

address something that occurred back in 1988 with respect to the actions of a Member of this House with regard to the scope and inquiry of one of its committees?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may not refer to the current ethical standing of other Members of this House.

Mr. BONIOR. So, further requesting a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, if we are talking about something that occurred back in 1988, that obviously is not current, and the gentleman from Georgia would be in order to talk about what was suggested by Speaker GINGRICH back in 1988.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless it is in reference to an ethical situation of a Member that is still in the House.

Mr. BONIOR. That Member certainly is not in the House at this point, so I would assume from that answer, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] would be within the bounds of the Chair's ruling to discuss the comments made in 1988 by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already ruled that the Members shall refrain from addressing any issue that is pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct relating to, a current Member of this Congress.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] may proceed on order.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me quote what Speaker GINGRICH said in 1988 about the investigation of Speaker Wright:

I am concerned that the scope, authority and independence of the special counsel will be limited by the guidelines the Ethics Committee has established.

Gingrich went on—

The House of Representatives, as well as the American public, deserve an investigation which will uncover the truth. At this moment, I am afraid that the apparent restrictions placed on this special counsel will not allow the truth to be uncovered.

Speaker GINGRICH was right then, and the same rules should apply today. Let the special counsel uncover the truth. If the Speaker has nothing to hide, do not limit the scope of the special counsel's investigation.

#### HURTFUL COMMENTS

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, just this past weekend, the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], made some very hurtful and intemperate remarks about New York, New York City and New York State, for which he has apologized, but frankly the hurt is still there.

The Speaker said that New York was "a culture of waste for which they expect us to send a check and that this country is not going to bail out habits that have made New York so extraordinarily expensive."

I want to say to the Speaker that New York City and New York State for many, many years has been sending the Federal Government much more than it is getting back; in fact, to the tune of \$9 billion. New York sends and New York State sends to the Government much more than it gets back.

The State of Georgia, quite frankly, sends \$1 billion less than it gets, \$1 billion less than it gets. So Georgia is a net gain in terms of Federal largess and New York is a net loser. In fact, in the Speaker's district, that district has received more pork frankly than any other district.

Let me just say we should be very careful before we make such hurtful statements, and let me say the Speaker is now in New York raising money. If he detests us so, he ought not to do that, and I hope his budget would change and that New York would get some more help.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1617, CAREERS ACT

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 222

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1617) to consolidate and reform workforce development and literacy programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 2332. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. The first six sections and each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI or section 302(f) or 401(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Goodling or his designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, may amend the portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against that amendment are waived. After disposition of that amendment, the

provisions of the bill as then perfected shall be considered as original text. During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 222 is the rule for the consideration of H.R. 1617, the Consolidated and Reformed Education, Employment, and Rehabilitation Systems Act, better known as the CAREERS Act.

This is an open rule. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. After general debate, the bill will be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill will be considered by title. The first six sections in each title now printed in the bill shall be considered as read. The rule provides priority recognition for Members who have preprinted their amendments. Finally, the rule provides for a motion to recommit with instructions.

This bill will consolidate more than 150 existing separate, duplicative and fragmented education and job training programs into four consolidated grants to the States. It represents a dramatic improvement over current law not only by consolidating so many different programs but also by providing States and local communities with greater opportunity and flexibility to design programs to meet the needs of their citizens, rather than the needs of the Federal Government.

This bill will also turn two Government sponsored enterprises "Sallie Mae"—the Student Loan Marketing Association—and "Connie Lee"—the College Construction Loan Insurance Association—entirely over to the private sector. And last, but certainly not least, this bill reduces the Federal deficit by cutting bureaucracy and waste, saving \$6.5 billion over 5 years with no disruption of service to individuals.

This rule provides for full, fair, and open debate and is brought up under an

open rule at the request of the chairman. Concerns have been raised about how the needs of individuals with disabilities will be addressed under H.R. 1617. This open rule will permit thorough consideration of this and other important issues by allowing amend-

ments to be offered on the floor for consideration by the full House. I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule. It permits for the fair consideration of a bill that will provide for a better prepared and more knowledgeable work force—benefiting both the

American people and American business. At the same time, it protects the right of Members to offer amendments for consideration by the full House. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following statistical information from the Committee on Rules:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS  
[As of September 18, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open <sup>2</sup>	46	44	46	74
Modified Closed <sup>3</sup>	49	47	14	23
Closed <sup>4</sup>	9	9	2	3
Totals:	104	100	62	100

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.  
<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.  
<sup>3</sup> A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.  
<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS  
[As of September 18, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95)
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MC	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MO	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PO: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PO: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PO: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MidCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PO: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PO: 258-170 A: 271-152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	O	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PO: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PO: 235-193 D: 192-238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PO: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PO: 242-185 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PO: 217-202 (7/21/95)
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95)
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95)
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95)
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95)
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95)
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95)
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95)
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95)
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95)
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	

Codes: O=open rule; MO=modified open rule; MC=modified closed rule; C=closed rule; A=adoption vote; D=defeated; PO=previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Utah, Mrs. Waldholtz, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing this resolution to the floor.

House Resolution 222 is an open rule which will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 1617, a bill to consolidate and reform work force development and literacy programs.

As my colleague from Utah has ably described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Under the rule, germane amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, the normal amending process in the House. All Members, on both sides of the aisle, will have the opportunity to offer amendments. I am pleased that the Rules Committee reported this rule without opposition in a voice vote and I plan to support it.

Though I support the rule, I have reservations about a number of provisions in the bill.

First, I am concerned about the overall cuts in the authorization level for Federal employment and training programs. Job training is an investment that will pay off in more productive citizens and increased human capital. We all agree that deficit reduction is important for the benefit of the next generation. However, the same can be said for education.

Second, I oppose title V, which amends the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. I have heard from a number of citizens with disabilities in my district as well as national organizations that represent persons with disabilities. They fear that rewriting the law will reduce the effectiveness of existing employment-related services.

Third, I am concerned about the repeal of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, which was just enacted last year with bipartisan support. This legislation helps States and local school districts create programs to prepare students for the world of work who do not go on to college. This is the kind of legislation that gets the most bang for the buck because the program provides only the seed money.

Mr. Speaker, this open rule will permit full discussion of these issues and give Members an opportunity to amend the bill. I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to H.R. 1617, the Consolidated and Reformed Education,

Employment, and Rehabilitation Systems Act, better known as CAREERS.

The rule we are considering today provides for an open, fair debate on this historic legislation. The bill represents an historic turning point for this Congress because CAREERS consolidates more than 150 existing separate, duplicative and fragmented education and job training programs into four consolidated grants to the States.

Never before has the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities agreed to consolidate and repeal so many existing programs under its jurisdiction. The CAREERS Act represents significant improvements over current law, not only by consolidating so many different programs, but also by recognizing that States are different and the needs of their individuals are different. The CAREERS Act promotes maximum flexibility for States while ensuring that they are held accountable for results through performance measurements they develop.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to talk a little bit about some of the criticisms that you will probably hear during the debate, and I would like to take them head on.

There are some who believe we should maintain the status quo as far as vocational rehabilitation is concerned. In other words, keep the current overly bureaucratic system that fails to find jobs for more than two-thirds of the disabled people it serves in meaningful jobs. No doubt many Members have heard from interested parties on this issue in the past few days, but I ask you to keep in mind they are hearing primarily from the bureaucrats who provide these services.

Our bill sides with the consumers of vocational rehabilitation services. Let me read to you a letter from ARC, formerly known as the Association for Retarded Citizens of the United States, concerning efforts to strike vocational rehabilitation from this bill, and I quote

To delink the vocational rehabilitation system from this new system in CAREERS will only serve to isolate the VR system and people with mental retardation from the employers. No one would gain except those professionals in the VR system whose sole agenda is to protect turf. We do not think that is what reform is all about.

I could not have said it better myself.

Some have complained that the bill could lead to mandatory Federal tracking forcing students into particular occupations at a very early age. To address that issue we have added the following provisions to the bill. Nothing in this act shall mandate that any individual, particularly youth served under title II of this act, be required to choose a specific career path or major. The bill does not mandate trapping.

We have heard from various Members concerned about privacy of labor market and other data collected under the legislation. We have added specific language restating title XIII of the Census Act relating to confidentiality of infor-

mation, and added language ensuring that this act is consistent with the Family Education Privacy Act.

There have been some concerns expressed about the skills standards provisions of the bill. Our bill recognizes that because work force development programs are all about preparing individuals for careers, we must increase the involvement of business and industry, both small and large, in the design and implementation of State and local work force preparation programs. It is essential that employers identify the skills needed in the workplace in order that employment and training assistance programs are relevant and useful. As such, we included provisions in the bill that tied program performance to providing the skills that have been recognized by industry as necessary to perform in a specific occupation.

Mr. Speaker, we also say that program participants may, I repeat, may, receive skill certificates, portable credentials that certify an individual has mastered the occupational skills identified by employers as necessary to do the job. We do not require, however, that any individual must receive such certificates or that any employer must accept or use skill certificates in making hiring decisions. We also add language to the bill clarifying that skill certificates shall not replace high school diplomas or GED's.

There are other issues I will bring forth later on. One other I might mention, maintenance of effort, is always very difficult. It is particularly difficult when you are talking about downsizing the amount of expenditures coming from the Federal Government. It would seem that if the Federal Government cuts back, then when we talk about maintenance of effort, we should also allow the States to cut back an equal amount, and if we do not, then of course we have unfunded mandates.

Finally, one of the big issues that Members, particularly those from the other side of the aisle, may raise concerns a provision that allows Governors to transfer 10 percent of their funds between the youth and the adult training blocks, first, let me make it clear that under this transfer authority, transferred funds must be spent at the local level.

Second, it is important that everyone knows exactly why we add the provision to the bill. That is to allow States additional flexibility to determine how best to meet the educational and training needs of their particular State. This is particularly important during this time of substantial cutbacks in Federal job training funds.

I might mention, I agree with the minority member, who earlier indicated a concern about the amount of money only in the youth block, but hopefully, as we go through conference, that will be restored. It was somewhat restored on the floor of the House; hopefully, more will be restored when we complete our conference.

□ 1045

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, which allows for open debate, and in support of the general direction of this bill. I think we have had too many job training programs that have been duplicative, that have been overlapping. I think the concept of this bill is a good one in merging those, a concept that supports some of the evaluation that, frankly, has not occurred in the past with reference to many of these programs.

The one very significant exception though that I would note to that support and on which I would focus public attention is the way that we handle the training programs for people with disabilities across this country.

I believe that the amendment that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, will offer to except vocational rehabilitation from the coverage of this one-stop bill to deal with some of the unique problems that our citizens with disabilities have is the approach that we must adopt.

I am sure that there are people that are involved in one training program or another that have views on this subject. I have heard from some of them. But the most compelling stories are the stories that I have heard from people with disabilities themselves. They have been coming out to see me as I visit around my home of Austin, TX.

This last weekend, recognizing that the Federal building may be a bit pretentious, I took my office out to the neighborhood and held office hours on a Saturday morning in front of a grocery store. I had a number of people with disabilities who came out. I expect they were concerned mainly about the way they are going to be hit on Medicare, since they, along with seniors, rely on Medicare, and it will reach into their pocket with this Republican plan to require that they pay more and get less under Medicare. But the second concern that they voiced, and a very real one, is having vocational rehabilitation lumped into House bill 1617.

Last Saturday one of the people who came and talked to me during these grocery store hours in north Austin was Doris Varnell. Doris is a woman who lives in Austin, and who at age 40 was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. Despite the debilitating effects of this terrible disease, she was determined to continue to work.

She told me that without the support of the Texas Rehabilitation Commission, TRC, as we call it in Texas, she is not sure that she could ever have made the first tough job search. You see, she was accustomed to being a person without disabilities, and like any of us, who are just one accident or one unfortunate illness away from a disability, she was a person who lived without disability

and now confronted disability and had to adapt to that and find out how to overcome that disability. She turned for the first time at a very scary time in her life to the Texas Rehabilitation Commission and found a way to avoid painful discrimination and found a way to benefit from the special services that have served her and have served literally hundreds of thousands of Texans, as they have served millions of Americans across this country. In fact, during the time the vocational rehabilitation system has been in effect in America, it has served and gotten into our work force some 9 million Americans.

Every year, vocational rehabilitation gives 200,000 more Americans the opportunity to serve in the work force, despite of and in fact overcoming their disabilities.

We hear so much in this Congress about the SSI Program under Social Security. Well, 40,000 people come off of SSI every year as a result of the services of vocational rehabilitation. All of this has been accomplished with a network of State vocational rehabilitation services, recognizing some of the unique needs of people with disabilities. In essence, we already have a block grant program for vocational rehabilitation. I fear that some have taken such a blockheaded approach to block grants that they are now going to block grant a block grant program.

This is a solution without a problem when it comes to people with disabilities in Texas. We already have a Federal block grant program going to the Texas Rehabilitation Commission. It provides unique services to meet the needs of people with disabilities. It does it well. It does it efficiently. It does it with local input and support and consultation with local groups involved with people with disabilities, and that is the way it ought to continue to occur.

I realize the appeal of a one-stop career center, and I think that that is appropriate for people who are unskilled, who are undereducated. But I am concerned that someone who faces multiple sclerosis, who has some other type of mental or physical disability, needs more than one stop. They may need extra assistance to deal with their disabilities and find a way to convince employers of how much they contribute.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that we have a system that works very well right now to meet the needs of people with disabilities. It involves people who are skilled as counselors in working with people with disabilities, and in the course of adopting a bill that has much merit, let us not destroy this hope that is out there of meeting the special needs of people with disabilities. Let us support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas Mr. GENE GREEN, to preserve a system that works and works well for people with disabilities.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], a member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our leadership for making time in our very busy schedule for this legislation to come to the floor. This is a good rule. It obviously continues our tradition in the 104th Congress of open rules under the Republican majority. I want to urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1617, the CAREERS Act.

This has been very much in its development stages a bipartisan bill. We were able to report the bill out of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities on a bipartisan basis. We have received a tremendous amount of assistance from the administration in crafting the bill, and I particularly want to salute Doug Ross, who is the immediate past assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training for his role in helping us craft this legislation. It is ironic, just to underscore the bipartisan nature of the bill, that we have also been working with Robert T. Jones, the vice president of the National Association of Business, who was the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training in the Bush administration. Again, I think that underscores the bipartisan nature of this bill.

We have worked very hard in crafting the legislation to address the concerns of various interest groups. We have worked closely with the Governors, the National Governors Association, and various family and value oriented groups. We have always listened carefully to what the business community has had to say about how we can improve upon the existing service delivery system for job training programs.

As the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], stressed, we have taken these 160-some odd separate Federal job training programs, what are called categorical programs, spread across 146 different Federal agencies and departments, and consolidated them into four block grants. The idea behind that is to give the States and Governors much more say and flexibility in designing and running these programs, and we have also included in the bill the idea of an individual voucher for job training recipients, what we call a career grant.

This is a very important concept, because what we are really trying to do is tell American workers that they will have a greater say in determining what kind of career training or work force preparation is right for them.

This is, again, a bipartisan concept that harkens back to the Bush administration. In the Bush administration, they first proposed a concept of a GI bill for workers, and this concept has

continued in the present administration with the President and Secretary Reich pushing hard for the concept of skill grants. Again, we have been able to embody that concept, although we call it career grants, a slightly different term, in this legislation.

Now, this legislation focuses in on several different groups of job training recipients. Of course, first and foremost are unemployed workers. In the legislation we take an employment first approach. We are trying to get these folks back into the work force as soon as possible.

We are also trying to help disadvantaged youth, those youth that are at risk of dropping out of school, particularly in the face of all the recent evidence suggesting that some degree of post-secondary educational attainment and computer literacy, or some computer skills, are absolutely essential to a young person's chances for competing and succeeding in an increasingly global economy. We think we can do a much better job with this bill of serving youth, particularly those, 70 to 75 percent of our young people, who are not college-bound or who, if they go to college, will drop out.

We are also working diligently in the legislation to help those who are extremely disadvantaged, either those who are disabled and must overcome certain physical and mental and architectural barriers to find gainful employment in the work force. We are trying to help those who are illiterate by having a separate block grant that is targeted to adult education and illiteracy.

We have good accountability and performance standards in the legislation that gives States and local communities a much greater say in determining what the performance standards should be based on local conditions, but we do require in the legislation the States after setting those goals, in consultation with local communities, to show continuous improvement and progress above the baseline that has been established.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation. Again, I urge support of the rule and support of the bill. This bill goes a long way toward improving the productivity of American workers, and therefore the quality of life or the standard of living for American workers. We will look forward as we get into the debate on separate amendments talking about in more detail about the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of H.R. 1617. The Consolidated and Reformed Education, Employment, and Rehabilitation Systems Act or CAREERS is quite an elaborate name for legislation aimed solely at simplifying and improving our current maze of job training and employment assistance programs. As a Member of the House who acknowledges the direct correlation between program design and program success, I urge all of my colleagues to listen closely to this debate today and de-

cide to vote in favor of creating a well-designed model for the deliverance of job training and employment assistance services.

We currently refer to our various fragmented job training and employment-related programs as ones formulating a system, which is laughable because the word system implies that there is some form of orderly program interaction taking place. This is not the case. The U.S. General Accounting Office [GAO] has identified 163 different programs, totaling \$20 billion, which offer some type of career related, education, job training or employment assistance to youth and adults. Further, the Associate Director for Education and Employment issues at GAO recently testified that the current employment, training assistance programs are narrowly tailored, leaving programs to compete for clients and funds. He then, in his testimony, went on to question the system's overall efficiency.

A potluck approach to Federal job training and employment assistance is a disservice to the adults and youth looking to utilize these programs. The CAREERS bill offers us a chance to streamline, improve the Federal effort in this important area. We will be working through this legislation to create a real training and employment system, equipped with easy customer access and choice. No one should be faced with a maze of noncoordinated programs when progressing toward employment objectives. CAREERS requires States and local work force development areas to establish integrated career center systems in which individuals may obtain services and familiarize themselves with the State's work force development system. This integrated system is user friendly and enables individuals to gain quick access to all parts of the system. Let us be clear, CAREERS does not mandate that you establish one-stop centers. Under CAREERS, one could enter the State career system through a colocated center, one-stop center or through an electronically linked affiliated site. The legislative intent is the creation of an integrated system where the user is best served.

I think it is important to point out that when we talk of an integrated system, we are not advocating the creation of a generic delivery system, one unable to meet the needs of the diverse people who will ultimately use these programs. The block grants included in CAREERS are all structured to assure that attention is focused on the four, distinct populations seeking service. Clearly, the one-size-fits-all approach will not work in this area. I am pleased that CAREERS not only allows for local control, customer choice, and customer accessibility but is also wisely structured so that diverse populations may be served.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and look forward to passage of H.R. 1617, the CAREERS.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 2, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 664]

YEAS—388

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Hilleary
Ackerman	DeLauro	Hilliard
Allard	DeLay	Hinchey
Andrews	Dellums	Hobson
Archer	Deutsch	Hoekstra
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Hoke
Bachus	Dickey	Horn
Baessler	Dicks	Hostettler
Baker (CA)	Dingell	Houghton
Baker (LA)	Doggett	Hoyer
Baldacci	Dooley	Hunter
Ballenger	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Barcia	Doyle	Hyde
Barr	Dreier	Inglis
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Istook
Bartlett	Dunn	Jackson-Lee
Barton	Durbin	Jacobs
Bass	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Bateman	Ehlers	Johnson (SD)
Becerra	Ehrlich	Johnson, E. B.
Beilenson	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Bentsen	Engel	Johnston
Bereuter	English	Jones
Berman	Ensign	Kanjorski
Bevill	Eshoo	Kasich
Bilbray	Evans	Kelly
Bilirakis	Everett	Kennedy (MA)
Bishop	Ewing	Kennedy (RI)
Bliley	Farr	Kennelly
Blute	Fattah	Kildee
Boehlert	Fawell	Kim
Boehner	Fazio	King
Bonilla	Fields (TX)	Klecza
Bonior	Filner	Klink
Bono	Flake	Klug
Borski	Flanagan	Knollenberg
Boucher	Foglietta	Kolbe
Brewster	Foley	LaFalce
Browder	Forbes	LaHood
Brown (CA)	Fox	Largent
Brown (OH)	Franks (CT)	Latham
Brownback	Franks (NJ)	Laughlin
Bryant (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lazio
Bunn	Frisa	Leach
Bunning	Frost	Levin
Burr	Funderburk	Lewis (CA)
Burton	Furse	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Galleghy	Lightfoot
Calvert	Ganske	Lincoln
Camp	Gekas	Linder
Canady	Gephardt	Lipinski
Cardin	Geren	Livingston
Castle	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Chabot	Gillmor	Lofgren
Chambliss	Gilman	Longley
Chenoweth	Gonzalez	Lowe
Christensen	Goodlatte	Lucas
Chrysler	Goodling	Luther
Clay	Gordon	Maloney
Clayton	Goss	Manton
Clement	Graham	Manzullo
Clinger	Green	Markley
Coble	Greenwood	Martini
Coburn	Gunderson	Mascara
Coleman	Gutierrez	Matsui
Collins (GA)	Gutknecht	McCollum
Combest	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Conyers	Hall (TX)	McDade
Cooley	Hamilton	McDermott
Costello	Hancock	McHale
Cox	Hansen	McHugh
Coyne	Harman	McInnis
Cramer	Hastert	McIntosh
Crane	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Crapo	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Cremins	Hayes	McNulty
Cubin	Hayworth	Meehan
Cunningham	Hefley	Meek
Davis	Hefner	Menendez
de la Garza	Heineman	Metcalf
Deal	Herger	Meyers

Mica	Regula	Talent
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Tanner
Miller (FL)	Riggs	Tate
Minge	Rivers	Tauzin
Mink	Roemer	Taylor (MS)
Molinari	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Tejeda
Montgomery	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas
Moorhead	Roth	Thompson
Moran	Roukema	Thornberry
Morella	Roybal-Allard	Thornton
Murtha	Royce	Thurman
Myers	Rush	Tiahrt
Myrick	Sabo	Torres
Nadler	Salmon	Torricelli
Neal	Sanders	Towns
Nethercutt	Sanford	Trafficant
Ney	Saxton	Upton
Norwood	Scarborough	Velazquez
Nussle	Schaefer	Vento
Obey	Schiff	Vucanovich
Oliver	Schroeder	Waldholtz
Ortiz	Scott	Walker
Orton	Seastrand	Walsh
Owens	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Oxley	Serrano	Ward
Packard	Shadegg	Waters
Pallone	Shaw	Watt (NC)
Pastor	Shays	Watts (OK)
Paxon	Shuster	Waxman
Payne (NJ)	Skaggs	Weldon (FL)
Payne (VA)	Skeen	Weldon (PA)
Pelosi	Skelton	Weller
Peterson (FL)	Slaughter	White
Peterson (MN)	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Petri	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Pickett	Smith (TX)	Williams
Pombo	Smith (WA)	Wilson
Pomeroy	Solomon	Wolf
Porter	Souder	Woolsey
Portman	Spence	Wyden
Poshard	Spratt	Wynn
Quillen	Stark	Yates
Quinn	Stearns	Young (AK)
Radanovich	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Rahall	Stokes	Zeliff
Ramstad	Studds	Zimmer
Rangel	Stump	
Reed	Stupak	

## NAYS—2

Martinez	Stockman
----------	----------

## NOT VOTING—44

Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)	Oberstar
Brown (FL)	Gejdenson	Parker
Bryant (TN)	Gibbons	Pryce
Callahan	Holden	Reynolds
Chapman	Jefferson	Roberts
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rose
Collins (IL)	Kingston	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Schumer
Condit	LaTourette	Siskis
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Torkildsen
Dixon	McCarthy	Tucker
Dornan	Mfume	Visclosky
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Volkmer
Ford	Moakley	Wise
Fowler	Neumann	

□ 1117

Mr. FOGLIETTA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call vote No. 664 on H.R. 1617 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on

which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, September 18, 1995, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 402 by the yeas and nays, H.R. 1091 by the yeas and nays, H.R. 260 by the yeas and nays, H.R. 1296 by the yeas and nays, and H.R. 558 by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

## ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 402.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 402, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 10, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 665]

## YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Chapman	Ewing
Ackerman	Chenoweth	Farr
Allard	Christensen	Fattah
Andrews	Chrysler	Fawell
Archer	Clay	Fazio
Armey	Clayton	Fields (TX)
Bachus	Clement	Flake
Baessler	Clinger	Flanagan
Baker (CA)	Clyburn	Foglietta
Baker (LA)	Coble	Foley
Baldacci	Coburn	Forbes
Ballenger	Coleman	Fox
Barcia	Collins (GA)	Franks (CT)
Barr	Combest	Franks (NJ)
Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Cooley	Frisa
Barton	Costello	Frost
Bass	Cox	Funderburk
Bateman	Coyne	Galleghy
Becerra	Cramer	Ganske
Beilenson	Crane	Gekas
Bentsen	Crapo	Gephardt
Bereuter	Creameans	Geren
Berman	Cubin	Gibbons
Bevill	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Bilbray	Davis	Gillmor
Bilirakis	de la Garza	Gilman
Bishop	Deal	Gonzalez
Bliley	DeLauro	Goodlatte
Blute	DeLay	Goodling
Boehlert	Dellums	Gordon
Boehner	Deutsch	Goss
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Bonior	Dickey	Green
Bono	Dicks	Greenwood
Borski	Dingell	Gunderson
Boucher	Dixon	Gutierrez
Brewster	Doggett	Gutknecht
Browder	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Brown (CA)	Doolittle	Hall (TX)
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hamilton
Brownback	Dreier	Hancock
Bryant (TX)	Duncan	Hansen
Bunn	Dunn	Harman
Bunning	Durbin	Hastert
Burr	Edwards	Hastings (FL)
Burton	Ehlers	Hastings (WA)
Buyer	Ehrlich	Hayes
Calvert	Emerson	Hayworth
Camp	Engel	Hefley
Canady	English	Hefner
Cardin	Ensign	Heineman
Castle	Eshoo	Hergert
Chabot	Evans	Hilleary
Chambliss	Everett	Hilliard

Hinchey	McNulty	Schaefer
Hobson	Meehan	Schiff
Hoekstra	Meek	Schroeder
Hoke	Menendez	Scott
Holden	Metcalf	Seastrand
Horn	Meyers	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Mica	Serrano
Houghton	Miller (CA)	Shadegg
Hoyer	Miller (FL)	Shaw
Hunter	Mineta	Shays
Hutchinson	Minge	Shuster
Hyde	Mink	Skeen
Inglis	Molinari	Skelton
Istook	Mollohan	Slaughter
Jackson-Lee	Montgomery	Smith (MI)
Jacobs	Moorhead	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Moran	Smith (TX)
Johnson (SD)	Morella	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Solomon
Johnson, Sam	Myers	Souder
Johnston	Myrick	Spence
Jones	Nadler	Spratt
Kanjorski	Neal	Stark
Kasich	Nethercutt	Stearns
Kelly	Ney	Stenholm
Kennedy (MA)	Norwood	Stockman
Kennedy (RI)	Nussle	Stokes
Kennelly	Oliver	Studds
Kim	Ortiz	Stump
King	Orton	Stupak
Kingston	Owens	Talent
Klecza	Oxley	Tanner
Klink	Packard	Tate
Klug	Pallone	Tauzin
Knollenberg	Pastor	Taylor (MS)
Kolbe	Paxon	Taylor (NC)
LaFalce	Payne (NJ)	Tejeda
LaHood	Payne (VA)	Thomas
Largent	Pelosi	Thompson
Latham	Peterson (FL)	Thornberry
Laughlin	Peterson (MN)	Thornton
Lazio	Petri	Thurman
Leach	Pickett	Tiahrt
Levin	Pombo	Torres
Lewis (CA)	Pomeroy	Torricelli
Lewis (GA)	Porter	Towns
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Trafficant
Lightfoot	Poshard	Upton
Lincoln	Quillen	Velazquez
Linder	Quinn	Vucanovich
Lipinski	Radanovich	Waldholtz
Livingston	Rahall	Walker
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Walsh
Lofgren	Rangel	Wamp
Longley	Reed	Ward
Lowey	Regula	Waters
Lucas	Richardson	Watt (NC)
Luther	Riggs	Watts (OK)
Maloney	Rivers	Waxman
Manton	Roberts	Weldon (FL)
Manzullo	Roemer	Weldon (PA)
Markey	Rogers	Weller
Martinez	Rohrabacher	White
Martini	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Mascara	Rose	Wicker
Matsui	Roth	Wilson
McCollum	Roukema	Wise
McCrery	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
McDade	Royce	Woolsey
McDermott	Rush	Wyden
McHale	Sabo	Wynn
McHugh	Salmon	Young (AK)
McInnis	Sanders	Young (FL)
McIntosh	Sanford	Zeliff
McKeon	Saxton	Zimmer
McKinney	Scarborough	

## NAYS—10

DeFazio	Obey	Williams
Filner	Skaggs	Yates
Furse	Vento	
Kildee	Visclosky	

## NOT VOTING—32

Barrett (WI)	Fowler	Oberstar
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Parker
Bryant (TN)	Gejdenson	Pryce
Callahan	Jefferson	Reynolds
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Schumer
Condit	LaTourette	Siskis
Danner	McCarthy	Torkildsen
Dornan	Mfume	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Volkmer
Ford	Neumann	