals.

We found that, as was the case over 225 years ago during the earliest days of the republic, America's extraordinary and longstanding spirit of service continues to shape the life of our nation. As our report details, we heard inspiring stories of dedicated military, national and public service everywhere we went. We also heard a clear desire for dramatically more opportunities to serve and needs to be met. It became clear to us, in a country of 329 million

Americans, the full potential for service remains largely untapped. *Inspired to Serve* offers a bold and inclusive vision to significantly strengthen the culture of service in our nation, beginning with comprehensive civic education and service learning starting in kindergarten through high school, service opportunities so ubiquitous that a year of national service becomes a rite of passage for millions of young adults, and new and revitalized service options for adults of any age, background, or experience. By the year 2031—the 70th anniversary of President Kennedy’s “Ask Not” call for Americans to serve our nation—we envision five million Americans will begin to serve in military, national, or public service each year. Our long-term goal is to cultivate a *culture* in which service is a common expectation and experience for all Americans—when it is the norm, rather than the exception—when every American is inspired and eager to serve. By igniting the extraordinary potential for service, our recommendations will address critical national security and domestic needs, expand economic and educational opportunities, unite people from different backgrounds in common cause and strengthen the civic fabric of the nation.

#### **Strengthening Emergency National Mobilization**

Throughout the history of the United States, Americans have proven their willingness to defend the country through military service. The Commission embraces the American tradition of first seeking volunteers for military service to meet national needs. The Commission has identified a need for a continuum between the routine recruiting mechanisms of the U.S. military and the activation of the draft and believes the nation must develop policy options across that continuum.

Nevertheless, the Commission ultimately concluded that the United States should maintain a draft contingency mechanism for mandatory military service in order to organize and

mobilize Americans in the event of a national emergency. The Commission has also recommended that ongoing, active registration with a modernized version of the Selective Service System is the best and most feasible way to draw on the talents, skills, and abilities of Americans to meet evolving national security needs and support the common defense.

The United States faces threats to vital national security interests and the potential for existential threats, natural or manmade, persist. As the National Defense Strategy Commission explained in 2018, “given the differing needs for forces across theaters, the challenges of projecting power over great distances, and the fact that the United States has rarely been able to predict precisely where or how adversaries will challenge its interests, the U.S. military will surely experience unanticipated force demands in coming years.”<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the Department of Defense noted in its 2017 report to Congress that the Selective Service “is not a theoretical capability,” but “*is the only* proven, time-tested mechanism by which to expand the [U.S. military] in the event of a national emergency.”<sup>2</sup>

The Commission determined the Selective Service System remains an essential component of the nation’s military preparedness and serves a function that cannot be replaced through other identified methods. The Commission shares the view of the Department of Defense that the Selective Service System is a necessary low-cost insurance policy against a shortage of military personnel as well as a symbol of U.S. resolve to mobilize the nation to meet commitments to its armed forces, allies, and partners.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Defense Strategy Commission, *Providing for the Common Defense: The Assessment and Recommendations of the National Defense Strategy Commission* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, November 2018), 21, <https://www.usip.org/publications/2018/11/providing-common-defense>.

<sup>2</sup> Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (OUSD (P&R)), *Report on the Purpose and Utility of a Registration System for Military Selective Service* (Washington, DC: DoD, July 2017), 10 (emphasis in the original).

The Commission also determined, however, that the broader emergency national mobilization system requires significant modernization in order to be fully prepared in the event of a national emergency. The ongoing pandemic has laid bare that agility and effectiveness in government response requires advanced planning and continuous stress testing. Ensuring that the Selective Service System can serve as an effective insurance policy requires improving the readiness of the entire national mobilization process, not just the Selective Service System, by holistically reviewing institutional and organization functions and roles that have not been exercised in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The Department of Defense's focus on resource-informed planning and immediate demands on the force have come at the expense of planning for a national mobilization and regularly testing those plans and concepts. The Commission urges the National Security Council and the Department of Defense to review and revise plans for responding to national emergencies that might necessitate a draft; specifically, the Commission proposed that the government formalize mechanisms to encourage additional volunteers and develop approaches to test existing plans and coordinate among key organizations responsible for national mobilization.

The Commission's recommendations seek to empower agencies and leaders to take the steps required to enhance this system, educate the public regarding their solemn and civic responsibilities to help defend the nation if called to do so, and ensure the government can call up the most qualified Americans to meet the national security needs of the nation if Congress and the President determine a draft is required.

Likewise, the Commission has determined that the Selective Service System itself—a system created over one hundred years ago in 1917—must modernize in order to achieve the objectives set forth above. Among these, the Commission recommended broader awareness of

the purpose of registration and the function of the Selective Service System. While maintaining the Selective Service System is critical to ensuring national preparedness, the Commission found that few young Americans have a deep understanding or even awareness of the system's basic requirements. A survey conducted by the Department of Defense's Joint Advertising, Market Research and Studies (JAMRS) revealed that only 35 percent of young Americans could correctly identify the current registration requirement for young adult men. The Commission believes that Selective Service System registration deserves a moment of earnest reflection and our report includes several ways to help every registrant understand the purpose and potential implication of their civic duty.

The Commission also considered, at the request of Congress, potential mechanisms to draft individuals with critical skills. The changing nature of warfare, including rapid technological advancements and the increased specialization required to address global security issues, has certainly heightened the need for individuals with critical skills necessary to maintain a military advantage. However, the Commission ultimately concluded the best way to leverage individuals with critical skills would be through innovative new voluntary mechanisms, such as the creation of an individual ready reserve focused on critical skills and a national roster of volunteers.

The Commission also considered whether women should register with the Selective Service System. More than any other topic within the Commission's mandate, the question of expanding Selective Service registration to all Americans, regardless of gender, evoked a range of passionate and deeply held moral, legal, and practical views. The Commission listened to diverse perspectives from the American people, consulted with experts from a wide variety of disciplines and groups, and examined the available evidence surrounding the issue. After

extensive deliberations, the Commission ultimately decided that it is in the national security interest of the United States that all Americans, men and women, register for Selective Service and be prepared to serve in the event a draft is enacted by Congress and the President.

The core function of the Selective Service System is to deliver individuals qualified for induction into military service to meet a wide range of Department of Defense personnel needs in the event of a national emergency, which includes non combat and combat positions.<sup>3</sup> Throughout American history, unanticipated force demands have occurred and most conflicts have persisted longer than initially projected. In times of unmet personnel needs, the Department of Defense has regularly resorted to reducing quality standards, harming our armed forces' ability to respond to national security threats.<sup>4</sup> Should circumstances necessitate a draft, including women in the pool of individuals eligible for selection would improve the military's ability to maintain higher military standards. Of the 17 to 24 year old cohort, equal proportions of women and men meet initial military accession standards – an estimated 29.3 percent of women versus 29.0 percent of men.<sup>5</sup> Women have served in every war throughout American history, and more than 224,000 serve in the U.S. Armed Forces today. Since the decision by the

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, 16 million men – 10 million of whom were conscripted – served during World War II. Over half of all enlisted personnel in the U.S. military worked in just three occupations: mechanics, administrative and clerical workers, and providers of services to the force. See The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, *The Report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force*, 44, <https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph/MG265/images/webS0243.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> "Project 100,000: New Standards Program" (Washington, DC, RAND, September 1966), <https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/MG265/images/webG1318.pdf>; Arnold Isaacs, "Book Review: McNamara's Folly," review of McNamara's Folly: The Use of Low-IQ Troops in the Vietnam War, by Hamilton Gregory, Modern War Institute, August 18, 2016, <https://mwi.usma.edu/book-review-mcnamaras-folly/>; and Jerry D. Morelock, "McNamara's Folly: Lowering the Standards to Fill the Ranks," Vietnam Magazine, December 2016, <https://www.historynet.com/mcnamaras-folly-lowering-standards-fill-ranks.htm>.

<sup>5</sup> JAMRS estimates that 29.3 percent of women in the 17- to 24-year-old bracket are eligible for military service, versus 29.0 percent of men. See Office of the Undersecretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), *Qualified Military Available Report* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 2013).

Department of Defense to open combat roles to women starting in 2016, thousands have proven they are qualified to serve in combat. Therefore, the Commission has found that women and men are equally capable of performing duties that meet the needs of the Department of Defense in a national emergency.

Furthermore, eligibility for the draft has historically centered on the contemporary judgement of Americans regarding who was fit for military service, and registration for the Selective Service System is premised on the notion of a common obligation to provide for the defense of the nation. It is the equal obligation of all Americans to defend the nation if called to do so. Registering women for Selective Service, and if necessary, including women in a draft, acknowledges the value women bring to the U.S. Armed Forces, and the talents, skills, and abilities women would offer in defending the nation in a national emergency.

#### **Advancing Military, National, and Public Service**

Service has been a part of the nation's core values and social fabric since its founding. Together, military, national, and public service shape almost every aspect of American life and help meet the nation's many critical needs. The men and women serving in the armed forces provide for the common defense of the United States; national service members use their time and talents to enhance government capacity and meet national and local needs; and civil servants provide critical functions for the common good. While great work is being done across the nation in each of these areas, cultivating a culture of service in the United States requires immediate action and continued attention as well as a frank discussion of how to increase awareness of, aspiration for, and access to service.

*Advancing Military Service*

The defense of the nation depends on the continued success and strength of America's military. We must ensure the military is strong, sustainable, and capable of meeting new and emerging threats. Since the United States ended the draft in 1973, it has relied exclusively on the All-Volunteer Force to fulfill the nation's military personnel needs. Yet three trends currently pose challenges to the long-term sustainability of the All-Volunteer Force. First, because only a small percentage of Americans – less than 0.5 percent – currently serve on active duty, gaps in understanding and interaction between civilian and military communities have grown. Second, enlisted recruiting remains uneven across the United States, with select geographic regions furnishing a disproportionate share of recruits; in fiscal year 2017, for example, 70 percent of new enlisted accessions came from the South and West. Third, an increasing percentage of American youth are ineligible to join the military without a waiver and even fewer are interested in military service. For example, an estimated 71 percent of youth are ineligible for military service and a mere 14 percent of youth expressed interest in serving in the armed forces.

The Commission's recommendations and legislative proposals would address these trends by increasing awareness of the realities of military life and the full range of occupations available and enhancing the military's ability to attract and retain qualified personnel critical to the long-term success of the All-Volunteer Force. This includes investing more recruiting resources in underrepresented markets and hometown-recruiting programs to help meet recruiting goals and ensure the U.S. military reflects the nation. The Commission further proposes expanding youth programs such as Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps and encouraging broader utilization of tools such as the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Career Exploration Program. The Commission also offers recommendations designed to

strengthen educational pathways to military service, including offering pre-service education opportunities for enlisted personnel conditioned on a military service commitment.

These expanded youth pathways and outreach efforts will significantly increase engagement between the military and the broader American public, provide a new generation of Americans with firsthand information about military life, and promote an acceptance of military service by all communities as a valued career choice. These outcomes are essential to strengthening the resiliency of the U.S. military, and securing our nation.

*Advancing Public Service*

Securing our nation extends beyond military service; public servants are vital to the well-being of the nation and increasingly important to national security in an era of great power competition. With integrity and impartiality, civil servants implement the decisions of elected officials and administer programs that fundamentally enhance our national security and improve the lives of Americans in countless ways.

The Commission found significant challenges within federal civil service personnel systems. With just six percent of the federal workforce under age 30 and more than a third soon eligible to retire, agencies must attract the next generation to public service employment. Yet, basic hiring processes have become dysfunctional. Most agencies do not have effective internship programs—hires of student interns dropped by 90 percent, from 35,000 in 2010 to 4,000 in 2018. Benefits are not competitive with the private sector, especially for those who do not seek careerlong government employment. Congress and the President have granted direct-hire authority to address critical hiring needs, but the personnel system has not been updated with sustainable solutions. The Commission would address these near-term problems so agencies can

function better now while building toward a modern talent-management system, so the federal government is a competitive employer in the long term.

To fix federal hiring, the Commission proposes to transform processes for recruiting applicants and assessing the qualifications of job candidates, such as by eliminating self-assessments, engaging subject-matter experts and hiring managers with subject-matter expertise to rate candidates, and utilizing advanced online assessment tools. The Commission also proposes setting competency standards and improving training for human resources employees and encouraging agencies to make full use of existing hiring authorities, such as by creating new tools to connect qualified applicants eligible for noncompetitive hiring with agency hiring managers.

Bold action is also needed to revitalize the hiring pipelines to federal agencies for students and recent graduates. At minimum, the federal government needs robust internship and recent graduate hiring programs. The Commission proposes reforming and expanding these programs as well as creating new pathways, such as a Public Service Corps that grants college scholarships in exchange for a 4-year public service commitment at a federal agency. Further, the Commission proposes a new Federal Fellowship and Scholarship Center, which would enhance developmental programs for students with critical skills and leadership potential.

The Commission also considers it crucial to modernize how veterans' preference works within the government's standard hiring process of competitive examination. Veterans' preference is not working well for younger veterans seeking to transition to civilian careers nor for agencies that need to hire highly qualified workers. The current preference does a disservice to veterans. Many veterans receive little or no benefit, and the preference routinely advances candidates with weak qualifications, because some veterans who are assessed as minimally

qualified based on their skills and experience are automatically moved to the top of the best qualified list. As a result, hiring managers are often presented with two suboptimal options: hiring a veteran to a position for which they are not a strong fit, doing a disservice to that veteran; or, having received a list of unqualified candidates, return it without making a hire—which is now done on more than half of all competitive service postings. At the same time, noncompetitive hiring options, like the Veterans Recruitment Appointment, are underutilized. The Commission proposes a comprehensive overhaul that would make veterans' preference a tiebreaker between equally qualified candidates and refocus the preference on recently discharged veterans who are transitioning to civilian employment, while expanding eligibility for the Veterans Recruitment Appointment from 3 years to 10 years after discharge. The Commission also proposes to expand noncompetitive eligibility for national service alumni and participants in federal internship, fellowship, and scholarship programs to leverage the skills of, and taxpayer investment in, these individuals.

To attract and retain public servants with critical skills, the Commission has recommended modernizing personnel systems for federal health care professionals, expanding special personnel systems for cybersecurity professionals, piloting a Civilian Cybersecurity Reserve, and investing in the skills of current federal employees.

To foster long-term competitiveness of federal personnel systems, the Commission would offer federal employees more benefit choices, including an option with fully portable retirement benefits, and would expand OPM's demonstration authority to test, refine, and adopt changes to federal agency personnel systems. These changes would help build the evidence base for broader improvements to federal personnel systems that increase competitiveness while preserving a merit-based civil service.

*Advancing National Service*

Each year, the federal government supports more than 300,000 national service positions through the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), the Peace Corps, and programs at other federal agencies, such as YouthBuild. National service improves the lives of participants and recipients, provides much-needed support for local and nonprofit organizations, and creates more united, civically engaged communities. Most importantly perhaps, national service members and volunteers roll up their sleeves and help meet critical needs of the nation, such as providing disaster relief, combating the opioid crisis, preserving parks and public lands, teaching and tutoring public school students in low-resource communities, and more. Already, national service is playing a critical role in how our nation responds to COVID-19. We believe growth of national service opportunities can and should be an integral part of a sustained solution, as communities across the country deal with the adverse impacts of this threat for years to come.

Despite the known positive impacts to individuals and communities, public awareness is one of the most significant barriers to expanding and promoting greater investment and involvement in national service. Most Americans do not know what national service is or how to get involved, and new efforts are needed to boost awareness and recruitment. The Commission's recommendations include means of promoting awareness of CNCS opportunities, including AmeriCorps and Senior Corps, and linking recruiting efforts between military and national service, such that aspiring Americans who are ineligible for either service can learn about other opportunities to serve the country.

Americans who do aspire to dedicate themselves to a national service program face challenges in finding available opportunities and affording the experience. To make national service more accessible, Congress should enhance existing infrastructure and grow national service to 1 million annual participants by the year 2031. As one step to achieving this goal, the Commission proposes to create a new national service fellowship program administered by CNCS that would let individuals choose where they want to serve – thus allowing more community, faith-based, and other nonprofit organizations, especially those in rural, tribal, or under-resourced areas, to benefit from the commitment and energy of young Americans. As proposed by the Commission, the fellowship program would be equitably distributed across congressional districts and would ensure inclusion of young Americans from tribal and low-income communities.

The Commission also found that the current living allowance can be a barrier for Americans who want to participate in national service. The Commission believes that every American should have the ability to consider and experience the positive impacts of service. As such, the Commission has recommended the AmeriCorps living allowance and Senior Corps stipend should be increased to more accurately reflect geographic cost-of-living expenses and rising inflation. Enhancing the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award by making it tax exempt, increasing flexibility in how it can be used, and matching it to the average cost of annual in-state tuition at a public university will provide greater choice and serve as a stronger, more attractive incentive as Americans struggle to meet rising tuition costs and student loan debt.

#### **Elevating All Forms of Service**

The Commission's review of military, national, and public service illuminated the need for better coordination of service efforts among the various disjointed agencies and organizations

that perform management and oversight. Despite the critical role of service in our country, currently there is no single entity responsible for advancing and coordinating service initiatives across the federal government—no focal point for valuable cross-service initiatives, including ways to attract individuals with critical skills to serve their communities and the nation. Establishing an interagency council within the Executive Office of the President, chaired by a presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed official, would elevate all streams of service and provide a forum for encouraging coordination, communication, and promulgation of best practices across military, national, and public service as well as advancing joint efforts to promote service.

The Commission also recognized that many service organizations, across all forms of service, face challenges identifying candidates interested in or eligible for service. As a result, the Commission believes there is significant value in creating a platform that can function as “one-stop shop” for service opportunities—a virtual clearing house that could connect service organizations with potential talent. After exploring several existing and previous models, the Commission proposes an interactive online platform that would consolidate opportunities in military, national, and public service. This approach will expose Americans to a wider range of opportunities and encourage them to explore different ways to serve their country. In addition, the Commission has recommended that this platform incorporate a mechanism for Americans to indicate their willingness to perform military, national, or public service, generally as well as in emergencies, and upload their qualifications. This would provide service organizations a national roster to recruit from, allowing for more proactive recruiting.

Finally, as the Commission traveled the country in search of ways to engage more Americans in service, nearly every conversation or meeting included a passionate call to improve

civic education. Leaders in military, national, and public service, as well as Americans from all walks of life, stressed civic education's ability to increase Americans' awareness of, aspiration for, and access to service and recommended that the Commission develop ways to enhance and expand civic education throughout the United States. The Commission also believes it is necessary to significantly expand the practice of service-learning—a teaching method that integrates classroom teaching with community service. Research suggests that students who participate in service-learning demonstrate better academic performance and a deeper understanding of civic responsibility. To that end, the Commission recommended that Congress make a significant financial commitment to jump-start a nationwide revitalization of civic education and service learning. The Commission believes that by appropriating these funds, the federal government will lay the foundation to ensure that students at all levels have access to high-quality civic education and service-learning opportunities—from kindergarten to 12th grade, and beyond.

Three and a half years ago, Congress charged our Commission with something never done before: conduct a comprehensive and holistic review of all forms of service to the nation. In doing so, we saw firsthand how service is a fundamental part of who we are as Americans, and how we meet our challenges. COVID-19 represents one of the most all-encompassing and unprecedented challenges in the history of the United States. Yet the potential for service is currently untapped. By igniting the extraordinary potential for service, our recommendations will address critical national security and domestic needs, expand economic and educational opportunities, unite our people in common purpose, strengthen the civic fabric of the nation, and establish a robust culture of service. Bold action is needed. Incremental changes and small improvements are not enough.

We call on Congress and the President to invest in the American people and the security of the nation by taking action. Now is the time—and *Inspired to Serve* is the plan—to strengthen service and achieve the vision of every American, inspired and eager to serve.

**The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck, Chairman**

The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck, Chairman Dr. Heck served three terms in the U.S. House of Representatives from 2011 to 2017, representing the 3rd District of Nevada. During that time, he was a member of the Armed Services Committee, where he chaired the subcommittee on Military Personnel; the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, where he chaired the subcommittee on Technical & Tactical Intelligence; and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. From 2004 to 2008, Dr. Heck served in the Nevada State Senate, where he was Vice Chair of the Transportation and Homeland Security Committee, and a member of the Commerce & Labor, Natural Resources, and Human Resources & Education committees.

A graduate of the Pennsylvania State University with a degree in health education, he received his medical degree from the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine; he completed his Emergency Medicine Residency at Albert Einstein Medical Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Board-certified in emergency medicine, he is a fellow of both the American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians and the American College of Emergency Physicians. He was the Operational Medical Director for the Southern Nevada Health District in Las Vegas, Nevada, and served as the Medical Director for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. Dr. Heck was the founder and President of Specialized Medical Operations, Inc., a corporation dedicated to providing cutting-edge emergency response training, consulting, and operational support to law enforcement, emergency services, military special operations, and business and industry. From 1998 to 2003, Dr. Heck was the Medical Director of the Casualty Care Research Center of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in Bethesda, Maryland.

An active member of the United States Army Reserve, Dr. Heck holds the rank of Brigadier General and is currently assigned as the Commanding General, 807th Medical Command. He is a graduate of the U.S. Army War College with a master's in strategic studies. Dr. Heck currently serves as President of RedRock Government Relations, where he oversees a team that provides insightful and innovative strategic guidance to help clients achieve their public policy goals.

**The Honorable Mark Gearan**  
**Vice Chair for National and Public Service**

The Honorable Mark Gearan, Vice Chair for National and Public Service Mr. Gearan's career has included leadership roles in public service and higher education. Mr. Gearan is currently the Director of the Institute of Politics at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. Previously, he served as President of Hobart and William Smith Colleges for 18 years. In government he has served as the Director of the Peace Corps, White House Director of Communications, and Deputy Chief of Staff. Mr. Gearan has been engaged in national and international service organizations, including as Chair of the Corporation for National and Community Service and board member for Points of Light, Jesuit Volunteer Corps, and the Leadership Council for the Franklin Project.

In higher education, he has served as Chair of the Annapolis Group, Chair of Campus Compact, and Chair of the Talloires Network, as well as board member of the National Association of Independent Colleges and the New York State Council of Independent Colleges. He earned his bachelor's degree in cum laude from Harvard University and his law degree from Georgetown University. He is the recipient of 13 honorary degrees.

**Mr. Steven Barney, Commissioner**

Mr. Barney served as the General Counsel to the Committee on Armed Services in the U.S. Senate, supporting 26 elected U.S. Senators making up the full committee and six subcommittees to plan, develop, draft, and ensure congressional passage of the annual National Defense Authorization Act. He was the lead professional staff member responsible for defense personnel programs, including support for the active force of over 1.3 million service members. Mr. Barney also served for over 22 years in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the U.S. Navy, leading military and civilian legal professionals and staff at sea and ashore. During that service, he worked as the Inspector General of the Naval Legal Service Command, and he was the Fleet Judge Advocate for the U.S. Fleet Forces Command in Norfolk and the U.S. Seventh Fleet in Japan. He retired in the grade of Captain in 2013. He received his law degree from Suffolk University Law School, his bachelor's degree from Saint Michael's College, and his master's from the U.S. Naval War College.



---

---

**DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

MAY 19, 2021

---

---



Congress of the United States  
Washington, D.C. 20515

**The Honorable Peter A. DeFazio**  
**Testimony for the House Armed Services Committee**  
**Full Committee Hearing: “Recommendations of the National Commission on Military,  
National, and Public Service”**  
**May 19, 2021**

Chairman Smith and Ranking Member Rogers:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony as part of the House Armed Services Committee’s hearing on the recommendations of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (NCMNPS).

As you know, the military draft has not been used since 1973, when President Nixon ended the Vietnam War draft and created an all-volunteer force. President Ford ended draft registration in 1975. Unfortunately, despite all evidence demonstrating it was unneeded, President Carter reinstated draft registration in 1980 largely for political reasons. Military draft registration has existed ever since, requiring all men aged 18-26 to register with the Selective Service System (SSS). **It should be repealed altogether.**

Alongside Congressman Rodney Davis, I’ve reintroduced bipartisan legislation – [H.R. 2509, the Selective Service Repeal Act](#) – to repeal the Military Selective Service Act (MSSA) and the draft registration system. Senators Ron Wyden and Rand Paul have introduced identical legislation in the Senate: [S. 1139](#).

The SSS is an unnecessary, unwanted, archaic, wasteful, and punitive bureaucracy that violates Americans’ civil liberties. The annual funding directed to the SSS could be better spent on encouraging and enhancing public service or reducing our federal deficit. It’s beyond time for Congress to repeal the SSS once and for all.

**The SSS subjects individuals to unnecessarily severe penalties**

Currently, men who fail to register with the SSS can be severely penalized by both the federal government and state governments. This could include years in prison, hundreds-of-thousands of dollars in fines, and the denial of federal student loans, grants, benefits, citizenship, job training, and federal employment. Various state laws also penalize individuals for failing to register with the SSS, including denial of driver’s licenses, state employment, and other services. Men who fail to register by their 26<sup>th</sup> birthday face these penalties for life, unless they can successfully appeal – which can be expensive, protracted, and require resources that many individuals don’t have.

According to USA Today, “Selective Service statistics suggest that more than 1 million men have been denied some government benefit because they weren’t registered for the draft.”<sup>1</sup>

**Unfortunately, low-income individuals and people of color are likely the ones most adversely impacted by these severe penalties.**

---

<sup>1</sup> “For a million U.S. men, failing to register for the draft has serious, long-term consequences,” *USA Today*; Gregory Korte; April 2, 2019; <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2019/04/02/failing-register-draft-women-court-consequences-men/3205425002/>.

It makes no sense to keep these unnecessarily severe penalties on the books for a hypothetical military draft that neither the Department of Defense (DOD) nor experts can conceivably imagine ever occurring, under a system that maintains inaccurate and unreliable data.

**We've known for decades that the SSS is redundant and unnecessary**

The Pentagon and Republican and Democratic administrations have consistently agreed there is no military or national security imperative to reinstate the draft. I learned this firsthand during the Carter administration while serving as a congressional aide to Oregon Congressman Jim Weaver, when I obtained a draft copy of then-Selective Service Director Dr. Bernard Rostker's report<sup>2</sup> stating that military draft registration was "redundant and unnecessary."<sup>3</sup> Oregon Senator Mark Hatfield entered Dr. Rostker's report, which the Carter administration tried to hide from the public, into the Congressional Record.<sup>4</sup>

Ever since the SSS's dubious reinstatement, military leaders have acknowledged that there is no realistic scenario in which the military anticipates ever reinstating a military draft. For example, in response to a 2012 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report urging the DOD to reassess the military necessity of the SSS, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense at the time wrote to the GAO stating that DOD had completed a reassessment and concluded "that there is no longer an immediate military necessity for the Selective Service System...DOD has no operational plans that envision mobilization at a level that would require conscription."<sup>5</sup>

There is an ongoing myth among some proponents of draft registration that we should maintain the SSS for national security reasons "just in case." A memorandum published by NCMNPS staff<sup>6</sup> echoed this misconception, claiming: "Although the DoD has no current plans to rely on conscription, the nation has historically relied upon the SSS to provide personnel to fight and win the nation's wars and asserts that the United States must retain the ability to respond to unanticipated crises." In his 2019 testimony to the NCMNPS<sup>7</sup>, Dr. Rostker points out that the staff memorandum's "statement is misleading. It is an incorrect reading of our national history and the history of the military draft." Dr. Rostker continues:

In fact, a pre-mobilization draft only existed after World War II and impacted the conflicts in Korea and Vietnam. In Vietnam it proved so divisive that it was replaced by an all-volunteer force we have today. A more correct reading of history shows that we have engaged in active military conflict numerous times since 1973 without the "help" of the Selective Service System, including the longest military conflict in our history. There are many reasons why we have been able to do so which negates the need for conscription. Most significant is the change in military technology which makes the need for a mass of untrained manpower, the very thing the draft provides, unnecessary and actually a burden. Today the Army does not need and cannot absorb the mass of untrained and unskilled men, and potentially women, the draft would provide. If

<sup>2</sup> *Improving Capability to Mobilize Military Manpower: A Report by the Director of the Selective Service*, draft working document, Washington, D.C.: Director of the Selective Service System.

<sup>3</sup> "Selective Service Told Carter Registration Is 'Unnecessary'", *Washington Post*; George C. Wilson; February 23, 1980; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1980/02/23/selective-service-told-carter-registration-is-unnecessary/cce24e6e-6335-44b3-8b19-1a91293b703a/>.

<sup>4</sup> "Improving Capability to Mobilize Military Manpower," *Congressional Record*; Senator Mark Hatfield; February, 27, 1980; <https://defazio.house.gov/sites/defazio.house.gov/files/Congressional%20Record%2C%20Feb%2027%2C%201980%2C%20Rep%20.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> "National Security: DOD Should Reevaluate Requirements for the Selective Service System," Government Accountability Office; June 7, 2012; <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-12-623>.

<sup>6</sup> "Staff Memorandum: Expanding Selective Service Registration to All Americans," National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service; <https://inspire2serve.gov/api/files/195>.

<sup>7</sup> Military and Public Service Policy Forum, Day 1, Part 2; C-SPAN; Testimony of Dr. Bernard Rostker, minutes 24:58 - 34:17, <https://www.c-span.org/video/?460068-2/national-commission-military-national-public-service-forum-part-2>; A pre-written version of Dr. Rostker's testimony to NCMNPS can be viewed here: <https://www.inspire2serve.gov/api/files/206>.

history tells us anything, it is that when we have needed to build a mass Army, as we did for World War I and World War II, there was sufficient time to develop a new Selective Service System from scratch; in the former case from the handbook written after the Civil War, and in the latter case from the work of a planning cell at the Department of War. Such a planning cell could again meet any future needs for the re-establishment of [a] military draft.

It's clear that the idea of a peace-time military draft registration system is an obsolete relic that has no place within the realities of 21<sup>st</sup> century warfare.

**The SSS does not maintain an accurate or reliable database**

Even if a military draft was reinstated, the SSS wouldn't provide an accurate registry or achieve its stated goals. According to Dr. Rostker's 2019 testimony to the NCMNPS:

"As I've argued in my recent paper<sup>8</sup> the current system of registration is ineffective and, frankly, less than useless. It does not provide a comprehensive nor an accurate database upon which to implement conscription. As I laid out, it systematically lacks large segments of the eligible male population, and for those that are included, the currency of information contained is questionable.

Numerically, let me suggest that the database of those eligible for conscription should be at least 93 percent comprehensive and 98 percent accurate; levels that are far from achieved by the current system..."

Wadi Yakhur, a former Chief of Staff for the Selective Service Administration during the Trump administration, stated that millions of American men have failed to register with the SSS.<sup>9</sup> Men aged 18-26 are also technically required to notify the SSS if they change their address, but this requirement is almost universally ignored. This underscores the inaccuracy and inadequacy of the SSS even if a draft was somehow reinstated.

**The SSS violates Americans' civil liberties:**

Coercing Americans into the military – absent an extreme national emergency – has no place in a free and democratic society. Civil liberties groups, faith organizations, pro-peace activists, and more oppose the SSS because involuntary military conscription is a violation of fundamental civil liberties and Americans' constitutional rights. That's why military draft registration has garnered bipartisan support for decades.

**The SSS is a wasteful bureaucracy**

The SSS has cost well over \$800 million over the last 35 years, and it receives approximately \$26 million in funding every fiscal year<sup>10</sup>. Eliminating this obsolete program will save American taxpayers more than \$250 million over ten years.

**Repealing Draft Registration Would Achieve Equality Under the Law**

As you know, after DOD lifted the ban on women serving in combat roles in 2013, some have suggested that women should also be required to register for the military draft in order to achieve equality under the law. **However, equality under the law can also be achieved by repealing military draft registration altogether.** We should not double the number of Americans forced to participate in an obsolete and unnecessarily punitive program that violates their civil liberties. Rather, we should repeal the SSS and finally end this unnecessary program.

<sup>8</sup> "What to Do with the Selective Service System? Historical Lessons and Future Posture," RAND Corporation; Bernard D. Rostker; <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE1197.html>.

<sup>9</sup> "Thousands of Pa. men fail to register with selective service," ABC 27; Kendra Nichols; August 12, 2020; <https://www.abc27.com/news/top-stories/thousands-of-pa-men-fail-to-register-with-selective-service/>.

<sup>10</sup> "The Selective Service System and Draft Registration: Issues for Congress," Congressional Research Service; Kristiy N. Kamareck; Updated May 1, 2020; <https://www.crs.gov/Reports/R44452?source=search&guid=8d7aac033c694954bc8e42720f203719&index=1>.

**Congress Should Pass H.R. 2509/S. 1139, the Selective Service Repeal Act**

I have reintroduced H.R. 2509 – the Selective Service Repeal Act – bipartisan, bicameral legislation to repeal the military draft registration system. The Selective Service Repeal Act would:

- Repeal the Military Selective Service Act (MSSA), which created the SSS.
- Eliminate all penalties for individuals who failed to register with the SSS and ensure there is uniform protection from these penalties in all U.S. states and territories.
- Maintain the federal protections for conscientious objectors contained in the MSSA.

Endorsing organizations of the Selective Service Repeal Act include: Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL), Center on Conscience & War, World BEYOND War, RootsAction.org, Peace Action, CODEPINK, American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), Just Foreign Policy, Pax Christi USA, Truth in Recruitment, the Military Law Task Force of the National Lawyers Guild, Committee Opposed to Militarism and the Draft (COMD), Courage to Resist, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, Antiwar.com, Church of the Brethren, Veterans for Peace, International Peace Research Association (IPRA), War Resisters League.

**Conclusion**

Our professional, all-volunteer military is the finest fighting force in the world. Recruits must compete under exacting standards in order to enlist, which is why military leaders have said time and time again they believe in and prefer an all-volunteer military. What we already knew in the 1970s is still true today: the SSS is an unnecessary, unwanted, archaic, wasteful, punitive, and potentially unconstitutional bureaucracy whose funding could be better spent on encouraging and enhancing public service or reducing our federal deficit.

Instead of expanding draft registration to all Americans aged 18-26 and thus doubling the number of Americans who are subject to the undemocratic and unnecessarily punitive military draft registration system – as some are now proposing to do – we should end draft registration altogether by passing my legislation, the Selective Service Repeal Act.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit testimony today. I appreciate the Committee's time and review of the arguments I've laid out, and I look forward to continued debate over the future of the Selective Service System.

reer he specialized in tax and tariff law and for many years was the principal legislative draftsman for the bills in those fields coming before the Senate, in more recent years Harry has worked very closely with the Committee on Rules and Administration and has given our staff frequent and valuable counseling and drafting assistance.

Harry Littell is an outstanding example of a career public servant. He has skillfully, ably, and tirelessly served the Senate for 33 years. I most sincerely wish him the enjoyment of a long and happy retirement, with his wife Becky and their family of four children. ♦

#### IMPROVING CAPABILITY TO MOBILIZE MILITARY MANPOWER

♦ Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. President, it has always been my belief that it is incumbent upon those charged with the defense of the Nation to choose the least divisive and intrusive means of accomplishing that task. And so, I submit for the Record today a 28-page report, issued January 16 by the Director of the Selective Service, which clearly states that draft registration, in its own words, is "redundant and unnecessary." This report preceded the 63-page February 13 report from the President to Congress on the state of the Selective Service. The option for a postmobilization registration plan, apparently endorsed by the Director of the Selective Service as the most efficient and cost-effective program for mobilization, was excluded from the report sent to Congress. The report I submit today shows that the administration has chosen to either ignore or bury the truth about draft registration.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that this report followed, by almost a month, the brutal Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. As indicated in the official report sent to Congress, the Selective Service mobilization timetable, based on the Department of Defense's specifications, because it is based on "worst case" planning already, includes exigencies like those in Iran and Afghanistan. These war plans require the first inductees within 30 days after an emergency is declared.

The postmobilization registration plan recommended by the Selective Service in the report I am submitting states that the first inductee could be made available within 17 days after mobilization. Under the Carter administration's proposed registration plan, the first inductee could be made available in 10 to 13 days. This would indicate a 4 to 7 day improvement over the capability of the system without draft registration. Either way, the requirements of the Defense Department are exceeded by a healthy margin.

Though the case is clearly made that draft registration is not necessary to carry out the Department of Defense's war plans, and one need not challenge their assumptions to make that case, two factors deserve mention because they strengthen the case against draft registration even more. First, the mobilization requirements assume that there will

be no volunteers. I would remind my colleagues that on June 4, 1917, 10 million men were registered and that on October 16, 1940, 16 million men were registered. I think an argument can be made, Mr. President, that basing our requirements on the assumption that there will be absolutely no volunteers in times of true national emergencies insults the patriotism of the American people.

In addition, given the current training base capacity of the United States, it is unlikely that vast numbers of draftees could be used prior to 30 days after mobilization. Optimistically, Army Reserve units are not to be manned, equipped, and organized until 19 days after mobilization. I urge my colleagues to study this report carefully. I have chosen to make this information public, Mr. President, because the American people, particularly our young people and their parents, have the right to know the truth about the empty symbolism of draft registration.

The report follows:

#### IMPROVED CAPABILITY TO MOBILIZE MILITARY MANPOWER

##### INTRODUCTION

Since 1973, the Armed Services of the United States have operated under an All-Volunteer Force (AVF) concept. Even though inductions under the Military Selective Service Act (MSSA) have been terminated, the Selective Service System is still responsible for providing the increased personnel necessary to man our Armed Services during periods of national emergency. The ability of the Selective Service to support a military mobilization is of concern to the Administration and the Congress. This report examines a number of alternative Selective Service postures and sets forth a course of action to insure that Selective Service can, in a realistic, efficient and equitable manner, meet the emergency manpower needs of the Department of Defense.

#### The Selective Service and the All-Volunteer Force

In 1970, the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force reported that they "unanimously believed that the nation's interest will be (best) served by an all-volunteer force, supported by an effective standby draft." (p. 56) Anticipating the advent of the AVF, the Congress, in 1971, amended the MSSA to provide that:

"The Selective Service System . . . shall . . . be maintained as an active standby organization, with (1) a complete registration and classification structure capable of immediate operations in the event of a national emergency and (2) personnel adequate to reinstate immediately the full operation of the system . . . in the event of a national emergency."

In FY 1973, the AVF became a reality. The last draft calls were issued in December 1972; statutory authority to induct expired in June 1973. On April 1, 1973 the President suspended the requirement that those subject to the MSSA register with the Selective Service System. Classification actions were terminated and local boards, State Headquarters, and appeal boards were closed in FY 1976.

#### The Standby Selective Service System

Under the AVF concept, the Selective Service is to provide a "standby" system to support a military mobilization. The system must be ready, without notice, to provide the untrained manpower that will be required to staff our Armed Services during a military emergency. The specific require-

ment—numbers of people and delivery schedule—are established by the Secretary of Defense.

In the mid 1970's, the Secretary of Defense established an induction requirement which Selective Service believed they could meet with their existing system. In October 1977, however, Defense increased the requirement and moved up the schedule. This change was based upon the worst case scenario in which there are no volunteers or enlistments from the delayed entry pool, and Selective Service provides the entire DOD requirement for untrained manpower. Table 1 contrasts the original and the revised delivery schedules.

TABLE 1.—DOD INDUCTION REQUIREMENT

	1st induction	100,000 inductions	Total inductions in 6 mo
Original.....	M+110	M+150	650,000
Revised.....	M+30	M+60	

M= Mobilization day.

The ability of the Selective Service to meet the revised schedule has been the subject of a number of recent critical reviews, including a major President's Reorganization Project Study. Each study concluded, as did the then Acting Director of Selective Service in a report to the Congress (March 1979), that Selective Service does "not presently have the capability to meet the Department of Defense wartime manpower requirements from our 'deep standby' status."

#### A report to the Congress

The 1980 Defense Authorization Act required that the President address a number of issues pertaining to military manpower procurement policies and the appropriate posture for a "standby" Selective Service. Specifically, Selective Service has addressed five issues posed by the Congress:

The desirability and feasibility of establishing a method of automatically registering persons under the Military Selective Service Act;

The desirability and feasibility of establishing a method of automatically registering persons under the Military Selective Service Act through a centralized automated system using school records and other existing records, together with a discussion of the impact of such a registration on privacy rights and on other constitutional issues;

Whether persons registered under such Act should also be immediately classified and examined or whether classification and examination of registrants should be subject to the discretion of the President;

Such changes in the organization and operation of the Selective Service System as the President determines are necessary to enable the Selective Service System to meet the personnel requirements of the Armed Forces during a mobilization in a more efficient and expeditious manner than is presently possible; and

Such other changes in existing law relating to registration, classification, selection and induction as the President considers appropriate.

In addition, the Conference report accompanying the 1980 DOD Authorization Act charges that:

"The President's recommendations with regard to the feasibility of establishing a registration plan through a centralized automated system should specifically address court decisions with respect to the requirement for issuing induction orders in the proper 'order of call,' as well as those dealing with conscientious objectors, classification procedures, and other relevant court decisions."

February 27, 1980

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4029

"If the President intends to rely on post-mobilization registration plans as the foundation of our mobilization capacity at time of emergency, then the report should also address the extent of testing of the plan that will be done, the acquisition schedule, and capability of computers and other necessary equipment, the extent of agreements with state election officials or other non-Federal agencies, the schedule for training Federal and non-Federal personnel who would be involved in registration, and the likelihood that induction orders issued under such a plan would survive potential court challenges."

The basic problem facing Selective Service is, "How should the Selective Service System operate to meet, efficiently and equitably, the mobilization needs of the Department of Defense for untrained manpower?" In order to address this question, we examined a number of options which correspond to the alternatives suggested by the Congress in the 1980 Defense Authorization Act. Specific options considered were:

1. A post-mobilization participatory (face-to-face) registration plan.
2. Pre-mobilization participatory registration.
3. Pre-mobilization participatory registration and classification.
4. Pre-mobilization participatory registration, classification, and examination.
5. Non-participatory registration.

#### This report

This report reflects the process undertaken to provide an answer to the above question and to choose a course of action designed to insure that Selective Service will be able to carry out its mission in support of the Defense Department. First, we examined the DOD requirement with regard to the Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations (AFEES) capacity to process registrants for induction. This established a minimum responsiveness goal for Selective Service. Next, we examined five options and assess their ability to meet delivery requirements, and their costs. We reviewed the post-mobilization plans previously submitted to the Congress and determined that major improvements could and should be made. We therefore developed a new post-mobilization system, dramatically different from the plan previously presented to the Congress, and determined its cost and responsiveness. Using this plan as a base, we provide for pre-mobilization registration, and estimated the added cost and improved responsiveness. We then considered classification, and classification and examinations, and, again projected the marginal cost and improvement in responsiveness. Our analysis also considered non-participatory registration as an alternative to face-to-face registration. Our basic conclusion was that non-participatory registration is undesirable and that every participatory registration option can more than meet the DOD manpower requirement. The post-mobilization option is by far the most cost effective, and least intrusive, and is the option chosen by Selective Service. The next section of the Report examines that option in detail, and steps taken to build an efficient and equitable standby Selective Service System.

The Standby Selective Service System presented in this report is markedly different from previous standby plans. We highlight the new system with respect to seven subsystems which make up the registration/induction process. The major changes are (1) reliance on the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) to conduct face-to-face registration; (2) the sort of registration forms by USPS into Random Sequence Numbers (RSN) and the creation of computer data files in RSN order and the accelerated promulgation of induction orders; and (3) the reliance on operating, in-

place, testable, Federal infrastructures to support the Selective Service in an emergency, i.e., Social Security Administration and Internal Revenue Service for "keypunch" support and DOD for computer, facilities, and personnel support. This support in no way compromises the administrative independence of the Selective Service and completely reserves for Selective Service the process by which claims for deferments and exemptions are adjudicated.

We also provide an Analysis of the new Standby Selective Service System to determine how flexible it is likely to be in meeting Defense's requirements. Our analysis considered (1) our ability to achieve a given schedule and (2) our ability to achieve a planned rate of production. The total registration/induction system has the capability to meet the DOD induction schedule even with considerable slippage in the assumed timetable or a failure of the Selective Service and/or the AFEES to achieve a given rate of production.

This report goes on to consider a number of additional concerns raised in the Conference report and statutory changes with regard to the new post-mobilization plan. The report concludes with a Summary and Conclusions section which highlights steps already taken to ensure Selective Service's immediate ability to respond to an emergency military mobilization.

#### The DOD requirements

In 1977, DOD asked the Selective Service to develop the capability to start inductions within the first thirty days after mobilization (M+30), and to deliver 100,000 inductees to Defense by M+60, with 60,000 inductees to take place during the first six months of mobilization. This was based upon the worst case scenario, namely that Selective Service would be the only source of untrained manpower.

As noted, the DOD requirements are stated as "inductions" and as such require the closest coordination between the Selective Service and DOD's Military Enlistment Processing Command (MEPCOM). In the "induction" process, the Selective Service:

Registers those subject to the MSSA.  
Determines the order of those who will be called for service.

Orders registrants to take physical and mental examinations.

Issues orders for induction.

Classifies individuals.  
Adjudicates claims for deferments, postponements, and exemptions.

The Military Enlistment Processing Command, through their 67 Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations (AFEES):  
Provides physical and mental examinations.

Inducts qualified registrants into the Armed Services.

In order to understand clearly the implications of the Defense requirement on the Selective Service, we have worked with MEPCOM to determine the AFEES capability to process registrants during a military mobilization. Our analysis shows that the AFEES have the ability to give at least 14,000 physical and mental examinations per day, 6 days per week during mobilization. This means that:

Historical analysis indicates that depending upon the time of the year, the Selective Service System must issue as many as 35,000 induction orders per day in order to guarantee that 14,000 registrants will report to the AFEES to take physical and mental examinations. (Induction orders would be issued ten days before an individual is expected to report to an AFEES.)

Based upon a historical 80 percent physical and mental examination acceptance rate, the system can induct 7,000 per day, 6 days per week.

The AFEES could accept registrants as late as M+43 and still provide 100,000 inductions by M+60.

Earlier delivery of registrants to the AFEES would allow them to operate below maximum capacity or the SSS/MEPCOM system to induct more than 100,000 by M+60.

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE OPTIONS

Selective Service considered in detail the five options in terms of the ability each provides to carry out our mission. Before describing the options and the results of our analysis in more detail, it is important to note that there are a number of features which are common to two or more of these options. The most important of these are:

United States Postal Service will carry out the face-to-face registration. USPS has agreed to undertake the task of face-to-face registration under all participatory registration options (Options 1, 2, 3 and 4). The USPS is attractive because it is a single command infrastructure with facilities and personnel, and a communication/transportation network extending to every corner of the country. Postal locations are widely known. USPS has provided similar services for the Department of State (passport applications) and for the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (alien registration). USPS is capable of storing registration forms, transporting materials and training personnel. They can sort registration material and transport forms to central locations for data processing. The USPS has also agreed to joint tests of their capability to register draft eligible individuals. The first such test will be conducted later this year.

The Emergency Military Manpower Procurement System procedures will be employed wherever possible. Both pre- and post-mobilization participatory registration options (1 and 2) will employ the procedures incorporated in the Emergency Military Manpower Procurement System (EMMPPS). A major feature of EMMPPS is that it eliminates pre-induction examinations and classification. After registration and a Random Sequence Number (RSN) lottery, all registrants will be administratively classified I-A, ready for induction. Induction orders would be centrally issued in RSN order by the Director of Selective Service. After receiving an induction order, a registrant would either report to an AFEES for examination (and if found physically and mentally qualified, would be inducted), or would request a deferment or exemption. Such requests would be processed by local boards.

A new data processing system will support all options. Everyone who has looked at the current state of the Selective Service has concluded that the ADP system is inadequate. In order to immediately provide the capability to register and induct, the Selective Service and the Department of Defense have agreed that the United States Army Management Systems Support Agency (USAMSSA) will provide computer support for the operation of EMMPPS. This is only an interim step. A joint Selective Service/MEPCOM computer center is planned for the Fall of 1980. The joint center will provide a single computer facility completely dedicated to the registration/induction process while preserving the operational and administrative independence of the Selective Service.

The Selective Service field structure will be reactivated in accordance with the requirements of each option. The Selective Service will recruit and train local and appeal board members and will provide for the establishment of area offices under all options. In an emergency (Options 1 and 2), the Department of Defense will provide selected facilities and personnel temporarily detailed from military recruiting commands to augment and support area office operations. If Selective Service undertakes pre-mobilization

classification of registrants (Option 3), area offices will be established and staffed.

Given these common features, the following discussion highlights the responsiveness, cost, structure and operating procedures of the Selective Service System under each option. (Cost and personnel requirements are based upon the assumption that the MSSA will be amended to require women to register with the Selective Service.)

**Option 1. Post-Mobilization Participatory Registration.** The discussion of this option reflects major changes from the post-mobilization plans previously presented by Selective Service. Our new plans provide that the USFS register one year of birth group (4 million men and women) four days after notification of mobilization (M+4). USFS employees will review completed forms, witness the registrant's signature, and provide the registrant with a copy of the form as a receipt. Two weeks later USFS will begin continuous registration of 18 year olds. Selective Service will conduct a lottery on the evening of M+4. The USFS will sort registration cards by lottery number and forward sorted data to IRS and/or SSA regional offices. Selective Service reserve officers will be located at IRS/SSA regional offices and will receive and ensure the security of the registration forms. The IRS/SSA will keypunch registrant data which will be transmitted to a central computer center. The Director of Selective Service, acting for the President and using EEMPS, will issue induction orders starting on M+7.

Concurrently, 434 area offices will open at pre-designated recruiting office locations. Fifteen hundred pre-trained personnel will transfer from the Armed Services Recruiting Commands to Selective Service to augment reserve officers already assigned to Selective Service. Area offices will provide administrative assistance to local boards. State Headquarters will also be reestablished to provide administrative assistance to area offices. Regional offices will continue to support both.

Under this option, Selective Service expects to exceed the current DOD requirement for inductees. Registration will occur at M+4 and induction notices will be issued starting on M+7. Inductions will begin on M+17 at the rate of 7,000 per day, the estimated capacity of MEPCOM. With this sustained rate, 100,000 inductions could be made by M+35 and 650,000 inductions by M+125.

The estimated yearly recurring cost for this option, i.e., base level cost to keep the Selective Service System in a true standby posture, is \$9.7M.

**Option 2. Pre-Mobilization Participatory Registration.** The USFS would conduct face-to-face pre-mobilization registration in largely the same manner as they would under emergency mobilization plans. Initially, USFS would conduct a start-up registration of one year of birth group (approximately 4 million 19 year olds) over a period of about a month. Continuous registration of 18 year olds would start shortly thereafter. Registration would occur during regular USFS business hours at classified post offices. The IRS/SSA would key only the registration data for the initial group. Data generated from continuous registration and change of address notices would be processed by Selective Service.

In the event of mobilization, the Director of Selective Service, acting for the President, would immediately classify registrants 1A and begin to issue order for induction. Registrants would begin to report to the AFERS the morning of M+10, seven days ahead of the Option 1 schedule.

As under Option 1, 434 area offices would be established at Recruiting Services upon mobilization, and the Recruiting Services would provide 1,500 pre-trained people to assist.

Under Option 2, Selective Service could order sufficient numbers of registrants on M-day so that the AFERS could immediately induct 7,000 per day, the maximum capacity of MEPCOM. At this rate, 100,000 inductions would be made by M+26 and 650,000 by M+117.

Estimated cost for Option 2 is \$11.3M in one-time costs and \$23.8M in recurring costs. This is an additional \$14.1M in annual recurring costs above the costs of post-mobilization registration (Option 1).

The additional one-time pre-mobilization costs would be \$5.8M for the USFS to conduct the initial registration and \$5.7M to the IRS/SSA to key these data. The increase in recurring costs would include \$6.8M to the USFS to conduct continuous registration, \$4M for additional rent, travel, printing, reproduction, and other services. About \$4.3M in additional costs would be for increased personnel; three hundred twenty additional people would be needed in the regional offices to key and input registration cards to record address changes. Fifty-nine additional people would be needed for management, supervision and staff support.

**Option 3. Pre-Mobilization Registration and Classification.** If the President directs pre-mobilization registration and classification, the Selective Service would modify its Emergency Military Manpower Procurement System (EMMPS) procedures.

Under this option, the USFS would register individuals as before. Registration data for the first group would be keyed by the IRS/SSA. Four hundred thirty-four area offices would be established to handle follow-up data entry and would, in addition, work with local draft boards in classification. At the same time, 97 appeal boards would be established. Registrants would be given continuous opportunity to appeal or petition for change of classification.

Pre-mobilization classification of registrants under Option 3 would not improve mobilization response times. First inductions would still occur at M+10. One hundred thousand inductions would be made by M+26 and 650,000 by M+117. The benefit of classification before mobilization is not response time, but in a more orderly induction process, since orders would be issued only to those already classified. It should be noted, however, that individuals who did not request reclassification in the pre-mobilization period might still do so during mobilization.

The additional costs incurred by reinstating pre-mobilization classification would be determined in part by the numbers classified. Two sub-options were considered: (1) classify only enough registrants to insure the delivery of 100,000 qualified inductees, and (2) classify an entire year of birth group annually.

In order to provide 100,000 qualified inductees, Selective Service would classify approximately one million registrants. Additional staff would be needed to handle classification questionnaires, make and maintain registrant files, request additional documentation when required, decide administrative reclassifications, support local boards, update data bases, notify registrants of results, arrange for personal appearances, and respond to queries. The one-time costs would increase by about \$2.8M and recurring costs would increase by \$12.0M—\$5.7M for increased systems support, \$0.2M for ADP support, and \$6.1M for additional personnel.

If an entire year group (about 4 million men and women) is classified each year, total costs would increase significantly, but with no increase in responsiveness. One-time costs would be about the same for classifying 4 million as for classifying one million. However, recurring costs would increase—\$23.1M for additional staff and \$6.4M for system support, e.g., communications, rent, printing, travel, and services. About 1,800 additional

people would be needed to handle the additional 3 million classifications, and another 450 people for management and supervision.

**Option 4. Pre-Mobilization Classification and Examination.** Under this concept, registrants with specified classification would be ordered to an AFERS for pre-induction examination. Those found acceptable would be available for induction after a check of physical status. Army regulations provide that physical examinations are valid for one year. If an individual is inducted within a year after his examination, only a physical inspection is required. If the delay is more than a year, a new examination would be called for.

Responsiveness would be improved because MEPCOM is able to process pre-examined individuals more quickly. Current estimates are that MEPCOM could accept up to 17,500 pre-examined individuals per day and that about 16,000 of these (92%) would be found acceptable and inducted.

As with pre-mobilization classification, two sub-options are: (1) examine sufficient numbers of classified registrants to insure 100,000 qualified inductees and (2) examine an entire year of birth group annually. In either case, induction orders would be issued on M-day, and inductions would begin at M+10. Initially at a rate of 16,000 per day. If a portion of a year group is examined, 100,000 qualified males could be inducted by M+16 and 650,000 individuals could be inducted by M+108. If the entire year group is examined in the pre-mobilization period, then the total 650,000 inductions could be made by M+56. Both cases exceed DOD's stated requirements for inductees.

Under this option, additional costs would be incurred by both the Selective Service and the Department of Defense. If a decision is made to examine only enough people to meet DOD's 60-day requirement, Selective Service would plan to order 600,000 registrants for examination. Additional Selective Service resources would be needed to process examination results, schedule transportation for the registrants to take examinations, answer queries, and schedule the additional workloads for local boards. One-time costs would not increase in either case since area offices would already be operational. The additional recurring costs would total \$11.4M if part of year group is examined and \$6.3M if an entire year group is examined annually.

The costs of the examinations would be borne by the Department of the Army. The Office of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel provided an estimate of \$75.00 per examination based on the expected use of contract physicians. Re-examinations would cost about \$10.00. Using these projected costs, examining part of a year group would cost about \$45M and examining an entire year group (approximately 3.6 million) would cost about \$266.0M.

**Option 5. Non-Participatory Registration.** The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the General Accounting Office proposed that Selective Service consider relying on existing computer files to form a list of draft eligibles instead of a planning on a traditional face-to-face registration. We have studied this proposal in terms of (1) our ability to construct a list of sufficient size and accuracy from which to induct the required personnel, and (2) the impact of such procedures on the Privacy Act, on other related statutes, on the MSSA, and on Constitutional questions of equal protection and due process.

The Selective Service, in order to carry out the draft, needs the name, address, and birth date of males subject to the MSSA. (If females were subject to the MSSA, we would also need to know the sex of the registrant.) At a minimum, we need valid data (correct addresses) on sufficient numbers of people to insure we can induct the required number of people; 5:1 in order to induct/induction

February 27, 1980

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

4031

ratio is planned. A master list must be available no later than M+20 to insure that we can deliver the first inductees to Defense by M+30.

The most comprehensive data base available is the master Social Security Administration (SSA) file which contains all the needed data except current address. Based upon our survey of five Federal agencies (Agriculture, HEW, Justice, Commerce, and Treasury); and the Education, Motor Vehicle, and Voter Registration agencies in six states, we found the most comprehensive source of "current" address is the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

The Congressional Budget Office, using Department of Labor employment statistics, has estimated that 85 percent of the 19-20 year old population work some time during each year, and therefore probably filed an income Tax Return. The Bureau of the Census reports that the mobility rate of the prime age group (18-26) ranged from 16 to 34 percent during the period 1975 to 1976. Our best estimate is that, unless a master list is updated regularly, approximately 25 percent of the addresses will be invalid by the end of a year. A merged SSA/IRS list will be most accurate immediately after April 15, and will become progressively inaccurate until the following year's filing. Given our estimates of an 85 percent IRS coverage and 25 percent mobility rates, a master list with "valid" addresses may capture as little as 60 percent of the draft eligible population. This, however, appears to be sufficient to meet DOD's induction requirements.

As noted, any registration system must be able to provide a list in about twenty days. CBO indicates that these agencies "already have a major tape exchange program in effect, and they estimate it would take about three to five days to merge the files." However, in response to inquiries from Selective Service, Social Security indicated it would take a month to deliver the data, and IRS indicated two months to perform the match and create the merged file. It appears that in order to insure a master file, we should plan on merging SSA and IRS data in the pre-mobilization period.

While the construction of a master list from SSA and IRS computer files is feasible, questions have been raised on privacy and constitutional guarantees of equal treatment and due process. All Federal agencies surveyed advised that not only would the Privacy Act of 1974 have to be amended, but prohibitions on individual agencies would also have to be changed. (IRS has specific prohibitions in Title 26.) Moreover, IRS believes that, "to use the Internal Revenue Service system for the purpose suggested would adversely affect our extremely important mission in a number of ways. It may have a significant impact on compliance in the area of withholdings and return filings . . . if withholding records are used in the military induction process, draft protesters would be presented with an irresistible temptation to become tax protesters."

The Selective Service General Counsel has advised that non-participatory registration would require an amendment to the MSSA, and that in his view such an amendment would violate both due process and equal protection guarantees of the Constitution.

Under present plans, not everyone eligible to serve is likely to be called. A system in which induction into military service is systematically reserved for those who have social security numbers, can be located because they have filed an income Tax Return, and have not moved, does not appear to be a reasonable means for the Congress to carry out its purpose. This is particularly true since there are other ways open to the Congress—both pre- and post-mobilization fac-

to-face registration—which guarantee due process under the law. The argument that merged computer files will save money and avoid generational conflict does not appear compelling enough to violate Constitutional guarantees.

It is often argued that face-to-face registration will not provide more names and addresses than non-participatory registration, and, therefore, the two systems are equivalent. This does not appear to be correct. We estimate a face-to-face registration will provide a list over 80 percent complete compared to as little as 80 percent by means of computer merger. More importantly, as long as we give everyone a fair opportunity to register, we will legally account for 100 percent of the population eligible for military service under the MSSA, i.e., those who do not register are in violation of the law and subject to legal penalty.

Non-participatory registration also appears to violate standards of equal protection because two people who are identical, except that one recently moved, would be treated differently in terms of the probability they would have to serve. The administration of such a scheme would produce such disparity of treatment of persons similar in all legally recognized ways that there can be no question that there would not be equal treatment.

In reviewing the above arguments, it is the position of the Director of the Selective Service that while it is technically feasible to construct a master list of draft eligible individuals, and meet the DOD requirements, such a system would be neither fair or equitable. Construction of a master list during peacetime raises serious privacy questions.

Moreover, such a system would effectively excuse as much as 40 percent of the eligible population from military service. The system would not be perceived as fair or equitable and could be challenged successfully as a violation of the Constitution. For these reasons, the Director has concluded that a non-participatory registration scheme is not a viable system for Selective Service.

## RECOMMENDATION

Our analysis of non-participatory registration suggests that while the system is technically feasible it is not likely to be perceived as fair or equitable and would be subject to serious Constitutional challenges. Moreover, such a system does not seem necessary in light of the projected ability of all options to surpass the required DOD induction schedule. For these reasons, the non-participatory registration concept is not recommended.

Our analysis of the various face-to-face registration options suggests that the post-mobilization plan is preferable. Table 1 shows the responsiveness, number of pre-mobilization full and part-time personnel, and initial and recurring costs for each option. The post-mobilization option should substantially exceed Defense requirements, employs the fewest number of full time personnel, and costs the least. While costs and staffing should not be the determining factor, the reduced delivery time provided by the other options is redundant and unnecessary. The post-mobilization option, subject to field testing later this year and the international situation at any time, is recommended as the basis for an effective Standby Selective Service.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

Summary of options	Post-mobilization registration	Pre-mobilization registration	Pre-mobilization registration with classification		Pre-mobilization registration with classification and examination	
			Part of year group	Entire year group	Part of year group	Entire year group
Responsiveness (DOD requirement):						
1st induction (M+30).....	M+17	M+10	M+10	M+10	M+10	M+10
100,000 (M+60).....	M+33	M+26	M+26	M+26	M+17(6)	M+15
650,000 (M+180).....	M+124	M+177	M+117	M+117	M+108	M+56
Pre-mobilization employment:						
Full time.....	116	495	1,080	2,385	1,535	4,960
Part time.....	715	715	300	190	200	0
Pre-mobilization costs:						
SSS initial.....		11.5	14.1	14.1	14.1	14.1
SSS recurring.....	9.7	23.8	35.8	65.4	47.2	123.6
DOD recurring.....					45.0	266.2
Total.....	9.7	23.8	35.8	65.4	92.2	389.9

## STANDBY SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

## Calendar of events

In the event of a national emergency and the reinstatement of the draft, the Selective Service, operating under EMMPS, will initiate the following process:

## Time and event:

M. The President declares a national emergency and orders that registration be reinstated.

M + 1-M + 3. Civilians in specific year of birth groups are directed to their U. S. Post Office facility to register.

M + 4. The USPS carries out the registration and ships completed forms to regional postal processing centers.

The Selective Service conducts a lottery after the registration has been completed and establishes the "order-of-call" based on Random Sequence Number (RSN).

Selective Service area offices are opened under an agreement with the Department of Defense to turn over recruiting command facilities and personnel to Selective Service.

M + 5. The USPS sorts registration material by RSN and ships the cards to data entry facilities.

M + 6. The Internal Revenue Service and/or the Social Security Administration data entry facilities receive the registration cards and begin to keypunch the data in RSN order-of-call sequence. Keypunched data are transmitted to the central Selective Service computer.

Congress authorizes the President to induct personnel into the Armed Forces.

M + 7. The Director of Selective Service pursuant to regulations issued by the President under Section 5(d) of the Military Selective Service Act (MSSA) issues orders for induction in the proper RSN "order-of-call".

M + 8-M + 17. Registrants receiving orders for induction can: Report to AFES for processing, request an exemption or deferment, or do neither.

If a registrant reports to an AFES, he will receive a physical and mental examination, and if found fit, will be inducted.

A registrant may request reclassification by filing a claim with an area office of the Selective Service.

Under EMMPS, after a second order for induction had been sent, a list of those who neither appeared or reported to an AFES

will be sent to the Enforcement Division in the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

M-18. The first inductees will report to their assigned military training bases.

M-24. The system, working at maximum capacity and without delays, will have processed 100,000 inductees.

The schedule outlined above is substantially different from previous Selective Service plans. We can highlight the new Standby System with respect to seven subsystems which make up the registration-to-induction process. The subsystems are:

A registration process that is rapid and reliable.

A method of entering registrant data quickly into an ADP system.

An ADP system (hardware and software) that can handle the registrant and claims populations in the time required.

A system for the promulgation and distribution of orders for induction.

A claims process that can quickly insure all registrants' rights to due process are protected.

A field structure that can support the claims process.

#### Registration

The Selective Service and the United States Postal Service have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which provides that the USPS will conduct a registration of up to 4 million draft eligible (two male year of birth groups or one male/female year of birth group) within 72 hours of notice. Postal employees will act as registrars and check completed registration forms for accuracy and legibility. They will sort completed registration cards by date of birth, deliver sorted cards to data processing sites, and undertake a continuous registration for those subject to the MSSA who were not required to register immediately after mobilization. The two agencies have also agreed to work together to fully develop implementation plans, i.e., training and storage of forms, etc., and to test the system in August 1980. The USPS has also agreed that even without these last steps they could undertake an emergency registration within seven days.

This agreement is based upon the results of a detailed analysis of existing postal windows in each zip code area in three representative states, estimates of the twenty year-of-birth population in each area and projected transaction times of 5 minutes and 2.5 minutes per registration. (Postal officials indicate that their average transaction time is approximately one minute.) For example in the state of Illinois, using the most conservative estimate of five minutes per registration transaction, and without taking any special measures, there are sufficient postal windows in 97% of the urban post offices and 98% of the rural windows. Postal officials have agreed that where there appears to be a lack of postal windows, they will open additional "windows" using tables and desks. In any event, postal facilities will stay open, so that no one required to register with Selective Service will be turned away.

We have also entered into an agreement with the Department of State whereby they will, operating from their overseas embassies and consulates, conduct an initial registration within 72 hours of notification and will transmit the data to the Selective Service Headquarters within 96 hours.

#### Data entry

One of the most fundamental changes in Selective Service plans is the development of a new concept for conducting the lottery, entering the data into the central computer and issuing the first order for induction. The previous plans required that an entire year group—2 million records—would have to be keypunched and verified before a lottery could be held and the first induction

notice issued. It was estimated that this would take 1,300 persons per day for ten days.

In sizing the keypunch requirement, we found that, in fact, there was no need to input into the computer a complete year group before we held the lottery or issued induction orders. The important thing is that induction orders are issued in random Sequence Number (RSN) order. This can be done by holding the lottery immediately after the close of registration, sorting the completed registration forms according to RSNs—a task that the USPS has agreed to undertake—and entering registration data into the computer in RSN order. Under this concept, induction notices can be issued to the first inductees while the registration data for those to be called later is still being processed. This "pre-sort" scheme substantially reduces the requirement for keypunchers by spreading the required work over the time available to Selective Service.

We estimate that at a minimum, we need to process 35,000 registrations forms a day, and this would require about 115 keypunch operators compared with 1,300 as previously planned. If we process more than 35,000 records per day, we would reduce the number of days it would take us to keypunch the registration data, but would not increase our ability to induct.

Under present plans, we will make use of the keypunch capacity of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and/or the Social Security Administration (SSA). Both agencies have agreed that in event of a national emergency, they could suspend part of their operations to support Selective Service. The IRS has over 4,000 data entry terminals located in ten regional centers, which are conveniently located near USPS centers. During the tax return period of January to June, the IRS has about 6,000 data entry personnel on-board. During the non-tax period of July to December, the staff is reduced to about 1,500 personnel. The SSA advises that they could do the entire job using some portion of the 1,200 terminals located at Wilkes Barre, Albuquerque and Saltina. In order to provide a margin of error, both agencies have agreed to plan for a production rate of 100,000 registration forms per day.

#### Automatic Data Processing Support

The present Selective Service computer center will not support a mobilized Selective Service System. Current hardware cannot be expanded to support EMMPS. In deciding how best to meet our computer needs, we considered that:

Selective Service has an immediate need for a substantial computer capability upon mobilization.

There is a very limited need for a computer during standby.

Any new ADP system should facilitate the entire registration-to-induction order process. This requires that we consider MFCOM's ability to process registrants in support of Selective Service, as well as our needs to support our area offices and local boards.

To provide short term ADP capability, we have developed a plan that will ensure we have (1) an immediate capability to, in the least, process registration data and issue orders of induction; and (2), within a year, provide for improved interface with MFCOM and our area offices.

We have a formal agreement with the Department of Defense and the Army that the USAMSSA computer center will support EMMPS. The compatibility of EMMPS and USAMSSA computer was tested and demonstrated in December 1979.

The USAMSSA agreement is only temporary. As a longer term solution to our ADP requirements, we have also agreed that Selective Service and MFCOM will develop a joint computer center, using a surplus IBM

370/165 computer belonging to Defense. We believe that a joint center has many advantages. It would reinforce the link between the two organizations, e.g., after mobilization the volume of data transmitted each day would be substantial and a joint facility would minimize delay and the need for an expensive telecommunication network. It would put Selective Service on a computer solely dedicated to the military manpower procurement mission, and would help insure the coordination of manpower flows from Selective Service to AFEES. The joint computer center will also support our local boards through the 434 area offices. Computer terminals in each area office will be linked to the IBM 370/165 and would be used to input and update registration and appeals information. Current budget, and requests before the Congress, are sufficient to carry out our plans and develop a joint Selective Service/MFCOM computer center. It will, however, be necessary to advance the procurement of terminals from FY82 to FY81. Accordingly, we are asking for an increase in FY81 funds of \$4.5M for this purpose.

#### Promulgation of orders for induction

Under EMMPS, there will be a single national draft call based upon random selection. Actual induction orders will be issued by the Director of Selective Service, by direction of the President and under authority of section 6(d) of the MSSA. Using the Selective Service master registration file, which will be created and maintained by RSW, induction orders will be transmitted as Western Union Mailgrams. The Mailgrams will contain the following information:

#### Identification of the inductees.

Orders to report at a specific time to a designated AFEES.

Information on procedures to follow if unable to comply with the induction order.

Information on exemption and deferment rights.

A simple claims form.

The address of the inductees local board/area office to which claims should be sent.

The area office, upon receipt of a claim will notify Selective Service Headquarters and will process the claim according to standard Selective Service procedures. MFCOM will also be notified of individuals ordered to AFEES and will report their status to Selective Service Headquarters.

#### Claims processing and the Selective Service field structure

Under EMMPS, after receiving an order for induction a registrant may apply for a deferment or exemption. It has historically been, and will continue to be, the task of local draft boards supported by Selective Service Area Offices to adjudicate such claims. It is imperative that a claims structure be in place when we start issuing orders for induction. Under present plans, this is likely to be as early as M-4-7 days. We are, therefore, developing plans and procedures for the selection and training of local board members. We are requesting \$1.1 million in FY81 and approximately \$20,000 per year thereafter for this purpose. Included in these totals are funds for three additional full-time positions for management of this program.

We have also streamlined our procedures to reconstitute essential area offices in support of local boards. On November 28, 1979, the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Director of Selective Service agreed that, "in order to facilitate the operation of the Selective Service in support of the manpower procurement needs of the Department of Defense, we must better coordinate our planning and post-mobilization manpower system. In addition, it is appropriate that DOD, like other Federal agencies, provide support to the Selective Service during a national emergency. Such support from DOD

February 27, 1980

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

4033

might include but not be limited to, computer and data processing, selected personnel and facilities. However, DOD should not in any way be involved in the process by which the Selective Service adjudicates claims for deferment or exemption."

Selective Service has 715 military reservists who are a cadre to reactivate the system. We have also entered into an agreement with Defense to take over specific Armed Forces Recruiting Offices within 24 hours after mobilization. Moreover, 1,500 Recruiting Service personnel will augment the Selective Service reservists for about 45 days after mobilization. These personnel will be identified by name, provided training and will participate in training exercises and field tests.

We have ordered a revision to this summer's annual training, in order to test these new procedures. We will "mobilize" each state headquarters and "reestablish" area offices. This should allow us to work out problems before Nifty Nugget 1980.

#### ANALYSIS

The capability of the Selective Service System to induct people into the Armed Forces depends upon (1) achieving, in a timely manner, the schedule of events and (2) achieving the appropriate rates of production in the various subsystems, e.g., physical and mental examinations per day, etc. The robustness of the new plan is shown by comparing the following four figures. Each figure shows the number of males processed on the vertical axis, the calendar of events (time) on the horizontal axis, each line is a different subsystem, and the rate of production for each subsystem is the slope of the respective line.

Figure 1 shows how the system would work if Selective Service and the AFES achieved both the schedule and the planned production rates. As is evident, first inductions start 12 days ahead of the DOD timetable, with 100,000 inductions delivered to Defense on M+34—26 days ahead of schedule.

In order to examine the flexibility of the plan, we considered what would happen if we achieved the schedule of events, but operated at the minimum rate necessary to meet the DOD delivery schedule. In such a case, the data entry, induction orders, and AFES subsystem could work well below their maximum mobilization capacity (2 shifts, 6 days per week) and still not jeopardize the schedule. In other words, staff capacity required for normal pre-mobilization operations, when expanded to a two shift, 8 days per week operation, can more than meet post-mobilization requirements, and provide a hedge against our failure to achieve our schedule of events. The extent of this hedge is seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3 shows that, if the AFES operates at its stated post-mobilization capacity of 14,000 mental/physical examinations per day, the Selective Service could issue its first induction order as late as M+32, 26 days later than originally planned, and still provide 100,000 inductees by M+80.

The above example assumes a failure in the schedule or rates of production, i.e., a failure by the Selective Service or the AFES. What if both failed? Clearly, there are combinations of failures in both parts that would result in a system wide failure. What is more important, however, is that substantial combinations of failures in both systems which would be sustained without compromising the delivery schedule. For example (Figure 4), if the USFS could not register until M+5 and data entry began not two days, but four days after registration (M+9) and induction letters did not go out one day, but two days after keypunching (M+11), and if we allowed fourteen days to report to the AFES, instead of ten days, the

AFES would still provide a hedge in meeting DOD requirements. In sum, over a reasonable range of failures in both the Selective Service and the AFES, the system is capable of inducting 100,000 people by M+60.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT AND STATUTORY CHANGES

The 1980 Defense Authorization Act requires Selective Service to recommend "changes in existing law relating to registration, classification, selection and induction." The Conference Report also raised a number of points relating to post-mobilization registration plans. Specifically:

"Order-of-Call" Court Decisions. There is some concern that under EMMPs, Selective Service might not issue induction orders in the proper order-of-call, and that the resulting legal challenge could stop the entire draft. The Selective Service General Counsel has reviewed pertinent court cases and has advised that even a successful "order-of-call" defense to a specific prosecution under the MSSA would not void the draft. Court decisions with respect to "order-of-call" merely reflect the well established rule that an agency must follow its own regulations. In the past rules and regulations were issued from the National Headquarters, the individual State Headquarters, and the over 3,000 local boards with the result that local boards inadvertently did not always follow our rather complex procedures. The order-of-call defense is less likely to be successful in the future because under EMMPs we will have a single order-of-call controlled from National Headquarters operating under a single set of simplified rules and regulations.

Extent of Testing the Plan. The Memorandum of Understanding with supporting Federal agencies provide that we test procedures in August 1980. We have also restructured the summer training to test our ability to mobilize State Headquarters and reestablish area offices. Selective Service reserve officers will visit the Armed Forces Recruiting Offices scheduled to support Selective Service during a mobilization. Equipment and personnel in these offices will be inventoried and local contacts with GSA, OFM, USPS and the telephone company will be made. The FY81 budget also has funds to allow Selective Service to fully participate in Nifty Nugget 80.

Computer Capability. The EMMPs program is installed on the Defense Department's USAMSSA computer. In an emergency, Selective Service could register and induct. We have also provided funds in FY80 and FY81 to take over a surplus DOD IBM 370/185 computer and have agreed to develop a joint SSS/MEPCOM computer center. We will request additional FY81 funds, originally programmed for FY82, to purchase 434 computer terminals to fully support our local boards and area offices. This will provide a computer network completely dedicated to military manpower procurement and processing and will not only improve the registration/induction process, but will insure a rapid adjudication of all claims.

Agreement with state officials and other non-Federal agencies. Under our new plans, the Selective Service does not rely on any agreements with either state or non-federal agencies.

Schedule for training Federal personnel in registration. Each Memorandum of Understanding with a supporting Federal agency provides that personnel will be trained on appropriate aspects of Selective Service procedures. Selective Service, USPS, IRS and SSA will review registration forms to insure that they are compatible with normal operating procedures.

Likelihood that induction notices would

survive potential court challenges. The Selective Service General Counsel has reviewed all post-mobilization plans and procedures. Sections 5(a)(1) and 401(b) of the MSSA imply that the local draft boards shall issue induction orders. At the same time, Section 5(d) of the Act authorizes a uniform national draft without regard to local boards whenever the President prescribes the use of the lottery. The section places the issuance of induction orders under such rules and regulations as prescribed by the President. Selective Service plans, through the EMMPs procedures, to issue induction orders under authority of this section and is developing updated regulations. To insure that the authority to issue induction orders is completely unambiguous, Selective Service recommends a statute change which will specifically grant the President authority to issue induction orders under Sections 5(a)(1); 401(b); and 5(j) of the MSSA.

The General Counsel has advised that the registration and induction system may be vulnerable to legal challenges if a claim structure was not in place at the time of induction. Accordingly, we are planning to undertake the selection and training of local board members in fiscal year 1981.

The General Counsel has also advised that to meet current Constitutional law requirements of equal protection, any system of registration for and induction into the armed forces must include both men and women. Accordingly, the Selective Service is recommending an amendment to the MSSA to provide for the registration and induction of men and women.

At this time we know of no other legal questions pertaining to a post-mobilization registration plan.

Registration and Induction of Women. The Selective Service and the Department of Defense agree that any future draft should be applicable to both men and women, because (1) it would be inequitable to restrict registration and induction to men since women can and currently do fill substantial, essential military requirements; and (2) the evolution of substantial relationship standards of equal protection in gender renders all male draft constitutionally suspect.

The Department of Defense has also advised that under the present state of the law, they assume the validity of current gender based combat restrictions, whether accomplished by statute or policy. In recognition of present combat restrictions, DOD has proposed, and Selective Service supports, a change to the MSSA to provide standby Presidential authority to register and classify both men and women, to randomly induct men only in sufficient numbers to fill combat positions and to maintain a replacement pool for those positions, and to randomly induct men and women on an equal basis to fill non-combat positions. We have been advised that given the above, Defense would not require women within the first 80 days, i.e., they would not be part of the 100,000/M+80 requirement, and that 80,000 women would be required over the period M+80 to M+180. These women would be part of the total 650,000 six-month requirement.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The Selective Service, over the last several months, has completely revised the plans by which it will register and induct draft eligible people into the Armed Services. We believe that we now have a capability to respond in an emergency. The changes which have provided this new capability are:

An agreement with the United States Postal Service to conduct registration at their 34,000 postal offices throughout the United States, and with the Department of State to conduct registration overseas.

An agreement with the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administra-

tion of keypunch completed registration forms.

A procedure to expedite the induction process by sorting and processing completed registration forms in Random Sequence—Lottery number order.

The development of a simplified procedure to issue induction orders, claims information and forms.

Agreements with the Department of Defense to:

Support the Emergency Military Manpower Procurement System (EMMPS) on an Army computer until we can build a joint SSS/MEPCOM computer center, which will be completely dedicated to military manpower procurement and processing, peace and war.

Provide to Selective Service, 434 Armed Forces Recruiting Stations and 1,500 personnel to facilitate the reestablishment of area offices.

While an immediate reactivation of the system, incorporating these changes, would be difficult and could not be accomplished in the minimum times suggested in this report, the actions already taken should enable us to meet the minimum needs of the Department of Defense. Selective Service is committed over the months ahead, working with supporting Federal agencies, to refine our plans, develop operating procedures, train personnel and test our ability to meet the emergency military manpower requirements of the Department of Defense. ●

#### "MAN OF THE YEAR" GERD HAHN

● Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to share with my colleagues the heartwarming story of Gerd Hahn of New Milford, N.J., who is soon to be honored as "Man of the Year" by the Corporal Charles M. Wallach Post 773 of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.

Born in Germany, Gerd and his wife, Peggy fled from the Nazis during the early years of the Third Reich. Gerd was among 10 children rescued from the Nazis by the Quakers who brought them to the United States in 1939. His wife, Peggy, who first fled to Holland, was later able to escape to England when Holland was invaded.

On his 18th birthday, Hahn volunteered for military service in World War II, but because he was not yet a citizen, he was unable to enlist. However, after expressing his desire to serve, he was drafted and became a citizen at Fort McClellan, Ala. He served in the Army for 2½ years—most of that time with the Infantry and port battalion in Italy.

Mr. President, during the past 21 years, Hahn has devoted himself to the community of New Milford, giving freely of his time, money, energy, and talents to help others. This gratitude and love for the country which gave him refuge and the chance for a new life of freedom and democracy, is evidenced by his lifelong dedication.

Hahn holds the rank of captain in the New Milford Auxiliary Police of which he has been a member for 21 years. He has originated and organized safety programs for motorists, fund raisers for a volunteer police auxiliary and local Boy Scout troops and blood drives for those in need.

Hahn has also been active in the New Milford Jewish Center where he has been

the synagogue's volunteer choir director. As a layman, he has also served as a "substitute Rabbi" and cantor.

Mr. President, while some native Americans unfortunately take for granted their rich heritage and the benefits of living in a democracy, Gerd Hahn has done nothing but prove his love for our country. He and his wife have always been willing to dedicate their own time and energy for their fellow Americans, and have always been guided by a desire to preserve our Nation's ideals.

The "Man of the Year" award is certainly a most fitting tribute to the lifelong dedication of Gerd Hahn, and I am pleased to have had the opportunity to call my colleague's attention to this well-deserved tribute to a noteworthy constituent. ●

#### DRAFT REGISTRATION VERSUS ADEQUATE DEFENSE SPENDING

● Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, the issue of draft registration will soon be before us. Although it is not the most critical issue before us, the Congress will debate the need for and the merit of this proposal just as the country is debating these issues. We must, however, be careful that we evaluate the real defense issues involved. While a draft registration system may decrease by a week or so the time necessary to conscript individuals in times of prolonged emergency, it will do nothing to increase the quality, their training, or the short-term readiness of our Active and Reserve Forces. The fact is that only the Active and Reserve Forces are capable of rapid mobilization which would be required by an emergency.

It will be good to remember, as we debate the issues of draft registration and the defense budget, that the problems with our military are primarily in the areas of recruitment and retention. Draft registration will not address these problems; financial and nonfinancial incentives will. It is interesting to note that recently the Senate was again prevented from voting on the Armstrong-Matsunaga amendment for an additional 3.4 percent pay raise for the military, the type of incentive which may help resolve some of the problems. Let us understand that if we want an effective military, we will have to focus more attention on the problems in both the Active and the Reserve Forces as well as demonstrate a willingness to pay for the defense of our Nation.

Mr. President, recently an article by Milton Friedman appeared in the February 11, 1980 issue of Newsweek which addressed these very issues. I ask that the article appear in the Record.

The article follows:

##### DRAFT REGISTRATION

Draft registration is neither necessary nor desirable. It is being proposed to reassure the public at home, not to frighten the Russians. It is not necessary because our military weakness derives neither from a shortage of manpower nor an ability to increase the number of people under arms by voluntary means. It derives from a failure to build new weapons—one after another canceled by President Carter. Recruitment

difficulties with the all-volunteer force reflect primarily the erosion of the inflation-adjusted compensation of first-term enlistees relative both to their civilian counterparts and longer-service personnel. When the draft was replaced by an all-volunteer force in 1973, the pay scales were adjusted appropriately. Since then Congress and the Administration have not seen fit to maintain the pay scale for first-termers. If it is desired to increase the size of the armed forces, either in general or for specialized personnel that can and should be done without a draft.

Bad Arithmetic: It is said that we cannot afford to do so. That is nonsense. Proponents of a draft point out that total personnel costs of the armed forces are more than 50 per cent of total military spending. However, only about 11 per cent of that goes for the pay of first-termers—in 1979, total personnel costs were \$58.4 billion but only \$6.3 billion of that went to pay people serving fewer than four years. Even a major increase in the pay offered new recruits would involve only a minor increase in the total defense budget. The rest of the total personnel costs is for the pay of longer-term personnel officers, civilians, and retirement benefits. And only first-termers would be recruited by a draft.

Registration would have a minor effect on the time involved in getting manpower and womanpower if a draft were reinstated. The time-consuming steps are not registration but selection and training. That was demonstrated in earlier drafts. And even a full-scale draft would not provide personnel rapidly enough for a modern war. That must be fought largely by forces in being.

Draft registration is not desirable because a draft is not desirable. It is a divisive measure completely in conflict with the basic values of a free society. Every emergency has shown that in time of real need there is no shortage of patriotic citizens eager to defend the country. Draft registration simply diverts attention from the real source of our military weakness.

That source is the welfare state. In 1970, spending on defense was 40 per cent of the Federal budget, and 8 per cent of GNP—one and a half times the budget of HEW. In 1979, spending on defense was 23 per cent of the budget and 5 per cent of GNP. The budget of HEW was one and a half times the defense budget. These developments have occurred under Republican and Democratic administrations alike. Carter has simply continued on a well-worn path.

The Real Culprit: Transfer expenditures have absorbed taxable capacity that had supported defense—and much more as well. We cannot undertake a major rebuilding of the military without cutting down the drain that the rest of the budget imposes on the taxpayer—whether directly through explicit taxes or indirectly through inflation and borrowing. There is, after all, a limit to the total taxable capacity of the economy. Look at Britain's decline as a world power, which, as C. Northcote Parkinson somewhere points out, owes much more to the growth of the welfare state than to any other single factor.

No series of symbolic acts, no expressions of belated intent will change that brute fact. If we try to follow a policy of guns plus welfare-state transfers, I fear we shall end up with neither.

President Carter has acknowledged the drastic recent change in his opinions about Russia—a courageous admission of almost unbelievable prior naivete.

Is it outside the bounds of possibility that he could acknowledge that past fiscal and military mistakes have made it impossible for us to respond effectively to Russian aggression now or in the immediate future, but that we are going to change course in light of the present danger?

## **ROGERS ASKS THAT ASSERTIONS OF POLITICAL BIAS WITHIN DoD BE ADDRESSED IN FY22 NDAA**

 [republicans-armedservices.house.gov/news/press-releases/rogers-asks-assertions-political-bias-within-dod-be-addressed-fy22-ndaa](https://www.republicans-armedservices.house.gov/news/press-releases/rogers-asks-assertions-political-bias-within-dod-be-addressed-fy22-ndaa)

May 18, 2021

**Washington, DC** - U.S. Representative Mike Rogers (R-AL), the Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee, released a statement following reports of political bias within the Department of Defense:

“I am greatly concerned by numerous press reports of conservative voices being silenced in the Department of Defense while Departmental leadership defends and protects left-leaning voices. The United States Armed Forces should be focused on preparing to face and win any battles against the threats posed by China and other foreign adversaries and not imposing political beliefs on those who chose to serve in uniform.

“My Republican colleagues and I hear regularly from active duty and retired service members that even holding conservative values is now enough to endanger a servicemember's military career. I believe that this is an issue that must be addressed in this year's NDAA and look forward to working with my Republican colleagues on the committee and any free-speech minded Democrats interested in joining our cause.”



Service Year Alliance Statement for the Record for the House Armed Services Committee  
Hearing on:

Recommendations and Report of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public  
Service

Thursday, May 19, 2021

Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Rogers and members of the Armed Services Committee,

Service Year Alliance is pleased to submit this testimony for the record for the hearing on the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service.

Service Year Alliance is an organization working to make a year of paid, full-time national service — a service year — a common expectation and opportunity for all young Americans. We do that through our Serve America Together campaign, which brings together a coalition of military and civilian service organizations, among others, to advocate to make civilian national service part of growing up in America. We also support service year programs and help stand up new innovative models, and maintain the only online portal — ServiceYear.org — that connects young people to all different types of available service year opportunities, including AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, YouthBuild and non-federally funded programs.

We were thrilled by the establishment of the National Commission on Military, National and Public Service and grateful to see the bold vision it outlined in its final Inspired to Serve report. We strongly support the Commission's vision of a lifetime of continued service and specifically of one million young people serving in civilian service year opportunities.

Our nation is beginning to see the path out of a pandemic that has affected every aspect of our lives. The weaknesses of our public health system were exposed and exacerbated by COVID-19. Education has been disrupted and children will continue to deal with the impact of learning loss. Millions of Americans do not know where they will find their next meal. At the same time, communities across the country are dealing with the impacts of climate change in the form of fires, hurricanes, and coastal degradation.

A generation of young people are increasingly disconnected from education and employment. Millions graduated from college and found no job prospects. Others who might have gone on to higher learning have either chosen not to or been unable to for a variety of reasons. The impact on educational opportunities has been most felt by economically disadvantaged youth and youth of color.

Finally, the last few years have shown us how polarized our country has become.

National service is uniquely suited to address all of these challenges. National service corps members serving with programs like AmeriCorps, YouthBuild, and the conservation corps are already mentoring and tutoring students, supporting vaccine distribution efforts, protecting our public lands, and serving at food banks across the country. Through their service, these young people are developing leadership and professional skills that put them on a pathway to higher education and careers while becoming an engaged and culturally competent generation of leaders who are more empathetic and better understand people who are different than themselves.

Their service also has a proven return on investment, which is as high as \$11 for every federal dollar spent. That ROI can grow even larger when communities come together to coordinate efforts, as can be seen in Flint, Michigan, where a service accelerator has created a return of investment of \$35.90 for every federal dollar spent.

During the last year, Congress has taken up national service as a cost-effective, bipartisan solution to help address the challenges facing our nation with bills like the CORPS Act and the Commission's Inspire to Serve Act. The American Rescue Plan Act that passed Congress earlier this year includes an additional \$1 billion to help expand current national service efforts — a critical downpayment on the kind of growth we and the Commission envision for national service.

To truly achieve the Commission's vision of national service we believe it must:

1. Exist at scale, engaging at least one million young Americans in civilian national service annually
2. Address America's unmet needs
3. Bridge divides and fuel civic renewal
4. Be an opportunity for all
5. Build pathways to long-term success for individuals who serve through benefits and connectivity to future education and careers

We were pleased to see the Commission address many of these fundamentals.

Our top recommendations to the Biden Administration and to Congress very much align with the Commission's recommendations and share the crucial premise at the heart of the Commission's work that military, national, and public service are inherently connected in creating a civic-minded America.

We outline these recommendations below. More information about them can be found in our recently released white paper called [Reimagining National Service: A Roadmap to a Service Presidency](#).

Our recommendations include:

1. Lead a Whole-of-Government Effort to Put Americans Into National Service to Meet Our Country's Urgent Needs:

We encourage the Administration to appoint a National Service Advisor to lead a task force of federal agencies to assess how they can integrate national service into their plans to address America's urgent unmet needs and build interagency corps in partnership with the AmeriCorps Agency (formerly known as the Corporation for National and Community Service) and ensure that synergies are created between military, national, and public service.

This could be effectively done, as the Commission recommended, by establishing a Council on Military, National, and Public Service within the Executive Office of the President. That office could coordinate between different agencies on recruitment, awareness campaigns, and transitions between different types of service. The Council could then oversee the implementation of these interagency corps.

A recent cost-benefit analysis has shown that communities that have an infrastructure in place — a collaboration of programs who meet regularly, pool resources like funds and trainings, and tackle community problems in coordination — deliver service more effectively, have a higher return on investment, and have better outcomes for corps members. Investing in opportunities to develop and maintain such 24 local infrastructure, and building in ways that this infrastructure can sustain, like Service Year Alliance's Impact Communities, would make national service far stronger.

The Task Force should also be mandated to look at best practices for building such an ecosystem of investment in national service, in particular looking at the role that Impact Communities can play in strengthening and expanding national service.

We encourage this committee to consider establishing this Council through this year's defense authorization bill.

2. Flood the Nonprofit Sector and Under-Resourced Communities with Critical Support Through a Service Year Fellowship and New Grantee On-Ramps:

We support the Commission's idea of establishing a fellowship program through AmeriCorps that allows flexibility for smaller nonprofits to nimbly fill gaps, manage volunteer labor, and shore up staff. Service year fellowships would allow access to corps members to smaller organizations — including faith-based organizations and organizations in rural or underserved areas — who would not otherwise have the organizational and grant-making infrastructure to compete and receive this support through existing AmeriCorps funding. Independent Sector has found that nonprofit organizations have lost over a million positions because of COVID-19 and 7 percent will permanently close. These fellowship positions can provide a surge of human capital to nonprofits while creating a pathway to jobs in the nonprofit sector when the economy recovers.

Further, to ensure all communities have access to national service as a resource, AmeriCorps and State Service Commissions should significantly invest in new program development and new grantee on-ramps for underserved communities and organizations. Currently, the vast majority of new programs are developed by state commissions. As new sources of funding come in, it is critical that commissions have the flexibility to respond to the needs in their states and communities, and build upon the successes and real areas of opportunity that surface — especially over the past year of the pandemic.

Further, increasing community access to national service requires investing in modernization and user-centric grantmaking processes and technology, creating planning grants geared toward under-resourced and diverse communities, updating the match scale and/or grant structure for new grantees, increasing the maximum cost per member as needed, and prioritizing incubation partners to help with grant management and compliance.

Finally, national service should be part of a lifetime continuum of service. The Administration should develop a continuum of service and civic engagement for individuals, starting with service learning and thoughtful civics education, which can set young people on a path toward service, through to national service and then alumni engagement, including a Reserve Corps that allows alumni to hone their skills and be available when the nation needs them, and to public service as a career.

### 3. Expand National Service Opportunities and Stabilize & Strengthen AmeriCorps:

As a first step, we support the Commission's recommendation that the Serve America Act authorization of 250,000 AmeriCorps positions be fully funded. Ultimately, like the Commission, we would like to see these positions expanded to 1 million a year. In this difficult financial environment, we also want to ensure programs can sustain and grow by addressing challenges with matching funds. AmeriCorps has waived the match requirement for FY21 to allow nonprofits to use their federal funds even if they are not able to fully match them. We need, however, to also look for other opportunities to match these funds.

### 4. Raise Awareness and Enable Matching of Young Americans Through State-of-the-Art Technology:

Historically, the national service field has greatly depended on word of mouth as a core recruitment strategy to bring the next generation into service. For this reason, the majority of Americans still aren't aware of the opportunities that national service can provide for themselves, their children, or their family and friends. We support the Commission's recommendation of an awareness campaign that directs individuals to the diversity of positions across the country to serve. It will help to connect the many young people in our country whose paths have been disrupted by the pandemic, with opportunities to give back and gain skills. In particular, it will be critical to ensure this campaign utilizes both traditional channels as well as digital channels to reach the target audiences and deliver them directly to opportunities to serve.

The Commission called for a central platform for all service types in their report, as a means of making it easier for all young Americans to serve regardless of whether it is through military or civilian service. Service Year Alliance, through the generous support of philanthropy, has already made significant investments in technology and best practices over the past six years to meet this need with the development and launch of ServiceYear.org. This platform is a state-of-the-art online marketplace that houses service year opportunities — including AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, and other non-federally funded positions — and makes it easy for users to browse positions, get matched with opportunities based on their interests, and apply to serve. Leveraging the technology and learnings from this experience would enable the administration to quickly roll out a cost-effective solution to support this national awareness campaign and match young Americans with the right service opportunity for them.

5. Make National Service Positions Accessible to All Young Americans:

We strongly support the Commission's recommendations on increasing the living allowance and wraparound services as fundamental to making national service something that is truly accessible to all young people.

Currently, AmeriCorps members receive stipends that are tied to the poverty level. These stipends make the choice of national service virtually impossible for young people coming from lower-income families who will have no choice but to choose employment opportunities over the possibility of building long-term skills through national service. Even those who can choose to serve oftentimes depend on food stamps. A 175% increase from the current AmeriCorps VISTA living allowance, with adjustments for regional cost of living, would allow all young Americans to choose this pathway to empowerment and potential careers. The tax on stipends, which creates an additional barrier to participation in national service by significantly limiting the amount of money corps members take home, should be eliminated.

Further, as the Commission pointed out, wraparound services like housing and childcare would make it possible for more young people to make a choice to serve. We also support raising the Segal Education Award to make it a worthwhile investment, making it more flexible, and eliminating the tax on it to match other education awards provided by the federal government.

We agree with the Commission's recommendation to "direct the CEO of CNCS to work with the American Association State Colleges and Universities and the National Governors Association to encourage members to offer in-state tuition rates to all national service alumni." The Agency's Schools for Service is one effort to accomplish this and some states are already looking at or have passed such legislation, including a recent new law in Nebraska. We would also like to see, as the Commission recommended, that "all State Governors and State legislatures require public institutions of higher education to offer all national service alumni and Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (RPCVs) application fee waivers and/or course credit incentives in recognition of service experience."

We strongly encourage the Agency and Congress to look at ways to make it easier for justice-involved youth to participate in national service. While AmeriCorps does not bar most justice-involved youth from participating in its programs, current requirements can be seen as too great a commitment from programs, which simply choose not to work with this community. The onerous criminal history check process required has also proven to be not only an unnecessary financial and overhead burden for AmeriCorps and grantees, but also a significant barrier to justice-involved individuals applying for positions.

We also encourage you to look at ways to allow young people in America in other immigrations statuses — those with DACA, temporary protected status, or DED, and refugees and asylees — to serve their communities through federal national service programs.

#### 6. Set Young People Up for Success:

The United States is going through a transition in its economy to high-skilled jobs just as many low-skilled jobs have been wiped out by the pandemic. One way to address this challenge is by using national service positions as a tool to create pathways to employment and to the middle class. National service positions cannot under law compete with existing jobs, nor should they impede new job creation. Rather, there should be a focus on integrating skills training, certifications, and credentialing into programs and working with institutions of higher learning, workforce development organizations, unions, and employers to help national service positions create pipelines to 21st-century jobs.

These paths should include developing programs or trainings that allow national service programs to be designated as "civic apprenticeships" that help young people move into the nonprofit sector as well as integrating trainings and credentialing into other high-need sectors. Further, AmeriCorps should also work with colleges and universities to accredit programs that can provide college credits or skills training that help young people transition from national service programs to higher education.

Finally, as the Commission recommends, the new Administration should allow service year corps members to receive the same preferential hiring and non-competitive eligibility for federal jobs as returned Peace Corps volunteers, Public Land Corps, and AmeriCorps VISTA members. The federal government provides a non-competitive hiring authority for individuals who complete the Peace Corps, Public Land Corps, and AmeriCorps VISTA. By extending this authority to everyone who completes a year of national service, the federal government would not only incentivize national service but provide a pathway into government for highly motivated, civically minded young Americans.

Opportunities for the House Armed Services Committee:

Not all of these recommendations fall under the jurisdiction of this Committee. However, because of the important linkages that the Commission identified between military, national and public service, there are some key things that the committee could do. In particular, the Committee should authorize the creation of the White House Office on Military, National and Public Service.

We encourage you to also look at ways to integrate recruitment among different service opportunities. Each military service has a recruiting command, while AmeriCorps has almost no recruitment capacity — even though 71 percent of young people are not qualified to serve in the military. Better integrating these efforts would capture the enthusiasm for service among young people and help them find the right path forward to serve their country.

Finally, service members and their families have already demonstrated a propensity to serve our country. There are many options for providing them with other service opportunities. Specifically, we encourage you to use the bill to establish a military family interagency service corps between the Department of Defense and AmeriCorps. Military families already have a high propensity for service — in fact, they already do serve alongside their service members. They also move frequently, meaning that they are often far from their extended families. Further, the frequent moves make it hard for military spouses to work. The Blue Star Families 2020 Military Family Lifestyle Survey Comprehensive Report found that military spouse under- and unemployment — consistently a top issue for active-duty spouse respondents — may have intensified due to COVID-19 impacts. A military family service corps would allow spouses and adult dependents to serve in their communities and build networks and relationships, while putting them on a pathway to careers. If implemented correctly, this career pathway would include the kinds of credentials and skills necessary for portable careers.

We also encourage you to allow service members to participate in civilian national service programs as part of the on-the-job training that they may participate in in their last 180 days on active duty in the DoDSkillBridge program.

As the commission so clearly demonstrated, national service has the power to bring Americans together in common purpose — whether that is on a forward operating base overseas or in a health center or food bank in their community. Imagine what our nation could be if every young person had such an opportunity.

---

---

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING**

MAY 19, 2021

---

---



## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. I served on the Cyberspace Solarium Commission and we also came to the same conclusion that civic education is essential, though we got there in a slightly different way. In the context of cyber or other threats to our democracy, how do you see civic education as a national security imperative?

Dr. HECK. Our Nation's security is dependent, in part, on the willingness of Americans to participate in that security. That participation can occur in many ways: through employment with federal agencies; serving in the uniformed services; or simply participating in civil society; among others.

The common threads through any of these pathways is an understanding of the rights and responsibilities that come with American citizenship, an understanding of the principles upon which this Nation was founded, and the importance of participatory democracy.

Civic education provides the foundational basis that every American must have in order to fully comprehend his or her individual role in achieving the collective security of our Nation.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Did you anticipate that civic education would be a big part of your commission's report? What made you decide to include a strong emphasis on civic education? And was it difficult getting bipartisan support for the civic education recommendations?

Dr. HECK. Civic education was not part of the charge given to us by Congress and was not part of our initial planning. However, as the Commission began its listening tour around the Nation we heard from Americans across the demographic spectrum that if our ultimate goal was to inspire every American to serve, we should begin by ensuring every American understood why their service is important. It was suggested to the Commission by those we spoke with that the best way to accomplish this is through a reinvigoration of civic education.

The Commission then undertook an analysis of the state of civic education in America and was, quite frankly, appalled at what we found. The crowding out of civic education in curricula across the country by "higher priority" topics, along with the loss of funding, has left civic education, and by extension America's youth, in dire straits.

As the Commission weighed potential policy options regarding civic education and presented them in public hearings on the issue, we were pleased by the overwhelming, bipartisan support we received. In fact, the bipartisan Commission felt so strongly about the importance of civic education as the foundation upon which a lifetime of service can be built, that it is the first topic we address in our final report.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Are you familiar with the recently introduced Civics Secures Democracy Act? Does the CSD or other federal legislation align with the recommendations outlined in your report?

Dr. HECK. Title I of the Civics Secures Democracy Act is very much in line with the recommendations of the Commission, and the Commission was pleased to see an included appropriation greater than the amount we suggested!

The Commission does not have an opinion on the remaining titles of the act.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Since the report was published over a year ago, have you experienced any added reasons for why we must reinvigorate and invest in civic education? Any justifications that might not be captured in the report? And how would you change or update the civics-related recommendations accordingly?

Dr. HECK. I do not believe there are any additional reasons, but perhaps further evidence to support the reasons we included. The divisive nature of today's society was evident during the tenure of the Commission, however it has certainly reached new heights (or lows) since the Commission dissolved.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Have you been able to continue working with former commissioners like Avril Haines or Shawn Skelly that are passionate about these issues and currently serving in (or nominated to serve in) the executive branch? Do you see a role for them in continuing to promote civic education in their current national security roles, and if so, what actions do you hope they will take in their respective posts to prioritize this issue?

Dr. HECK. The Commission maintains an active "alumni network" and we were all pleased at the selection of Ms. Haines and Ms. Skelly to join the administration. It was an honor and privilege to serve with them on the Commission and it is my

hope that in their new roles they will continue to advocate for the Commission's recommendations.

Mr. LANGEVIN. How do we know that an investment in civic education is a cost-effective, comprehensive tool for protecting our democracy? What makes you confident that civics is the right approach as opposed to pursuing alternative solutions?

Dr. HECK. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of research on this question and any answer would be based on anecdotal or extrapolated evidence. The Commission, while not recommending a specific curriculum, found that the approach whereby civic education is a thread woven into the fabric of all subjects is preferable to a one-time course on US History or US Government. Civic education, to be effective, must be a continuous, P-16 academic program, integrated with innovative service-learning opportunities that allow America's youth to apply the principles they learn in the classroom to real-world experiences. We learned that if an individual participates in a personally meaningful service experience at a younger age, they are much more likely to undertake service throughout their lifetime. The intangible benefit of this is the increase in participatory democracy, which heals divisions and brings people together. The economic benefit is the estimated \$4-5 returned for every \$1 invested in service.

Mr. LANGEVIN. How can Congress become a better support for states, districts, businesses, etc. looking to develop civics initiatives? Do you get the sense that enough members of Congress fully understand and appreciate the importance of civic education?

Dr. HECK. The Civics Secures Democracy Act is a good start, but we saw how that recently became politicized. As with any initiative undertaken by Congress, not every member will have the same understanding or interest, if it doesn't align with his or her priorities. The Commission felt that it was imperative that Congress and the Department of Education maintain its support role to the states and not go down a path of mandating specific curricula or topics.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Did you anticipate that civic education would be a big part of your commission's report? What made you decide to include a strong emphasis on civic education? And was it difficult getting bipartisan support for the civic education recommendations?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. LANGEVIN. Since the report was published over a year ago, have you experienced any added reasons for why we must reinvigorate and invest in civic education? Any justifications that might not be captured in the report? And how would you change or update the civics-related recommendations accordingly?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. LANGEVIN. How do we know that an investment in civic education is a cost-effective, comprehensive tool for protecting our democracy? What makes you confident that civics is the right approach as opposed to pursuing alternative solutions?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. LANGEVIN. Did you anticipate that civic education would be a big part of your commission's report? What made you decide to include a strong emphasis on civic education? And was it difficult getting bipartisan support for the civic education recommendations?

Mr. BARNEY. We did not anticipate that civic education would be a big part of our commission's report. The legislation that created the commission did not mention civic education. Our legislative mandate did not require us to address civic education. Rather, during our numerous commission engagements around the country we heard concerns voiced by Americans representing a broad and diverse demographic that the lack of a strong foundation in civic education threatens our country. This experience informed our decision to include a strong emphasis on civic education in our report because we commissioners concluded that if we failed to do so it would not accurately reflect what we learned through our engagements. It was not difficult to gain bipartisan support for the civic engagement recommendations in our report. In fact, I recollect that during our deliberation of recommendations to include in our report, that the commissioners were unanimous in support of our recommendations to strengthen civic education. Stated differently, the commissioners' support for our recommendations to strengthen civic education was overwhelmingly bipartisan.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Since the report was published over a year ago, have you experienced any added reasons for why we must reinvigorate and invest in civic education? Any justifications that might not be captured in the report? And how would you change or update the civics-related recommendations accordingly?

Mr. BARNEY. Yes, in the year since the commission published our final report I have observed additional reasons why our nation must reinvigorate and reinvest in civic education.

Our nation's experience in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated in the strongest possible manner, the need to promote a sound understanding of the civic principles that form the foundations of our American democracy. At the core of this principle is the inherent tension between individual rights and liberties and the need for a common response to defend our nation from threats. Whether those threats are from a deadly virus or from human actors, the ultimate success or failure of our government actions at the federal, tribal, state, and local levels requires all Americans to have a deeply informed understanding of the constitutional foundations of our American democracy. We all experienced the need to sacrifice our personal liberties to safeguard the health of our neighbors. We also saw that certain constitutionally protected rights including the rights to gather peaceably and to worship, are enduring and fundamental principles that can and must be protected even during a pandemic.

The tragic death of George Floyd, and the national focus on matters involving how we as Americans treat each other in acknowledgement of our racial and ethnic diversity, has produced hard lessons that our nation must address. Included in those lessons is to promote a better understanding of our relationship as citizens with government, and particularly with challenging issues related to the role of law enforcement.

Finally, the 2020 elections have demonstrated that our nation has an urgent need to strengthen understanding of the constitutional and other legal bases for the conducting fair elections that are the foundation for our American democracy.

If I would change or update any aspect of our report with respect to civic education it would be to cite these and other examples from the past year to demonstrate the urgency to adopt the commission's recommendations that would restore civic education to its preeminent role in our nation's schools.

Mr. LANGEVIN. How do we know that an investment in civic education is a cost-effective, comprehensive tool for protecting our democracy? What makes you confident that civics is the right approach as opposed to pursuing alternative solutions?

Mr. BARNEY. We know that investment in civic education is a cost-effective, comprehensive tool for protecting our democracy because events of the last year have demonstrated that our current lack of adequate funding for civic education has neglected this essential citizenship-informing foundation for our American democracy. We need to do a better job as a nation to provide every American with a solid foundation of understanding civics to prepare us to respond to future threats to our nation, whether those threats are related to an infectious disease, or to civil disorder in our cities, or to the system for elections on which effective government depends. Stated differently, the cost of funding civic education is important because the cost of not funding civic education risks tearing our nation apart. Finally, it is critically important that Congress must provide strong and consistent federal funding for civic education. We know that federal funding is crucial and effective because we have seen that our national investment in STEM education has reinvigorated local and state education agencies to promote teaching of science, technology, engineering, and math. If we value our American democracy then it is a necessary and sound investment for the federal government to use its powerful legislative tools to authorize and appropriate funding to ensure future generations of Americans are fully prepared to deal with threats to our nation, and to promote an enduring commitment to serve in federal, tribal, state, and local government.

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. KHANNA

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS give any consideration to ending Selective Service registration entirely, rather than trying to expand it to young women as well as young men, as one way to go about equalizing treatment of men and women?

Dr. HECK. Yes, the Commission debated disbanding the Selective Service Registration system and also putting the system into "deep standby" similar to what occurred in 1973.

The Department of Defense provided five reasons to maintain the system as currently configured:

1. The military selective service system guarantees the certain and timely fulfillment of military manpower requirements in a national emergency
2. The selective service registration database provides valuable military recruiting leads
3. Registration reminds America's youth of the importance of Military, National, and Public Service
4. Selective service registration is a critical link between the All-Volunteer Force (AVF) and society at large

5. Military selective service is a symbol of national will and a deterrent to potential enemies of the United States

The Commission evaluated each of these claims and found little objective evidence to support numbers 2–5. However, based on current mobilization timelines to call-up and process inductees, the Commission felt that disbanding or placing the system in standby would create a substantial risk to meeting the manpower needs of the armed forces in times of crisis.

Mr. KHANNA. What is a realistic scenario for a war or wars that the U.S. should fight, but in which not enough Americans would volunteer for military service?

Dr. HECK. The Commission was not charged to evaluate what wars the U.S. should fight or what the manpower needs of the armed forces would be for a particular conflict.

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS conduct any research on how many Americans would be likely to volunteer for military service in a war in which it was needed?

Dr. HECK. The Commission was not tasked or resourced to conduct independent research. We did, however, review the available research conducted by others.

America's involvement in World War II was supported by the general population and volunteers rushed to join the military after Pearl Harbor. Almost eighteen million men served in World War II, but the majority—over 10 million—were drafted into service.

More than three-quarters of the men who fought in Vietnam volunteered to join the military. Roughly 8.7 million troops served in the military between 1965 and 1973 with only 1.8 million drafted. Of the 2.7 million that fought in Vietnam, only 25% were draftees.

During the period of the AVF, using the total size of the military as the metric, the size of the military actually decreased during the Gulf War (Operation Desert Shield [2 August 1990–17 January 1991] and Operation Desert Storm [17 January 1991–28 February 1991]) by 2.68% in 1990 and 2.75% in 1991, demonstrating a gap between new enlistments and those leaving service during a time of war. Post 9/11, the military end strength increased 3.26% in 2002 and 0.89% in 2003, before decreasing in 2004.

According to the Harvard Institute of Politics (IOP), of nearly half of millennials polled in a 2015 survey, 60% of people between the ages of 18 and 29 support the commitment of American combat troops to fight ISIS, however 62% percent of those same people say they would not join the fight themselves. Millennials feel serving is not their responsibility.

Mr. KHANNA. Unlike draftees, volunteers for military service would not request deferments or exemptions which might delay their induction. If the NCMNPS concluded that draftees could be inducted more quickly than volunteers, what was the basis for that conclusion?

Dr. HECK. The Commission reached no such conclusion. At the time of the Commission's deliberations, there were approximately 1.3 million service members in the active force and another 1.04 million in the Ready Reserve. It is assumed that these forces would be first to the fight. During the time of expansion, volunteers would be accepted and processed into the service under current policies and procedures and would represent the next wave into the fight. The current mobilization timeline in the event a draft is initiated is M+0 to M+86 is preparation/organization time; M+86 begin to qualifying registrants for induction; M+193 first inductees arrive at the Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS); and M+210 100,000 inductees delivered to the MEPS.

Mr. KHANNA. The NCMNPS heard testimony from a former Director of the Selective Service System, Dr. Bernard Rostker, that noncompliance has made the current database “less than useless” for an actual draft. Nobody has been investigated or prosecuted for violating the Military Selective Service Act since 1986. Does the NCMNPS proposal include any plan or budget for enforcing an expanded Selective Service registration requirement?

Dr. HECK. The Commission did not include any plan or budget for enforcing an expanded Selective Service registration requirement in its report.

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS consult the Department of Justice or receive any input from the DOJ concerning whether, how, and/or at what cost the DOJ is prepared to enforce an expanded registration requirement, or whether such an enforcement plan would be more effective than the registration enforcement program the DOJ abandoned in 1988?

Dr. HECK. The Commission requested such information from the DOJ, however no information was provided.

Mr. KHANNA. The last GAO audit of the registration database, in 1982, estimated that 20–40% of registrants' addresses would be obsolete by age 20, and up to 75% by age 26. Did the NCMNPS assess what percentage of men currently subject to

the registration requirement register within 30 days of their 18th birthday and report to the SSS within 30 days of each change of address until their 26th birthday?

Dr. HECK. The Selective Service System claims 92% compliance with initial registration requirements, primarily due to the passive methods used, e.g. when applying for a drivers license. We did not receive data regarding notification of address changes.

Mr. KHANNA. If the NCMNPS proposal to expand the obligation to register to women as well as men is enacted into law, what percentage of women did the NCMNPS estimate would register within 30 days of their 18th birthday and report to the SSS within 30 days of each change of address until their 26th birthday? What is the basis for this estimate?

Dr. HECK. The Commission did not specifically address this question, but would expect the answer to be the same as for males.

Mr. KHANNA. In your testimony regarding enforcement of the Selective Service registration requirement, Maj. Genl. Heck pointed to the law which formerly required registration as a condition of Federal student aid. But provisions Congress enacted as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, remove that requirement, effective not later than 2023. SSS officials told the NCMNPS that SSS registration depends primarily on laws in some states and U.S. territories that make Selective Service registration a condition for obtaining drivers' licenses. SSS officials and members of the NCMNPS expressed concern during NCMNPS deliberations that many of these state laws use gendered language and would not apply to women unless they were amended. Putting an expanded Selective Service registration requirement applicable to women as well as men into effect would require action by state legislatures to amend each of these laws. Did the NCMNPS prepare any list or tally of gendered state and territorial laws related to compliance with Selective Service registration?

Dr. HECK. Of the states and territories that have registration requirements, 22 have gendered language

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS assess whether state and territorial laws related to Selective Service registration which are worded as applying only to males would be rendered invalid, unless and until amended by state legislatures, if we were to expand the requirement to register with the SSS to apply to women as well as men?

Dr. HECK. The Commission did not consider this question.

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS give any consideration to ending Selective Service registration entirely, rather than trying to expand it to young women as well as young men, as one way to go about equalizing treatment of men and women?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. What is a realistic scenario for a war or wars that the U.S. should fight, but in which not enough Americans would volunteer for military service?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS conduct any research on how many Americans would be likely to volunteer for military service in a war in which it was needed?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. Unlike draftees, volunteers for military service would not request deferments or exemptions which might delay their induction. If the NCMNPS concluded that draftees could be inducted more quickly than volunteers, what was the basis for that conclusion?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. The NCMNPS heard testimony from a former Director of the Selective Service System, Dr. Bernard Rostker, that noncompliance has made the current database "less than useless" for an actual draft. Nobody has been investigated or prosecuted for violating the Military Selective Service Act since 1986. Does the NCMNPS proposal include any plan or budget for enforcing an expanded Selective Service registration requirement?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS consult the Department of Justice or receive any input from the DOJ concerning whether, how, and/or at what cost the DOJ is prepared to enforce an expanded registration requirement, or whether such an enforcement plan would be more effective than the registration enforcement program the DOJ abandoned in 1988?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. The last GAO audit of the registration database, in 1982, estimated that 20-40% of registrants' addresses would be obsolete by age 20, and up to 75% by age 26. Did the NCMNPS assess what percentage of men currently subject to the registration requirement register within 30 days of their 18th birthday and report to the SSS within 30 days of each change of address until their 26th birthday?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. If the NCMNPS proposal to expand the obligation to register to women as well as men is enacted into law, what percentage of women did the NCMNPS estimate would register within 30 days of their 18th birthday and report to the SSS within 30 days of each change of address until their 26th birthday? What is the basis for this estimate?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS assess whether state and territorial laws related to Selective Service registration which are worded as applying only to males would be rendered invalid, unless and until amended by state legislatures, if we were to expand the requirement to register with the SSS to apply to women as well as men?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS give any consideration to ending Selective Service registration entirely, rather than trying to expand it to young women as well as young men, as one way to go about equalizing treatment of men and women?

Mr. BARNEY. Yes, the commission adopted as a foundation for our investigative approach the congressional legislative mandate that required that we first consider whether a selective service system was required before considering what changes, if any, might be made if the selective service system were retained. We did not assume that a selective service registration requirement should continue. We listened to viewpoints that advocated for elimination of the selective service registration requirement. We included in all our engagements including public meetings and hearings, opportunities to receive comments from individuals on whether our nation should retain or end the selective service registration system. There were strong views on both sides of the issue. In the end, as commissioners deliberated our recommendations we came to what I recall was a unanimous decision to retain the selective service system and to expand the registration requirement to both men and women. To me personally, the issue of equal treatment of men and women in the selective service registration requirement was secondary to the ultimate need to provide for the best and most capable people to defend our nation in a national emergency. With enactment of the additional recommendations we offered to strengthen the selective service registration system, that system will remain the best and lowest cost "insurance policy" for our national security.

Mr. KHANNA. What is a realistic scenario for a war or wars that the U.S. should fight, but in which not enough Americans would volunteer for military service?

Mr. BARNEY. Our nation is founded on the belief that a democratic society is the ideal approach for governance of free people. Our nation uses its diplomatic and economic tools to promote democracy throughout the world. While the United States has many allies who share our views, other countries have entirely different approaches. While our commission did not express views on the issue, my personal belief is that tension within the People's Republic of China may result in future hostilities between mainland China and democratic Taiwan. Such hostilities may trigger treaty obligations for the United States to come to the defense of Taiwan with a corresponding demand for resources, including trained military personnel, that would far exceed the number of Americans who would volunteer for military service. Other examples include mutual defense treaty obligations that would require the United States to come to the defense of Japan, South Korea, and other western Pacific allies. Our obligations under Article 5 of the NATO treaty would also require us to use American forces in defense of our allies. In short, the United States has treaty obligations to defend other democratic allies who are attacked. These treaty obligations go to the heart of what it means for the United States to be viewed as a reliable ally of free countries around the world. Our history has demonstrated that many Americans respond willingly and selflessly when our nation is under attack. That said, wars are not popular with the American public. Our nation may face a future war where our treaty obligations require us to come to the defense of a loyal ally, but where many Americans may conclude that they do not support the war. The United States must be prepared for future wars. An essential part of that preparation is the unmistakable signal to a would-be adversary that the United States is prepared to fight and win, and if necessary to mobilize for war through the last resort of a viable selective service system and a military draft. The deterrent value of a viable selective service registration system is well with the modest national investment required to keep the Selective Service System ready and reliable.

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS conduct any research on how many Americans would be likely to volunteer for military service in a war in which it was needed?

Mr. BARNEY. The commission did not conduct any research on how many Americans would be likely to volunteer for military service in a war. However, in our research we took note of the fact that even in the aftermath of the attack on Pearl Harbor by the Empire of Japan, and the subsequent declaration of war against the United States by Nazi Germany, the large outpouring of volunteers to enlist in the

U.S. armed services was ultimately inadequate to meet the military personnel requirements during the Second World War. The nation needed a draft in World War Two. For that reason—among other facts derived through our research, meetings, and public hearings—the commission recommended that the United States must retain a ready and reliable Selective Service System as a cornerstone of our national defense.

Mr. KHANNA. Unlike draftees, volunteers for military service would not request deferments or exemptions which might delay their induction. If the NCMNPS concluded that draftees could be inducted more quickly than volunteers, what was the basis for that conclusion?

Mr. BARNEY. The commission did not conclude that draftees could be inducted more quickly than volunteers. The commission recommended that the United States must retain a ready and reliable Selective Service System in order to meet the military personnel requirements of the Department of Defense in the case of an extraordinary requirement that exceeds the number that would be met by volunteers. Through our research we found that the modest cost to maintain a selective service registration system would be more effective and produce sufficient numbers of personnel through a congressionally authorized draft than could be achieved by other methods. We specifically considered and found inadequate alternatives to a selective service registration system, including disestablishing the Selective Service System or putting it into deep standby, because the time necessary to reconstitute a selective service and draft capability in a time of national crisis would not meet the requirements of the Department of Defense and would put at risk the then-serving members of the active and reserve components of the all-volunteer force.

Mr. KHANNA. The NCMNPS heard testimony from a former Director of the Selective Service System, Dr. Bernard Rostker, that noncompliance has made the current database “less than useless” for an actual draft. Nobody has been investigated or prosecuted for violating the Military Selective Service Act since 1986. Does the NCMNPS proposal include any plan or budget for enforcing an expanded Selective Service registration requirement?

Mr. BARNEY. While the Selective Service System reports that it has achieved registration compliance rates in excess of 90 percent, our research confirmed that the system would face serious challenges in using the selective service registration database to generate numbers of qualified individuals to respond to induction notices. For that reason, the commission made a number of recommendations to make it easier for individuals to register and to maintain accurate information that would get induction notices to registrants should Congress in the future require a military draft. The Selective Service System achieves its high compliance rates through passive registration by using, for example, state motor vehicle licensing and federal student loan financing applications, to register males from the ages of 17 to 26. The commission found that passive registration does not instill in registrants a knowing, solemn understanding of the potential military or alternative civilian service obligation that is implicated through the registration process. For that reason, the commission recommended that an appropriate ceremony be conducted that would instill in registrants a full understanding of the significance of the selective service registration requirement. The commission also recommended that the Department of Defense and the Selective Service System should conduct regular exercises to assess the readiness of the Selective Service System and to make reports to Congress on the effectiveness of the system. In my personal view, the nation has for too long failed to invest in the readiness of the Selective Service System. Its budget has remained fixed at about \$25 million per year for several decades. Given the seriousness of the Selective Service System and its value to the defense of the nation it is appropriate for Congress to receive continuous information on the readiness of the system and to authorize and appropriate adequate funds so that it can meet its critical mission when and if the nation needs it.

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS consult the Department of Justice or receive any input from the DOJ concerning whether, how, and/or at what cost the DOJ is prepared to enforce an expanded registration requirement, or whether such an enforcement plan would be more effective than the registration enforcement program the DOJ abandoned in 1988?

Mr. BARNEY. I do not believe that the commission received information from the Department of Justice concerning the impact to the Department of an expanded selective service registration system.

Mr. KHANNA. The last GAO audit of the registration database, in 1982, estimated that 20–40% of registrants’ addresses would be obsolete by age 20, and up to 75% by age 26. Did the NCMNPS assess what percentage of men currently subject to the registration requirement register within 30 days of their 18th birthday and report to the SSS within 30 days of each change of address until their 26th birthday?

Mr. BARNEY. The commission did not assess what percentage of current registrants register within 30 days of their 18th birthday or the rate at which those registrants report a subsequent change of address. However, the Selective Service System reports that the process of registration by using state motor vehicle licensing and use of the federal student loan application processes have pushed compliance with registration requirements to over 90 percent. The commission's recommendations, if enacted, would further strengthen the registration process and the integrity of the registration database by promoting awareness of the solemn obligation to register with and maintain the accuracy of the individual's registration with the Selective Service System. The commission also recommended changes in the Military Selective Service Act that would further incentivize timely registration and updated registration information. Congressional enactment of the commission's recommendations begins the necessary process to ensure that the nation's Selective Service System is a ready and reliable foundation for our national defense.

Mr. KHANNA. If the NCMNPS proposal to expand the obligation to register to women as well as men is enacted into law, what percentage of women did the NCMNPS estimate would register within 30 days of their 18th birthday and report to the SSS within 30 days of each change of address until their 26th birthday? What is the basis for this estimate?

Mr. BARNEY. The commission recommended that the registration requirement should be expanded to all Americans, but we did not determine or estimate the percentage of women who would register within 30 days of their 18th birthday or the rate at which those registrants report a subsequent change of address. The Selective Service System estimates that the agency would need about \$16 million in additional funding in the first year, and an additional \$59 million over the first five years to complete the policy change. My personal assessment based on the commission's research is that upon completion of actions to expand registration requirements to women that the Selective Service System would likely continue to achieve initial registration compliance rates over 90 percent.

Mr. KHANNA. Did the NCMNPS assess whether state and territorial laws related to Selective Service registration which are worded as applying only to males would be rendered invalid, unless and until amended by state legislatures, if we were to expand the requirement to register with the SSS to apply to women as well as men?

Mr. BARNEY. The commission did not assess whether state and territorial laws related to Selective Service registration which are worded as applying only to males would be rendered invalid unless and until am

---

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. KIM

Mr. KIM. I'm interested in helping veterans find their "second service," as they leave the military. The report has some much needed guidelines that would encourage better information sharing on community service with veterans, and I applaud those efforts. But I've heard that some of these issues have to do with timing, to make the transition to the military and into a program like AmeriCorps gapless. Or for Veterans looking to use their GI Bill benefits, they're looking for ways that can continue serving, but in a way that fits into their class schedules or summer breaks. What can we do to examine making these programs more adaptable to meeting veterans where they are?

Dr. HECK. The Commission makes several recommendations around including post-military service opportunities as part of the transition assistance program available to separating service members. Americorps has the to develop flexible programs to meet the unique needs of veterans.

Mr. KIM. I've read about some promising programs that would enable veterans to earn apprenticeship hours through service learning, and even use their GI Bill to help supplement their income while gaining this experience. How can we structure service learning to help build critical skills in career fields—especial for veterans who do not wish to pursue a 4-year degree?

Mr. GEARAN. [No answer was available at the time of printing.]