

As I say, first was the overwhelming universal feeling of all parts, all of the philosophical spectrum in Russia opposing this, not only opposing it but emotionally opposing it, feeling threatened by it.

Second, Mr. President, I was struck by what you might call the political immaturity, the fact that the political personality of Russia has not yet matured. Their national psyche is still in the formative process. Their emotional involvement in this new democratic experiment—it was just overwhelming to see the emotion of these Members of the Duma. At this critical time, at this time in a formative process for Russia, for us to come along, rather than portray ourselves as their friend, their ally, their helper, someone who is interested in seeing the country move forward, to come along, in effect, with a new policy of containment to me, Mr. President, is absolute madness.

It seems to me that we ought to find some way to have cooperation with these new Eastern European democracies to make them feel part of our political family without having them be part of our nuclear umbrella, particularly when that umbrella is surrounding the former Soviet Union, containing the former Soviet Union, and threatening the former Soviet Union.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SAM NUNN

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, just for one moment, I want to congratulate, of course, the Senator from Texas for her leadership, but the Senator from Georgia for his leadership on this issue, which is just another one of those issues in which, through the years, he has led this Senate, has led this country in its political thinking.

Most Senators of this body are content to properly represent their people, to reflect their political views, to be popular in the polls, to vote right, to vote in the national good. Other Senators like to think of themselves as being effective enough to be able to take the ideas of others which they agree with, to take the speeches, to take the bills, to take the thoughts of others and effectively represent those thoughts and feelings and bills out here on the floor of the Senate so as to move the country in the right direction.

There are occasional Senators, Mr. President, by virtue of their wisdom, their training, their background, their effort, their industry, their dedication, their devotion, but mainly by virtue of their God-given gifts, who are able to lead, to conceive the ideas by which the country ought to move, to determine what those policies are and, in the process, to serve as the beacon, the guidepost by which the rest of us Senators may guide our thoughts and our policies and our votes.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] is one of those rare individuals. As Senator BYRD said here on the floor not too many months ago, Senator NUNN

will stand out in the history of this country through the 200 years of this Senate as one of the outstanding leaders, not just for the 1990's or the 1970's when he came, but throughout the history of the country.

He really gives lie to that old aphorism that no one is essential because, Mr. President, when Senator NUNN leaves this body, there will be left a tremendous hole. Of course, in his experience, and know-how and technique, but really in that kind of wisdom that guides the country, that forms policy, that gives Americans, and especially gives Senators, the confidence that the country is moving in the right direction. As long as Senator NUNN was here, we always knew there was a voice on foreign policy matters upon which we could rely, and defense matters.

He will be greatly missed and, I suspect, if he is ever replaced, it will be many, many decades before we ever develop a man of his ability and wisdom and judgment.

Mr. President, he will be greatly missed and, from a personal standpoint, I can say that many of us will miss him and certainly his wife, Colleen, who is one of the most beloved Senate wives in this body and certainly one greatly beloved by me and my family.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his kind remarks, for his friendship and leadership. As he well knows, I have the greatest esteem for him. We have been colleagues from day one. He tried to claim seniority when he first came here and had to be awakened to the fact that he did not have it. I was the senior Member of the new class of 1972, now ancient.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator will yield, I have only said I was second to "NUNN" in seniority.

Mr. NUNN. The Senator is corrected on that. I appreciate his kind words and leadership. I appreciate him coming to the floor. He has basically been a keen observer of the national security scene and the NATO scene for a long, long time. All of us who have had dealings in this area realize that this is a subject that needs some really careful consideration. So I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comments.

USE OF THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR A RAOUL WALLENBERG CEREMONY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 94 regarding the use of the Capitol rotunda for a Raoul Wallenberg ceremony just received from the House, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and

that any statements relating to this measure be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 94) was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DEWINE).

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed as in morning business. I ask unanimous consent that the time that I use not be charged against either side managing the bill that is now the pending business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Reserving the right to object, and I will not do so, just to suggest we are waiting for, I believe, probably Senator JEFFORDS and Senator PELL to offer the first amendment. But certainly I look forward to Senator PRYOR being able to speak as in morning business.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the Chair. I thank my distinguished colleague from Kansas.

I see the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island here at this time. I am wondering if he would like for me to withdraw my consent request and allow him to offer his amendment.

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I think I would prefer that the sponsor of the amendment have the first opportunity.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the distinguished Senator. I will proceed. I will be sensitive to the time constraint that we are faced with.

(The remarks of Mr. PRYOR pertaining to the introduction of S. 1299 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I thank once again the distinguished manager of the bill and my colleague from Rhode Island, who allowed me to go before him. I thank them.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island whatever time is necessary for the offering of his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2886

(Purpose: To provide for the State distribution of funds for secondary school vocational education, postsecondary and adult vocational education, and adult education)

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas, and I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and myself and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], for Mr. JEFFORDS, for himself and Mr. PELL, proposes an amendment numbered 2886.

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I ask that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 77, strike lines 7 through 18, and insert the following:

(4) STATE DETERMINATIONS.—From the amount available to a State educational agency under paragraph (2)(B) for a program year, such agency shall distribute such funds for workforce education activities in such State as follows:

(A) 75 percent of such amount shall be distributed for secondary school vocational education in accordance with section 112, or for postsecondary and adult vocational education in accordance with section 113, or for both; and

(B) 25 percent of such amount shall be distributed for adult education in accordance with section 114.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island should be aware there are 45 minutes allocated, equally divided, for this amendment.

Mr. PELL. Right. That will be done by the managers of the bill.

I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by Senator JEFFORDS.

The bill provides that 25 percent of the funds go to the work force education. This amendment would stipulate that 25 percent of those education funds would go to adult education and 75 percent to vocational education.

To my mind, it is very important the adult education be assured of funding. In State after State this is a program that is run by volunteers and groups that do not have substantial political clout. Consequently, I fear that adult education will be at a considerable disadvantage in the give and take that will lead to dividing the pie with vocational education.

Today, adult education serves only half of all those who seek its services. This says nothing about outreach to those who need such services, but do not seek them. If the one-stop career centers operate as they are envisioned, it is reasonable to expect that we will identify many more adults who need

adult education services. That, in turn, could well overwhelm an adult education system that is already overburdened.

Approval of the Jeffords amendment would mean simply that adult education would be ensured a flow of funds that would enable it to continue the very excellent and much-needed services it now provides. I would urge my colleagues to support its passage and that I strongly support it myself.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I think this is a critical time in our history when we examine as we go forward how we are going to take care of the difficult problems facing our society. We are dealing in this bill with people who have difficulty obtaining employment, and at the same time in a related bill we are dealing with individuals who are on welfare.

Let me take a look at the overall needs of the Nation in order to emphasize how important it is that we allocate our scarce resources appropriately.

There are approximately 90 million people in this Nation who are functionally illiterate. There are also large numbers, millions, who are unemployed. What would be the cost of helping all 90 million achieve literacy? If we dedicated merely \$10 per person, it would cost \$900 million; or \$100 per person, the figure would be \$9 billion. However, to be truly effective, a more realistic figure would be \$1,000 per person or \$90 billion to help those 90 million people achieve literacy.

As far as unemployment is concerned, the figures are less specific, but we do know that for every space we have for employment training now, there are 10 people who are unemployed or underemployed who desire that slot. That leaves nine people who desire this training unserved for every one who receives training.

The amendment we have before us today will help ensure that we adequately provide literacy services for those who must, at least, overcome this obstacle before entering the work force; this is the essence of adult basic education. The amount of money that we are dealing with in this particular bill is approximately \$5 billion.

When you remember those figures I gave you on what it would cost to help those 90 million people achieve literacy or the fact that it would probably cost 10 times as much to provide adequate job training for those who require it, you realize how desperate the need is for these funds to be adequately appropriated.

With respect to our amendment, my own experience causes me to be concerned that the pressures that are placed on these bills and the kinds of incentives that are placed in these bills will tend to focus resources on employment training at the expense of adult basic education.

I say that from my experience, because I have been in either the House or Senate for 21 years now, and I have been involved in all the employment training legislation that has gone on during that period of time. I have watched how these scarce resources were moved in one direction or another.

Before I go through that, let us look at what this bill and the welfare bill encourage States and individuals to do. One, we have the social welfare bill. The primary emphasis in this bill is to move people off welfare; that is, the States are rewarded for moving people off welfare.

On the other hand, and keep this in mind because it kind of shows what can happen here if we are not careful, there is a provision that could terminate benefits after 2 years. That is an incentive to the individual that says, "I must get educated, I must get a job or else I lose my benefits."

My experience tells me that the incentive created to get people off welfare, combined with the incentives we have now in employment training to try and move people off the unemployment rolls and on to the employment rolls will inadvertently result in what is referred to as creaming. That is the emphasis will be to focus the funds on those for whom it is easiest to get off welfare and to get employment. That means, however, those who need the funding and education the most, those who are on welfare now and have been on welfare for many years, will probably have no opportunity to get the education they need because States have responded to incentives to focus resources in other directions.

Let me now turn to some charts, first of all, to emphasize what I have been saying. I point to the first chart. I told all of you to remember the article from the business section of the Washington Post that came to the attention of all of us, "Battling Against Workplace Illiteracy." This article emphasized how critical and how important the failure of our country to have provided an adequate education to our people has been to this Nation. I will just read the subtitle: "Companies Take Action as Awareness Increases of \$225 Billion Drag on U.S. Productivity." At the same time, as we remind ourselves that we are here to figure out how it is that this Nation can reduce the deficit, it seems very clear, when I look at the next chart, and other charts thereafter, that it is education that is a key to balancing the budget. If we do not improve the education of this Nation, not only will our deficit not get better, but it will get worse.

Let us take a look at the total drag on the economy now caused by the failure of our educational system. I tell you, when I see the statistics—I do not know how we got into this. In our schools, 50 percent of the kids who graduate, the "forgotten half" as we

are prone to refer to them now, graduate from high school functionally illiterate. That is a big part of how we got to where we are.

Let us take a look at this next chart, which indicates over half a trillion dollars in gross domestic product is lost each year because we have failed to educate our people properly. The \$225 billion I mentioned earlier is in this piece of the pie, which is green, \$225 billion for the cost of illiteracy to the marketplace. That is the inability of people to handle a job they ought to be able to handle has created a drag on our business to such a degree that we lose about \$225 billion of productivity annually.

Now let us get to the relevance of the two bills I have referred to today. First of all, take a look at \$208 billion for welfare expenditures. That means that the individuals that are on welfare, as against not being on welfare and in the employment sector, costs us \$208 billion. You see there is some double counting in here, obviously, because we are already up to \$433 billion, and we still have another factor to go.

The other factor is for training of employees. The businesses in this Nation are required to spend \$200 billion a year on either skill training or literacy programs. In fact, if you put literacy in there, it goes even higher. That is another burden on our businesses. If you add those up, we are over \$600 billion, with some double counting.

In addition to that, if you consider what it would save this Nation by having higher revenues because businesses and individuals would be earning more, we lose another \$125 billion.

My point, and a critical point, is that education is the key to our problems; education is the key to our future.

Now let me take a look at the next chart which I think will put things in perspective also.

We all say, "Hey, it's not our State. We are all doing fine. Our kids are getting educated. We don't have a problem."

Take a look at this chart. Those in green are the best States, and that means about 25 percent of their adults are functionally illiterate. Most of the States are even worse. Most of them are in the orange and red. Thirty to fifty percent of the adults in these States are functionally illiterate. The final category contains a large portion of the population and a lot of States. These States are shown in blue and have populations in which 50 percent or more of the adults are functionally illiterate. What a staggering indication that our country is in trouble.

The final chart will show you the relevance of illiteracy to the welfare problem. This one is very critical, and I think everyone should be aware of what we are talking about. The percentage of welfare recipients who have less than a high school diploma: Of those on welfare more than 5 years, almost 70 percent have less than a high school diploma. Of those on welfare 2

to 5 years, over 40 percent did not get a high school diploma. And of those who have less than 2 years on welfare, 30 percent.

What does that mean? It means that if we do not provide basic adult education, then there is no hope that those who have been on welfare more than 5 years are going to have an opportunity to get off welfare and to be able to be taxing citizens of this country.

I point out that what this means is that the way the incentives are built into this bill—and that is to try and enable people to move from unemployment to employment and to reduce the welfare rolls—all the emphasis will be placed upon this group right here, those that are on welfare less than 2 years. They are the ones more likely to be able to be employed, more likely to get off the unemployment and welfare rolls. And yet, there is little incentive to help those who have been on welfare more than 5 years. Without adult basic education these long-term welfare recipients, more than 60 percent of whom do not have a high school diploma, will not have the opportunity to become employable. In fact, I would guess that the incentives for States in this bill are such that very few long-term welfare recipients will be able to get the kind of education needed to give them any hope of getting off of welfare if we do not have adequate funding for adult education.

All this amendment does is to make sure that a minimum of 25 percent of the work force education funds here will be used for adult basic education—education for those on welfare who really need it.

I am sure, in my own mind, from my own experience, that if we do not pass this amendment, you are going to see the percentage of funds spent on adult education go down steadily. We will see more and more people suffering and losing their benefits, and we will have to restructure our work force development programs. It has happened before. It happened when we went from CETA to the Job Training Partnership Act. Since then, we have seen that we still did not effectively serve all of the target population. Now, without this amendment, this bill may very well have the exact same result.

So I urge you to support this amendment which would ensure the very minimum necessary to help long-term welfare recipients who need the most help get off of welfare and not just help those who need the minimum assistance to get off of welfare.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). There are 22 minutes 30 seconds, and the Senator from Rhode Island has 12 minutes 25 seconds.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. If I may comment for a moment, many of us put education as a top priority of interest and concern. But there are no two people, I think, in the U.S. Senate who

have spoken with greater dedication to the importance of education than Senator PELL, who has lent his name to one of the most important student aid programs that there is, the Pell grant program, and Senator JEFFORDS. So it is with regret that I must oppose this amendment. I opposed it in committee where it was defeated on a tie vote, and I oppose it today for one major reason.

To me, it is an important one, because it goes to the heart of what we have tried to do with the work force development legislation. It would reduce the State flexibility, which is really at the heart of S. 143. Many have said that S. 143 is still too bureaucratic. Mr. President, we ended 80-some programs. We have really revolutionized the way we handle job training, and we have tried very hard to keep a flexibility in place so that the States can determine how best to design a program that fits the need of that State.

Major goals of the legislation are to create a single work force development system, to allow States flexibility in deciding what is needed. Throughout the development of this legislation, we have made every effort to minimize the number of mandates and funding set-asides. Some guidance to the States is necessary to assure that the Federal dollars are appropriately and effectively spent. That is why the bill sets minimum amounts—25 percent—which must be spent both on work force training and work force education activities respectively. Beyond that point, however, I do not believe we should be dictating the mix of education or training activities the State feels is most important. If we start down this path, I suggest that we will soon arrive at the same place we started, which was 90-odd separate, narrowly defined programs.

That is why, as I say, with all of the good intent of the authors of this amendment, I must oppose this. I do not believe that adult basic education services will be forgotten without this set-aside. The bill already requires that funds be provided for these services within the 25 percent that is reserved for education activities.

So I just suggest, Mr. President, that I think we have addressed that concern without, again, going back to a set-aside that would be very restrictive to the flexibility that is necessary.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield time, or is the Senator using time on the bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment. I think the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Vermont have made a very strong case for adult education. We are perhaps the only advanced industrial nation in the world in which

illiteracy is increasing. The fact is that the States themselves have not been responsive to this problem in developing adult education programs. It was the hope of all of us, when we developed the initial adult education programs at the Federal level, that the value of these programs would be clearly seen and the States themselves would develop such programs. But that has not been the case.

With the existing adult education program, it is oversubscribed by twice the number of individuals than actually receive services. There are 100 percent more individuals who want to participate in the adult education programs than are able to do so. So there is a great demand and desire for adult education.

Finally, Mr. President, what we have seen is that adult education programs have enormous benefits for both the individuals participating in the programs and for the economy. These programs are also enormously important in terms of the education of the children of adults who participate. One of the most powerful reasons for increasing support for adult education is because, for the most part, parents that are involved in these programs and have small children are able to participate more effectively in the development and the education of their children. So this has a dramatic impact in terms of bringing children along and enhancing their ability to achieve academic excellence.

So, Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Kansas has included in her legislation a provision reserving 25 percent of the funds in the block grant for education, and that her bill also requires that there be funds spent on adult education, but there are no figures specified. Looking at what has happened so far in the States, there is very little reason to believe that the States are going to embrace adult education programs in a robust kind of way. Adult education, it seems to me, has a very special standing, an importance in terms of our citizenry. Therefore, I think it deserves the kind of targeting in the legislation which the amendment would provide.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from Minnesota here. I ask how much time we have. We want to try to follow the agreement, which is to work through on the agreed time on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 6 minutes 21 seconds, the Senator from Kansas has 19 minutes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I am happy to yield some time to the Senator from Minnesota. It is my understanding that Senator MOYNIHAN is prepared to offer the next amendment. Senator GRAMS has an amendment he will offer, and then we will stack those three votes. So we will complete the debate on this amendment, and that is with the agreement of Senator JEFFORDS and Senator PELL, just to give some indication for those who might be

wondering what the timing is. I would be happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. Five minutes would certainly suffice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to support the Pell-Jeffords amendment. I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

Mr. President, the Minnesota Literacy Council issued a study earlier this year, and I quote:

Minnesota adult basic education has had a profound and multidimensional impact on individual learners and on the quality of life in Minnesota.

I was a teacher for 20 years, and I have spoken on the floor before and I have made the argument, and I think the evidence is irrefutable and irreducible—not because I make the argument, but nevertheless I think the evidence is very strong—that there is a very strong correlation between the education of a mother or a father, or both, and certainly whether or not a mother or father are literate, and what they can do by way of encouraging their children to learn in school. So, this is really, if you will, an important family issue.

Also, there is a tremendous multiplier effect that comes with adult basic education, which is why I thank my colleagues for their effort. To the extent a man or woman is literate, he or she not only can do better with their children, not only can do better at work, but also can more fully participate in the economic and the social and the political life of our Nation. In other words, this is critical to a functioning democracy.

Adult basic education programs work. I have seen that in Minnesota, over and over and over again, traveling around the State and working with people who are in adult education. In 1993, more than 36,000 people received adult basic education services free of charge at over 600 sites statewide. Of these, 63 percent obtained a high school diploma, GED, gained citizenship, secured employment or job advancement, or got off public assistance. So it is enormously important in my State.

Nationally, there was a recent article, and I think I heard the Senator from Vermont refer to this, in the Washington Post, which reported that about 90 percent of the Fortune 1,000 executives say illiteracy is hurting productivity and profitability, and it costs the United States, roughly speaking, \$225 billion a year in lost productivity. So it seems to me this is really very much, if you will, a national security issue. It is a national commitment, and that is why I support this important focus on adult education.

As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, my State is ranked as one of

the best States in terms of literacy rates. According to the Minnesota Literacy Council, about 20 percent, however, of Minnesotans, are functionally illiterate. According to the 1990 census, in Minnesota approximately 18 percent, or 445,000, aged 25 and over, do not have a high school diploma. If you add to that those between 18 and 25, the number of people without a high school diploma or GED would go up to about 560,000. So, again, it seems to me, this amendment is extremely important. It puts the focus on the education that is vitally important to adults, vitally important to their children, vitally important to families, vitally important to democracy, vitally important to job productivity, and I would argue in a State that has been the leader in the Nation, as my State so often is—if I can say that on the floor of the Senate—vitally important to Minnesota.

I yield the floor and I thank my colleague from Kansas for her graciousness.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise as a strong supporter and cosponsor of this amendment, which will guarantee that adult education—including adult literacy—programs receive adequate funding under the Workforce Development Act. Unfortunately, over 50 percent of adults in the United States are functionally illiterate, roughly 44 million Americans. Illiteracy costs the U.S. economy about \$225 billion a year in lost productivity. As we improve our worker training programs, we must provide adequate funding to combat adult illiteracy.

In my home State, many dedicated Vermonters are working hard to help adults overcome illiteracy and enjoy a more productive and enjoyable life. For instance, my sister, Mary Leahy, has devoted herself to helping adults with reading and writing problems at Central Vermont Adult Basic Education in Barre, VT. Mary, along with many other Vermonters, know the deep satisfaction of helping another adult unlock his or her potential.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It is one of the best ways to help our work force and improve the quality of life of millions of adults.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I do not know if anyone else wishes to be heard. Does the Senator from Vermont wish to speak at this time?

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to clarify where we are here, so people understand a little bit better.

First of all, when we talk about education in this bill, we are not just talking about what I was referring to as adult basic education. This is where all your money comes from for the so-called Perkins programs, the vocational education, the other employment money. That 25 percent amounts to a little over \$1 billion.

What we are saying is, when you take a look, again, at this chart, the bulk of

people on welfare are in the category where they have been on it 2 to 5 years. These are the ones who are supposed to lose their benefits if they do not get adequate education. There is \$340 million that would be available for them, plus anyone else in that area, to get the basic adult education. That would be fine, but the demand is about \$1.6 billion. All we are saying is, for God's sake, at least make sure they get the \$340 million that is indicated when they need \$1.6 billion to be able to comply with the purpose of the bill, and welfare, and that is get to work. How can you get work if you do not have an education, if you have no skill training? So we have \$1.6 billion that should be out there to get the people off but only \$340 million as provided in this bill. All this amendment does is say: At least, at least make sure they have the \$340 million.

I urge everyone to vote for this amendment just to protect, as best they can, really the small amount of money that is available relative to the great need in this area.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. Effectively, what this amendment is doing is saying that adult education should be a priority and a national priority. For all the reasons the Senators from Rhode Island and Vermont have expressed here, plus the particular importance that this does not just benefit the adult, but also the child, which has been verified time in and time out by every single study, I hope the amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Jeffords-Pell amendment be set aside for the consideration of the Moynihan amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any remaining time on that amendment would be yielded back.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield it back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 2887 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2885
(Purpose: To strike the provisions repealing training and employment services for trade adjustment assistance, and for other purposes)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] proposes an amendment numbered 2887 to amendment No. 2885.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 217, beginning on line 14, strike all through line 17.

On page 217, line 18, strike "(2)" and insert "(1)".

On page 217, line 20, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 217, line 22, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)".

On page 217, line 24, strike "(5)" and insert "(4)".

On page 218, line 1, strike "(6)" and insert "(5)".

On page 220, beginning on line 1, strike all through page 225, line 6.

On page 225, line 7, strike "(2)" and insert "(1)".

On page 227, line 8, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 232, line 10, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)".

On page 232, line 15, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 233, line 1, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 233, line 6, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 233, line 17, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 234, line 6, strike "(5)" and insert "(4)".

On page 242, lines 11 and 12, strike "(as amended in paragraph (1)(G)(i) is further amended" and insert "is amended".

On page 245, line 15, strike "(2)" and insert "(1)".

On page 260, line 9, strike "(6)" and insert "(5)".

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to make a simple proposal, which I deeply wish the Senate will accept and see the reasons for. This amendment would simply preserve the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, which has been in place for a third of a century now, having been one of the great social inventions, one of those that come along from time to time to help a nation, in this case ours, resolve a legitimate dispute in which there are legitimate interests on either side, in the very best tradition of a democratic society.

The conflict is elemental. When our Government enters a trade agreement with another nation or group of nations, as is increasingly the case, it undertakes to lower tariffs on goods coming into our country in return for lowered tariffs in other countries—lowered restrictions, access to markets, all the different arrangements that go into a multilateral world trading system which has emerged so exceptionally in the world, and of which we are the pre-eminent member, the largest trading nation in the world.

Getting to this point was not easy. It took courage, it took invention, and it happened here in the U.S. Congress. We have to go back to 1930 and the Smoot-

Hawley tariff of that year, in which tariffs were raised to the highest levels in our history. The understanding was that this would protect American jobs.

Indeed, in the course of the next 2 years from the time it was signed by President Hoover, imports dropped by one-third in our Nation. More. Alas, so did exports. And the world spun into the disaster of the 1930's. The British left free trade and went to imperial preferences. In Japan, the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere was put in place. Manchuria was invaded—China, in fact. But we somehow called it Manchuria. Unemployment soared.

In 1933, Mr. President, in Germany, Adolf Hitler came to power in a free election. Our Nation tumbled into a depression unlike anything we had known. And we had been warned. Mr. President, 1,000 economists—at a time when the Nation perhaps was more fortunate than now and had only about 1,000 economists—wrote to President Hoover and said, "Do not do this." He did it even so.

Then in 1934, Cordell Hull, who was Secretary of State, began the reciprocal trade agreements program in which we would try to make our way by mutual accommodation with other countries. It was a great invention. A great man, Harry Hopkins, worked on it. It was to have been given an institution as part of the great postwar settlement—the World Bank, the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the International Trade Organization which was to have been located in Havana. But the ITO died in the Senate Finance Committee out of lingering fear of opening trade to the rest of the world. But I am happy to say in the last Congress it came back alive as the World Trade Organization now in place in Geneva as part of that enormous achievement, the Uruguay Round.

How did we get to the point where there was this consensus that we had the Kennedy round, the Tokyo round, the Uruguay round, and then the free trade agreement with Canada, the North American Free-Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico, and more in prospect? Well, sir, one was the manifest benefits that trade had brought this Nation and the world.

But there was also a social invention. It began in 1954, when David MacDonald, then President of the United Steelworkers of America, proposed that as part of a next trade agreement, if workers were put out, if workers lost their jobs because of imports that the Federal Government had agreed to in a trade agreement, there would be some trade adjustment assistance. There would be training for them. The proposition was that, as a matter of public policy, the U.S. Government had entered into an agreement in which certain workers were displaced, certain workers lost their jobs, and other workers would gain jobs. The total would be much to the advantage of all. But there were individuals left out, and

it had been the result of a Government policy. Well, then it ought to be the practice and policy of the Government to help with a readjustment.

In 1962, as the Trade Expansion Act of that year was under consideration, Luther Hodges, then President Kennedy's Secretary of Commerce, came before the Senate Finance Committee. He said this.

Both workers and firms may encounter special difficulties when they feel the adverse effects of import competition. This is import competition caused directly by the Federal Government when it lowers tariffs as part of a trade agreement undertaken for the long-term economic good of the country as a whole. . . . The Federal Government has a special responsibility in this case. When the Government has contributed to economic injuries, it should also contribute to the economic adjustment required to repair them.

Sir, at that time I had the honor to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor. I was Assistant Secretary of Labor for Policy Planning and Research. We had done our work on this, sir. We knew what we were proposing. I thereupon became one of the three persons who negotiated the Long-term Cotton Textile Agreement—still in place in its successor form—that helped firms, and saw to it that firms which were losing out to international competitors because of a trade agreement—textile mills in the Carolinas, garment industries in New York, Chicago, and California—were protected, in this case by quotas.

Also, there was trade adjustment assistance for workers. We put that into that legislation, sir. And the American labor movement was solidly behind the Trade Expansion Act and the Kennedy round.

There was social learning going on here; how to protect certain vulnerable firms, workers whose jobs had been negotiated away in the larger general interest. And so we went from there to the Tokyo round. Labor supported the round because it had a commitment to trade adjustment. And then we had the free trade agreement with Canada and the North American Free-Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico. And last year the Uruguay round. And before that, the commitment to trade adjustment assistance was crucial in obtaining the necessary support for fast track—in which the President brings a trade agreement back and sends it up here to the Congress for an up-or-down vote—and for NAFTA itself. The Uruguay round came to the Finance Committee in the 103d Congress when I had the honor to be chairman. And trade adjustment assistance was an essential commitment. Labor did not support the North American Free-Trade Agreement. I did not in fact support it. But we did not stop it, and we could have done so, and would have done so if there had been no trade adjustment assistance.

Mr. President, in the years just since 1975, to give you a sense of the dimension we are talking about here, 2 million workers have received trade ad-

justment assistance benefits as their right, as the public interest demands. The assistance is part of the trade expansion activity of the Federal Government. Tariffs and trade agreements, those, sir, have always been located in the Committee on Finance. The Committee on Finance has very carefully—not always successfully but I think with an ever assiduous effort—tried to see that trade adjustment assistance is maintained. You get trade adjustment assistance when it can be shown that tariff agreements have closed down an industry at the cost of the workers and management—2 million workers since 1975.

It would be such a great loss—turning our backs on generations of experience and learning the hard way—to give this up now. I do not think we want to do this to American workers. We made a commitment. *Pacta sunt servanda*, agreements must be kept. These are agreements at the highest level of Government. And they have been so enormously effective.

But, sir, I say to the Senate, I say to anyone listening outside the Senate, strip trade adjustment assistance from the trade laws and you will never see a trade agreement again in this time. For the men and women, the working people who will have seen a pledge to them broken, a commitment negotiated by their own leaders broken, the trust will not be there again. It is sufficiently eroded as is.

We know very well how difficult the last 10 years have been in this area, and we see troubles coming ahead of us. We do not need them. We worked out an arrangement which got by as—which I think is a fair statement—a social invention of very considerable measure.

And so, Mr. President, it fell to the distinguished chairman of our committee, Senator ROTH, and I to write to our very good friends, in whom we have the deepest respect, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources and the ranking member, who are here today. On October 5, Senator ROTH and I wrote to say that the Committee on Finance has not had an opportunity to consider this matter, the folding in and thereby elimination of trade adjustment assistance, and the NAFTA transitional adjustment assistance program. These are programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, and we respectfully asked they be removed from the Workforce Development Act, a remarkable bipartisan achievement, with the changes we would like to make, as, for example, those suggested by Mr. PELL and Mr. JEFFORDS.

Now I offer this amendment, and I would hope it might be accepted. It will ensure great harmony in this measure if it is accepted and disharmony if it is not. It will break with 33 years of legislation, break with three generations of learning and working together in the area of trade which has proved of such enormous benefit to the

United States, and it would put in jeopardy, put a cloud over our prospects of continuing in that tradition.

Mr. President, I do not speak longer than necessary if there are other Senators who wish to speak.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I see my friend from Minnesota present.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his graciousness.

Mr. President, while I agree with the underlying premise of this job training bill to consolidate and streamline—and I simply say to the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Massachusetts, I deeply appreciate this bipartisan effort—I believe that repealing key elements of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program in the process, as this bill does, is a serious mistake.

Mr. President, from January 1, 1993, to August 31 of this year, more than 2,300 Minnesota workers have received TAA. That assistance has taken the form of about \$4.5 million in training funds—job search and educational assistance—and about \$6.8 million in income support.

Let me just be very direct about it. I did not support NAFTA even with the TAA as a part of it. I opposed NAFTA and GATT, and the view I took then and the view I take now is it is far better to raise wages and living standards and environmental protection through international agreements than depress those standards.

I argued that GATT and NAFTA failed to meet these tests, and many of my predictions about NAFTA's adverse impact on American workers have come to pass. American jobs have been shipped to Mexico and workers have been left to fend for themselves.

This bill in present form without this amendment—and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be an original cosponsor of this amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Would exacerbate the problem. It is sometimes necessary to remind ourselves of promises made. Proponents of NAFTA, for example, promised it would boost exports to Mexico and create hundreds of thousands of new American jobs almost immediately.

Instead, 21 months after implementation of NAFTA, our trade balance with Mexico has dramatically worsened. Our trade deficit with Mexico for the first 6 months of this year was \$8.5 billion. Furthermore, according to the Department of Labor, 42,000 Americans are certified to have lost their jobs as a result of NAFTA. And as an article in yesterday's New York Times observed,

this number is undoubtedly lower than the actual numbers of jobs lost to NAFTA—that is, for a variety of reasons, not all workers eligible did apply.

What about the American companies that assured us during the NAFTA debate that many new American jobs would be created by the agreement? Public Citizen conducted a useful survey of a number of these firms. Public Citizen's report found that of 66 firms which had made explicit job-creating promises or projections and which replied to Public Citizen's inquiries, 89 percent reported making no significant progress toward meeting these projections.

Twenty months after NAFTA, Public Citizen also was able to contact five companies from my State of Minnesota. Officials from each one of these companies had made explicit projections or promises of economic benefits to Minnesotans from NAFTA. Unfortunately, after 20 months of NAFTA, none could report creating new jobs in Minnesota or even increased exports from Minnesota as a result of the agreement.

It seems to me a promise is a promise, and we must live up to our commitment. I think NAFTA was a profound mistake. I think GATT was a profound mistake. But the TAA as a part of NAFTA was supposed to help those workers gain new skills and obtain new jobs in the local economies because these workers are the ones who are rocked by some of these agreements and some of what has happened in the global economy.

The increasing globalization of our economy makes a lot of U.S. workers feel that the forces that directly affect our standard of living and the quality of our lives are moving further and further from our control and from accountability to us. It seems that local, State and national governments are increasingly powerless to solve our most pressing problems. And I am afraid that this trend only makes citizens more alienated from and distrustful of their governments.

Without this amendment, this bill would heighten this sense of alienation from their government that American workers feel. Repealing TAA would betray the commitments we made here in Congress to provide even modest job retraining and other benefits to sustain dislocated workers through a difficult transition period to another job. Even the House version of the job training bill which recently passed did not repeal TAA.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Let me describe why I think this job retraining funding commitment is so important, and how it works in practical terms.

Under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program [TAA] and the special NAFTA/TAA program enacted when NAFTA was passed 2 years ago, workers who meet certain eligibility requirements and are certified as having

lost their jobs because of competition from imported goods are eligible for special assistance. This assistance includes:

First, income support consisting of up to 52 weeks of extended unemployment benefits beyond the 26 weeks a worker would normally be entitled to under most State unemployment laws; and second, employment and retraining services;

The income support portion of these programs is an entitlement. A worker who meets the eligibility requirements is entitled to the extended unemployment benefits, provided that the worker is enrolled in training.

Employment and training services are provided through a capped entitlement—that is, funds are appropriated for these services, and eligible workers are entitled to receive them as long as funds are available.

This bill repeals the sections of TAA and the NAFTA/TAA program that give eligible workers a capped entitlement to employment and training services. Eliminating the entitlement to these services means that these workers will have to compete with all other job seekers for whatever employment and training services may be available in their State.

At the same time, the bill substantially cuts Federal job training programs overall, thereby prompting an intense competition for diminishing funding among the various groups of workers who need to be retrained—whatever the reason for their displacement.

Repealing these provisions fundamentally breaks faith with a commitment first made by President Kennedy in the Trade Expansion Act 1962—and renewed again when Congress passed the NAFTA/TAA program—that workers adversely affected by our trade policies would receive special assistance from the Government to find new employment.

Mr. President, since the TAA program was established, Democrats and Republicans alike have recognized our special responsibility to workers who lose the jobs as a direct result of Government trade policies. The Senate reaffirmed its commitment to honor that responsibility when it enacted the NAFTA/TAA program for workers displaced because of increased imports or shifts in production to Mexico and Canada. We must not renege on that commitment now.

Even under the current JTPA Dislocated Worker Program, there is not enough money to serve more than about 25 percent of eligible workers. Under the Kassebaum bill, there is no requirement that a State spend any particular portion of the Federal funds it receives to serve dislocated workers.

Moreover, while States are required to offer job search and job placement services through their one-stop centers, there is no requirement in the bill that States actually provide job training to anyone. If trade-impacted work-

ers are no longer entitled to employment and training services, there is a good chance that in some States many will not get them. They will be out of luck.

This amendment preserves the employment and training portions of the TAA and NAFTA/TAA programs as a capped entitlement. This is part of a social contract that we made with working men and women when we asked them to support our efforts to open world markets and eliminate trade barriers. I believe we have an obligation to honor that contract.

At the Labor and Human Resources Committee markup on this bill, Senator KENNEDY offered an amendment similar to this one which preserved the right of trade-impacted workers to obtain retraining services, but required that all such services be provided through the same systems established by the State to serve other dislocated workers. Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated on a tie 8-to-8 vote. I hope that we will get a different result on this vote. American workers deserve better.

So I thank the Senator from New York for his amendment. I thank the Senator from Delaware. I thank him for their leadership. I am proud to be an original cosponsor, if that is appropriate, and I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in general, I believe that our country must improve our Federal job training programs to reduce fragmentation and increase efficiency. I also firmly believe that we should maintain our longstanding commitments to workers who are dislocated by Federal trade policy.

Two programs under the Finance Committee provide assurances that workers who are dislocated because of Federal trade policies will get retraining and support—the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act [TAA] and NAFTA-TAA.

In my view, these programs are fundamental commitments made to workers during trade negotiations. Many West Virginia workers have relied on TAA benefits in the past. In fact, since 1990, 1,673 West Virginians qualified for TAA benefits and got retraining and income support needed to rebuild their lives and find new jobs or careers after being dislocated. For these families, TAA offered hope and a second chance.

TAA means a great deal to workers in small towns that are hit with major plant closings. For example, when Hanover Shoes in Marlinton, WV, closed because of shoe imports, 231 West Virginia workers needed and got assistance thanks to TAA. Similar dislocations have occurred in Franklin, Bartow, Parsons, Martinsburg, and other communities because of the decline in shoe manufacturing and textiles in this country. Many of these workers have spent 10 years or more working in one factory, so it takes time and support to learn new skills. Similar disruptions occur in the oil, natural gas, and coal industry. West

Virginia workers want to get new jobs and new careers, but retraining is often essential to help make a shift from an industry like textiles into another field.

Because of my concerns for dislocated workers in West Virginia and my longstanding support for TAA, I am strongly supporting Senator MOYNIHAN's amendment to strike the language repealing the TAA and NAFTA-TAA programs. We should not renege on this basic commitment to workers, especially at a time when we are just beginning to see plant closings and dislocations from NAFTA.

Personally, I believe that we do have a special obligation to workers who are dislocated by general trade policy or trade treaties like the North American Free-Trade Agreement—Federal decisions that we make knowing they may jeopardize jobs in particular industries or regions.

There is no doubt in my mind that more West Virginians will need retraining and benefits to cope with the dislocations created by trade policy, by NAFTA, and also because of the implementation of the Clean Air Act.

I believe passing the Moynihan amendment to strike language repealing TAA and NAFTA-TAA is essential, and I want to ensure that the new streamlined approach suggested by the Workforce Development Act will provide the help and training that West Virginia workers need, and deserve.

I strongly hope that the Moynihan amendment and other amendments will be adopted today to improve this legislation, and I expect that I will be supporting many of them.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment by the distinguished Senator from New York. This amendment preserves trade adjustment assistance—job training and job placement help for workers who have lost their jobs as a direct consequence of U.S. trade policies.

We here in Congress pass the laws that put out Nation's trade policies into effect—the policies that are negotiated by Presidents with our trading partners. We have the responsibility to assure that those trade policies benefit all Americans.

Now, Mr. President, at times I have supported expanded trade as one of the ways to promote our Nation's economic interests. I am convinced that we must open the markets for American products and services around the world. Those new markets are our best hope for a growing economy with growing incomes and expanded job opportunities.

I believe that without expanding world markets we will end up fighting over a stagnant or shrinking economy. But at the same time, there is no automatic guarantee that growth will benefit all Americans—in fact, economists will tell us that there will be losses as well as gains as jobs shift from low-growth to high-growth industries.

That is why we must have the ability to help those who will pay part of the

price for progress—those whose job loss can be traced to changes in our trade policies. That is why we must preserve the trade adjustment assistance training programs.

These are men and women who have played by the rules—who have worked by the rules, Mr. President—and who, through no fault of their own, find their work is no longer needed. They have raised their families, built our neighborhoods and cities—they have done all a country can ask of them, and more.

But today, these men and women can find that their job security is dependent on trade policy made here in Washington. Our decisions to participate in trade agreements can expose their industries to increased international competition. How can we turn our backs on their plight?

Trade adjustment assistance not only helps these people deal with the transitions that are increasingly part of our rapidly changing international economy. This assistance makes good economic sense because it lowers the costs of economic adjustments—costs in wasted hours of unemployment and underemployment, in depressed communities, towns, and regions. By helping to move workers displaced by trade into new jobs faster, into jobs that best fit their skills and work experience, we reduce the costs of economic adjustment and increase the benefits for everyone.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this amendment. It is the fair thing for us to do, it is the responsible thing for us to do, and it makes good economic sense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Just 30 seconds, if I may, sir, I ask my friend from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes and 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I would like to put a table in the RECORD, a cumulative program activity record from the last 20 years to show—this is a carefully administered program—of 2,011,268 workers certified for the program, 2,032,507 were denied.

This is carefully administered and successful and ought to be continued.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUMULATIVE PROGRAM ACTIVITY
(April 3, 1975 Through June 30, 1995)

	Cases	Workers
Cases Instituted	31,183	4,240,496
Certified	11,494	2,011,268
Partially Certified	416	104,824
Denied	17,594	2,032,507
Terminated/Withdrawn	1,576	91,897
In Process	103	N/A
Completed	31,080	4,245,096

CUMULATIVE PROGRAM ACTIVITY—Continued
(April 3, 1975 Through June 30, 1995)

	Cases	Workers
JUNE, 1995 PROGRAM ACTIVITY		
Instituted	94	2,732
Certified	81	7,628
Part. Certified	0	0
Denied	27	2,694
Terminated/Withdrawn	9	2
Completed	117	10,324

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. How much time remains on the Moynihan amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 4 minutes, and the Senator from Kansas has the other 22 minutes 32 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself my time remaining on the amendment.

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to be a cosponsor with the Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, on this amendment. He has made the case for this amendment very powerfully. Effectively, what we are saying is that for the past 30 years it has been a matter of national policy for Republicans and Democrats alike that, if we were going to enter into various trade agreements as a direct result of which individual workers were going to lose their jobs, those workers would be entitled to retraining and income support in the form of extended unemployment benefits so that they can continue to support their families while they are being retrained. The income support amounts to up to a year, rather than 6 months, of extended unemployment benefits. That is what is basically the outline of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program.

And the concept behind that, Mr. President, was that as a result of expanded trade, the economy as a whole was going to benefit, Americans were going to benefit in all parts of the country. But some workers in some industries were also going to lose their jobs, and we recognize a special responsibility to those workers—in many instances workers who had worked a lifetime at a particular job—and ensure that those workers would be able to get training and financial support during that period of the training for up to 1 year.

Now, what have the results been, Mr. President? The fact is, that individuals have lost their jobs as a result of increased imports and plant relocations stemming from trade agreements like GATT and NAFTA. These are men and women who want to work, who can work, and the only reason they are not working is because a decision has been made that is in the national interest, passed by the Congress and the Senate, which results in their dislocation. These individuals' lives are disrupted. But under the TAA and NAFTA-TAA programs, they are able to get into training programs and are able to get some supplemental assistance. And then they are able to try and generally are able to get back into employment.

Now, what does the pending legislation say? It says that in spite of the assurances that were given by Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike at the time we approved NAFTA and the GATT, that these programs would be available for them, that we had a broad bipartisan agreement to support—in spite of those assurances, this bill now says that if an individual is dislocated, there is no guarantee that there will be a training program there. And if there is no training program there, then there are no extended unemployment benefits. These individuals will no longer get any priority for assistance.

Now, Mr. President, I think this is basically going back on the solemn commitments that were made during the debate on NAFTA and on GATT. The Senator from New York mentioned a number of those.

Let's look at what was said about TAA by Members of Congress and the administration when we were debating whether to enter into the NAFTA.

On May 1, 1991, in a letter to congressional leaders requesting an extension of fast-track authority to negotiate the NAFTA, President Bush wrote as follows:

[W]hile economic studies show that a free trade agreement would create jobs and promote growth in the United States, I know there is concern about adjustment in some sectors. These concerns will be addressed through provisions in the NAFTA designed to ease the transition for import-sensitive industries. In addition, my Administration is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that there is adequate assistance and effective retraining for dislocated workers.

At a question-and-answer session with business editors and writers on that same day, May 1, 1991, President Bush said again:

I know that there's a concern—not just on Capitol Hill but in many of the labor halls around this country—about job loss. And our negotiators will address these concerns in provisions of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. We will work with Congress to see that dislocated workers receive proper assistance and retraining. We believe we have the answers to the questions that are being raised by the labor unions and by some on Capitol Hill.

On May 7, 1991, at a Finance Committee hearing on United States-Mexico trade, Secretary of Labor Lynn Martin repeated that commitment. She testified that:

The President and I are both committed to working with the Congress to be sure there will be adequate assistance for effective retraining of any dislocated American workers. . . . The President is determined to assure the timely availability of comprehensive services to United States workers who might conceivably be displaced over a period of time as a result of such a trade agreement.

Carla Hills, then the U.S. Trade Representative, acknowledged at that same hearing that:

Studies also show, and experience would indicate, that some sectors might face increased competitive pressure. In a broad sense, society benefits when we focus our

jobs and our capital in sectors where we are most productive. But we should not and will not forget that the transition to a new job can be difficult for individual workers and communities. Not every worker will keep his or her job once a NAFTA is negotiated. . . . [W]e cannot ignore the impact that the loss of a job has on the individual affected. . . . [W]e have a responsibility to be ready to assist any dislocated workers affected by the NAFTA who face adjustment difficulties. Effective retraining and adjustment programs can facilitate adaptation to ongoing shifts in our economy.

[T]he Administration is firmly committed to working with the Congress to ensure an effective, adequately funded worker adjustment program. . . . Any needed changes in U.S. law should be in place by the time the NAFTA enters into force and could appropriately be addressed in legislation implementing the NAFTA.

The importance of that commitment in persuading Members on both sides of the aisle to support the NAFTA agreement cannot be overstated.

During the Finance Committee hearings, Senator Bentsen, then the chairman of the committee, stressed the origins of trade adjustment assistance, noting that:

It was President Kennedy who first proposed trade adjustment assistance when he launched a new round of global talks back in 1962. President Kennedy favored free trade because he knew it would benefit the United States as a whole; that, as competitive as we are, we would come out a net winner.

But he also understood that a country had to do something for those who suffer in the move to open competition, and he saw trade adjustment assistance as an essential part of that trade policy. Adjustment assistance is just as much an essential part of our trade policy today as it was 30 years ago.

That is why, when I was working to extend the fast track, I stressed to [President Bush] that we needed a firm commitment from the administration to work with the committee and the Congress on an effective program to work with the committee and the Congress on an effective program to meet the challenge of a Mexican agreement.

We got a promise and an action plan from the President in May of 1991. That commitment was important to winning congressional approval of the fast track.

Senator Packwood, then the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee, agreed with Senator Bentsen that a commitment to trade adjustment assistance for workers who lost their jobs was an integral reason why Congress agreed to the fast-track authorization. He stated:

I agree with the chairman that NAFTA will rise or fall on whether or not there is a good retraining act. Without it, I do not see any possibility that NAFTA will pass.

Senator ROTH, who is now the chairman of the Finance Committee and who has long been a champion of the TAA Program, also stressed how important worker adjustment assistance was to approval of the NAFTA. He stated:

While many of us have made a final decision on whether to support NAFTA . . . there is one thing on which we can all agree, and that is the need to help dislocated workers make the difficult but necessary transition to new jobs. . . . An effective worker adjustment program must go hand in hand with NAFTA.

Senator BAUCUS, also a member of the Finance Committee, stated:

I think I speak for many Senators when I say that I will not vote for the NAFTA until a fully-funded worker retraining program is in place.

Mr. President, all we are saying is that we all support the consolidation of training programs. And the Senator from Kansas has done an extraordinary job in being able to do that. But we have a solemn responsibility to those workers who have lost or will lose their jobs because of NAFTA or GATT. I will not take the time to spell out a profile of who these workers are. But they are men and women who are proud Americans, and who have suffered as a result of the action of Congress. I think we can do no less than meet our responsibilities to them as has been outlined by the Presidents and the leaders of the Congress when we passed those particular treaties.

I thank the Chair.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if I may put a little different perspective on this issue, recognizing, as has been eloquently stated by the Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, and the ranking member of the Labor Committee, that there has been, through both Republican and Democratic administrations, a commitment regarding trade adjustment assistance.

But let me make clear how the TAA is handled in the work force development bill. While the training part of the trade adjustment assistance is consolidated into the bill, the entitlement to income support for dislocated workers under TAA is not repealed. This, of course, is something that remains under the Finance Committee. This means our commitment to workers who lose their jobs because of a trade agreement is maintained, it is not eliminated. That is why I believe S. 143 is important in the context of helping all workers. Workers who may have been affected by any trade agreement will still receive the assistance for job training but, I suggest, in a far more effective way.

It makes no sense to keep separate and distinct programs for workers who are laid off for one reason or another. All workers who lose their jobs should have access to job training. All workers who need assistance should be able to enter the system with the kind of quality assistance that is their due. Dislocated workers who need good training linked to real jobs have been ill-served by existing programs, including TAA. We must reform these programs and establish a comprehensive system that is based on accountability for putting people into real jobs. I think the Senator from New York would be certainly one who would agree with that goal as I know the Senator from Massachusetts does as well.

Secretary of Labor Reich has pointed out that under the current program when a plant closes, one group of workers may be eligible for training while others on a different assembly line are

not. This makes no sense. How do you know whether somebody has lost work at Cessna Aircraft because of NAFTA or because of structural related cut-backs? We need to move to a single integrated job training system and not single out a particular group for special training programs. That is, as I suggested before, how we end up with the maze of programs that we have here today.

I believe that Governors and local elected officials will be responsive to the training needs of all their citizens and in particular to those who are laid off and have lost their jobs.

Anyone who is mindful of the concerns in their State will be putting those people first and foremost in wanting to offer the very best program.

Mr. President, I would like for a moment to comment on the General Accounting Office's report on the Trade Adjustment Assistance Job Training Program. It stated that it believes the TAA Program is seriously flawed. The GAO has testified that its study, as well as those of the Department of Labor Inspector General and a study commissioned by the Department of Labor, concluded that the TAA Program falls short in assisting dislocated workers to enter the work force.

I would like to list a few of the findings: TAA benefits are not equally available to all available workers as a result of the flawed certification process; and the TAA Program is often slow in reaching workers as a result of this complex certification process. I think there is a recognition that some of this does need to be improved. The TAA recipients do not receive services tailored to their needs because only a limited mix of services are provided. TAA lacks the ongoing counseling and support necessary to ensure completion of training. The liberal use of waivers has resulted in as many as half of TAA recipients not even participating in training. It rarely works with participants after they finish training to help them find jobs, and TAA does not have an effective accountability system in place.

The GAO has also pointed out that the existence of "several other targeted dislocated worker programs," in addition to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, suggesting that the United States overall approach to dislocated worker assistance needs reform.

The GAO followup study of the NAFTA-TAA Program last year indicated that many of the shortcomings of the existing TAA Program had not been addressed.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I believe that the protection in the entitlement that exists still with the Finance Committee for financial support is protected and continues. At the same time the job training portion would be included in, I think, a much superior system so that everybody can be helped and assisted in a comprehensive way.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Just in response to the Senator from Kansas, the concerns described in the GAO study which have been outlined in terms of criticisms of the way the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program was administered under previous administrations are in the process of being remedied under the present administration.

What we have seen under Secretary Reich is a vigorous effort to try and deal with some of the points that have been raised in the General Accounting Office report. We stand ready to make sure that any other problems which are brought to our attention are addressed.

Let me just say this, Mr. President. We are not saying that you have to have a separate training program for trade-impacted workers. We support the consolidation of training programs. We are not saying maintain a separate training program for those who fall under this particular category. We offered an amendment in committee to require that States provide training and employment services to workers eligible for TAA and NAFTA-TAA through the same programs established by the State to serve other dislocated workers. What we wanted to preserve, we said, was the guarantee that trade-impacted workers who needed retraining would actually receive training, which is something we have under the TAA and NAFTA-TAA programs which we do not provide to other dislocated workers. But my amendment was rejected in committee.

We are saying, all we want to do is make sure that these workers' rights to retraining are going to be protected as they were guaranteed by previous administrations, Republicans and Democrats alike. And we support providing that training through consolidated training programs. All we are saying is that these workers should be included in the same programs, but their rights to participate should be preserved. They, in effect, get a right to retraining if they qualify, and if they are in training, they can receive extended unemployment benefits so that they can continue to pay their bills and support their families while they are in training. Under the law, if they are not in training they are not able to receive the income support benefits.

At the present time, these workers have certain rights that were guaranteed by Presidents and Congress when we approved GATT and NAFTA, and we are saying continue those rights under the consolidated training programs.

That is basically what we are asking for.

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time we have.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I do not know if the Senator from New York wishes to make any further comment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I would simply like to thank the chairperson for her courtesy and clarity. I do make the point, however, that the future of trade agreements in this country would be diminished if this authority does not remain in the committee that is required to approve the trade agreements themselves.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I now call on the Senator from Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent, first, to set aside the Moynihan amendment for a brief presentation of an amendment that has been agreed to by both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield to Senator GRAMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2888 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2885

(Purpose: To enable States to develop integrated plans)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment and send it to the desk for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] proposes an amendment numbered 2888 to amendment No. 2885.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 30, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(5) STATE OPTION FOR INTEGRATED PLAN.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, with the express written agreement of the Governor, the State educational agency, the State postsecondary education agency, and representatives of vocational education and community colleges, of a State, the Governor may develop all parts of the State plan, using procedures that are consistent with the procedures described in subsection (d). Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a Governor who develops an integrated State plan under this paragraph to duplicate any information contained in 1 part of the plan in another part of the plan.

Beginning on page 114, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 115, line 13, and insert the following:

(1) FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE SUFFICIENT PROGRESS.—

(A) FINDING.—If the Federal Partnership determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that a State has failed to demonstrate sufficient progress toward reaching the State benchmarks established under section 121(c) for the 3 years covered by a State plan described in section 104, the Federal Partnership shall—

(i) make a finding regarding whether the failure is attributable to the workforce employment activities, or workforce education activities, of the State; and

(ii) provide advice to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education.

(B) REDUCTIONS.—

(i) FAILURE ATTRIBUTABLE TO BOTH CATEGORIES.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), if the Federal Partnership finds that the failure referred to in subparagraph (A) is attributable to both categories referred to in subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, acting jointly on the advice of the Federal Partnership, may reduce the allotment of the State under section 102 by not more than 10 percent per program year for not more than 3 years.

(ii) FAILURE ATTRIBUTABLE TO ONE CATEGORY.—Unless the Governor of the State has developed an integrated State plan under section 104(b)(5), if the Federal Partnership finds that the failure referred to in subparagraph (A) is attributable to 1 category of activities referred to in subparagraph (A)(i) but not to the remaining category, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, acting jointly on the advice of the Federal Partnership, may decide to reduce only the portion of the allotment for the category of activities to which the failure is attributable.

(C) COMBINATION AND REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding sections 103 and 111, if the Federal Partnership finds that the Governor of the State has developed an integrated State plan under section 104(b)(5), and the failure referred to in subparagraph (A) is attributable to 1 category of activities referred to in subparagraph (A)(i) but not to the remaining category, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, acting jointly on the advice of the Federal Partnership, in lieu of making a reduction under subparagraph (B), shall—

(i) reduce the portion of the allotment for the category of activities to which the failure is attributable by a percentage determined by the Secretaries, but not to exceed 5 percent of such portion, for a period determined by the Secretaries;

(ii) require the State to combine, for such period—

(I) an additional percentage, equal to the percentage determined under clause (i), of the funds made available through such portion; and

(II) the funds made available to the State under this subtitle for the remaining category; and

(iii) require the State to expend the combined funds in accordance with the strategic plan of the State referred to in section 104(b)(2) to carry out the remaining category of activities.

(D) CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, funds referred to in subparagraph (C)(ii)(I) that are combined under subparagraph (C) shall be considered—

(i) to be made available under section 103(a)(1) if the combined funds are required to be expended for workforce employment activities; and

(ii) to be made available under section 103(a)(2) if the combined funds are required to be expended for workforce education activities.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, the Federal job training system, as we know, is broken. The current patchwork of 163 programs is failing to give us the results we need as a Nation to compete in a worldwide economy. Furthermore, we can no longer afford the \$25 billion it costs American taxpayers each year.

To improve results, the legislation before us will send one block grant to the States allowing each State to invest this money in the most efficient and effective employment programs. But with those dollars comes responsibilities. States would be accountable for how that money is spent. The State must be able to show how it meets or exceeds several specific performance standards. Such standards include increasing the number of job placements, increasing the length of time participants stay employed and increasing participant earnings.

While these are noble goals, as it currently stands, S. 143 requires the plan to be developed into three distinct parts: The strategic plan, the workforce education plan, and the workforce employment plan.

It also requires the block grant to be set aside into three separate pots of money: 25 percent for the Governor; 25 percent for the State education agency; and 50 percent for a flex account which is jointly administered by a broad-based group of State officials and private sector individuals.

After consulting with officials in my home State of Minnesota, it is clear that Minnesotans strongly support this bill, and they are anxious to assume the duty of training and placing of Minnesota workers.

However, Minnesota wants to go one step further and coordinate its efforts for education and training. Under the current bill, Minnesota and every other State would be required to create three separate plans covering education and training. My amendment would provide States with a choice.

I understand there are occasions when separate efforts may be desired. However, the Federal Government should not stand in the way of States wishing to coordinate those efforts. A State should be allowed to implement a work force State development strategy without divided State plans. If the Governor and State education agency can both agree to work through a collaborative State partnership, they should be allowed to. My amendment would give States that option.

By allowing States to form a collaborative effort in planning both sides of the block grant, States like Minnesota will be able to save time and resources, as well as to maximize the benefits to its workers.

My amendment requires the consent of the Governor, the State education agency, the State postsecondary agency, and representatives of vocational education and community colleges before the option to integrate into one State plan can be implemented.

My amendment also ensures that work force education and work force employment activities are integrated to the greatest extent possible within the constraints of State laws regarding educational authority.

It gives the State the option, again, only if the Governor and the State election officials agree, to integrate

State planning for the block grant by using the collaborative effort.

The State will be allowed to develop one strategic plan tailored to the needs of the State to develop all areas that are required under the bill.

Most important, my amendment unifies State accountability for program performance by placing the responsibility for setting State performance indicators by all parts of the block grant with the same collaborative process that develops the State goals and benchmarks.

Lastly, State accountability is strengthened under this amendment.

If a Federal partnership finds that a State which has exercised its option to integrate has failed to make progress toward work force employment or educational goals, it may recommend a sanction of up to 10 percent from the State's block grant.

However, for States that do not exercise the integrated option, the Federal partnership can sanction the part of the plan that does not meet the benchmarks, up to 10 percent.

Under this scenario, only one-half of the sanction will return to the Federal partnership; the other half will remain in the State but will be transferred to the administrator of the programs that are meeting those goals.

Mr. President, in conclusion, this amendment will ensure that States have the option to put forth the most efficient strategy for implementing its block grant.

My amendment protects State education agency authority by expressly requiring agreement between all of the parties before exercising the option. It also maintains strict sanctions for States that do not meet those benchmarks.

Furthermore, my amendment has the strong support of Minnesota Gov. Arne Carlson, the National Governors' Association, and the Republican Governors' Association Workforce Development Task Force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the National Governors' Association outlining that support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION,
October 10, 1995.

Hon. ROD GRAMS,
U.S. Senate, Senate Dirksen 261, Washington,
DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRAMS: It is our understanding that during consideration of the Workforce Development Act, you plan to offer an amendment that would provide states with additional flexibility to submit a unified state workforce development plan. NGA is strongly supportive of these efforts.

As I understand it, your amendment does two things. First of all, it would provide states with the option, if the Governor and the State Education Agency agree, of unifying policymaking authority for all of the block grant funds by using the state's collaborative process for the strategic plan to develop all parts of the state plan. This state option would address in part NGA's concerns

that the bill would prohibit states from developing a fully integrated workforce development system because it fragments planning and implementation authority for the block grant. Your amendment would provide states with this important flexibility while also protecting the legal authority of the state education agency (SEA) by requiring the explicit consent of the SEA before the state can exercise this option. The NGA applauds your efforts to remove barriers that stand in the way of states creating a single unified workforce development system.

We thank you for your efforts to provide states with greater flexibility and look forward to preserving this provision during the conference process.

Sincerely,

Gov. ARNE H. CARLSON,
Chair, Human Resources Committee.

Gov. TOM CARPER,
Vice Chair, Human Resources Committee.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, the task force includes Governor Thompson of Wisconsin, Governor Engler of Michigan, Governor Branstad of Iowa, Governor Voinovich of Ohio, and Governor Whitman of New Jersey.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would like to say that I am very appreciative of the Senator from Minnesota and the initiative he has undertaken on his amendment. I believe it strengthens our bill. I appreciate his willingness to work with us to craft a provision that streamlines the planning process for some States while maintaining important jurisdictional protections.

I think this is a very worthy addition.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that votes now occur, first, on the Pell-Jeffords amendment, second, on the Moynihan amendment and, third, on the Grams amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that the second and third votes be limited to 10 minutes each and that 4 minutes of debate time be available between each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome the Senator's amendment and urge its adoption as well.

I am prepared to yield back my time. Mr. President, as I understand, we are prepared to move ahead with votes. The first vote would be the Jeffords-Pell amendment followed by the Moynihan-Kennedy-Wellstone amendment, followed by the Grams amendment. I urge an aye vote on all of them.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2886

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2886 offered by the Senator from

Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYLE] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] is absent due to a death in the family.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 481 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Heflin	Pell
Boxer	Hollings	Pryor
Bradley	Inouye	Reid
Breaux	Jeffords	Robb
Bumpers	Johnston	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Chafee	Kerry	Simon
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Daschle	Lautenberg	Specter
Dodd	Leahy	Stevens
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—49

Abraham	Gorton	McCain
Ashcroft	Graham	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Brown	Grassley	Nunn
Burns	Gregg	Pressler
Campbell	Hatch	Roth
Coats	Hatfield	Santorum
Cochran	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Hutchison	Simpson
Craig	Inhofe	Smith
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Thomas
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thompson
Dole	Kerrey	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Faircloth	Lugar	
Frist	Mack	

NOT VOTING—4

Bryan	Exon
Cohen	Kyl

So the amendment (No. 2886) was rejected.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we might bring the membership up to speed about where we are on the various amendments and what we would like to try and do for the remainder of the afternoon.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the next two stacked votes be postponed to occur not before 5:20 this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. We have made some good progress, and as I understand it, we have an Ashcroft amendment on drug testing; we have the Glenn amendment on displaced homemakers; and a Pell amendment on the reallocation of the distribution of the formula; and a Phil Gramm amendment with regard to the reduction of FTE's.

There may be one or two other items, but I think those are the principal measures which we want to address. We have made good progress. We have two votes now which we will stack, hopefully have that vote shortly after 5:20. One is a very important measure dealing with the trade adjustment provisions. We are very hopeful after those we will come to the Job Corps amendment on which there is a great deal of interest. But we would like to invite those Members certainly on our side, my side and others who do have amendments to be prepared to move ahead because we are prepared to move ahead.

I see the Senator from Ohio in the Chamber at this time; also, the Senator from Louisiana who had an amendment which we have been able to work out. It is a very important amendment. So we would welcome the opportunity to deal with either or both of those in the next immediate period. Then the Senator from Connecticut, Senator DODD, has an amendment which has been worked out. And then perhaps we could be close enough to the period of 5:30 where we could vote on the other two amendments, if that is agreeable to the Members.

AMENDMENT NO. 2889 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2885

(Purpose: To ensure that training for displaced homemakers is included among work force employment activities and work force education activities for which funds may be used under this act)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 2889 to amendment No. 2885.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 11, strike lines 4 through 10 and insert the following:

(9) DISPLACED HOME MAKER.—The term "displaced homemaker" means an individual who—

(A) has been dependent—

(i) on assistance under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act and whose youngest child is not younger than 16; or

(ii) on the income of another family member, but is no longer supported by such income; and

(B) is unemployed or underemployed, and is experiencing difficulty in obtaining or upgrading employment.

On page 50, line 9, strike "and".

On page 50, line 12, strike the period and insert "; and".

On page 50, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(P) preemployment training for displaced homemakers.

On page 54, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(6) providing programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women;

On page 54, line 11, strike "(6)" and insert "(7)".

On page 54, line 13, strike "(7)" and insert "(8)".

On page 108, line 15, strike "and".

On page 108, line 16, strike the period and insert "; and".

On page 108, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(F) displaced homemakers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

There are 45 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer this amendment because I am extremely concerned that the current provisions in this bill will neglect and ignore a very important segment of our population, and that is displaced homemakers. Nationwide there are 17 million displaced homemakers. We have close to 700,000 in Ohio.

How do you define displaced homemaker? It can be people who are divorced; it can be widows. It does not have to be women. As a matter of fact, it can be widowers, those who have lost their wives and are responsible for taking care of the children in the family.

In other words, they are at-risk people which this bill has said it wants to take care of, which is defined in the bill, but I think this particular group has been pretty much left out. And I think that is a shame. I realize that the managers of the bill do not want amendments in the bill and are trying to hold those down, but I do not want to see us hold down amendments and see some 17 million displaced homemakers not be dealt with properly in this legislation, and that is what we are talking about here.

The current Perkins vocational programs for displaced homemakers and single parents has been extremely effective. Approximately 80 percent of women served in these programs are placed in employment and/or postsecondary education.

Mr. President, I repeat that. Approximately 80 percent of women served in these programs are placed in employment and/or postsecondary education. That is an amazing success story, 80 percent. If that is not considered a success story, I certainly do not know what is.

It is a good example in which something that we created many years ago works and works well. Recent statistics show that 85 percent of former program participants across the Nation rated the displaced homemakers programs "excellent" or "very good." And over 75 percent said that these programs were better than other Govern-

ment-funded programs they had participated in. In other words, it gets accolades all over.

Mr. President, not long ago a lot of us voted for a welfare reform bill that was heavy on promises but light on the mechanics of how you get people off the welfare rolls. Well, what we are talking about right now is a vital component of moving people from welfare to work. And we can pass all the laws in the world requiring people to get off of welfare and get a job, but it is not going to do the least bit of good if we do not provide them with the job skills. That is where the rubber meets the road. That is what is going to move single parents from welfare to work.

Amber McDonald back in Ohio recently sent me a letter about her experiences about such training. I would like to quote this.

I'd like to state that I am on public assistance at this time in my life and have one child. I don't take pride in the fact I receive welfare. I am grateful to the State of Ohio for their help. It has allowed me to survive and keep my child. It's a long hard road to getting off assistance. One I believe I'm on now. I am attending Displaced Homemaker classes and these classes have helped me make decisions—good solid decisions. Not the pleases-the-system decisions I've made in the past. The Displaced Homemaker classes educated me about where I could go, what I would need to succeed and how to go about it. We need this program and others like it. A lot of us want off welfare. We are as tired of being on the system as the system is of having us.

I think, Mr. President, that really summarizes this whole program. And this is why the success ratio of displaced homemaker programs is so high. It is because of people like Amber. They take their training very seriously. They are not deadbeats. They are taking this very seriously, and they have a lot riding on it. And they have been working very hard with this program. Before 1984 when States were not required to fund displaced homemakers training activities, States, unfortunately, spent less than 1 percent of their funding on specialized services for displaced homemakers.

This is unfortunate because programs for single parents and displaced homemakers have been effective in not only helping families move in the welfare system, but also in preventing families from entering the welfare system. And displaced homemakers remain an at-risk population, something this legislation purports to deal with. According to the 1990 census, more than half of the displaced homemakers live in or near poverty. I want to repeat that. According to the 1990 census, more than half of the displaced homemakers live in or near poverty. Some recent statistics show that 47 percent of displaced homemakers lack a high school diploma, and the median annual personal income for displaced homemakers is \$6,766. Try living on that with a child in this modern day and age.

And I know that my distinguished colleague from Kansas will argue that this amendment, by separately defin-

ing and listing displaced homemakers, is somehow giving preferential treatment to one category of people and therefore goes against the philosophy of job training consolidation.

Unfortunately, displaced homemakers seem to be singled out for exclusion under this bill. For some unknown reason, the displaced homemakers are the only major program from Perkins not included in this bill. While ignoring displaced homemakers, the bill singles out veterans, out-of-school youth, youth in correctional facilities, older workers, at-risk youth, and individuals with disabilities, just to name a few.

But this was the only major program from Perkins not included in this bill. In fact, language in the House bill, H.R. 1617, the careers bill, includes a requirement for States to provide plans on addressing displaced homemakers. And that bill passed with an overwhelming bipartisan support of 345 to 79 in the House of Representatives.

My amendment will not—and I repeat will not—result in a set-aside. This amendment will only make it permissible for States—does not require it—it makes it permissible for States to fund specialized vocational employment and educational activities. It just makes it permissible for States to fund specialized vocational employment and educational activities. States will still have the flexibility in determining the funding amount and the types of programs to institute. There is nothing in this amendment that will require the States to fund employment or educational activities for displaced homemakers. I just want to make sure that States are encouraged and reminded to continue these programs that are working so well.

Now, there may be some who will argue that displaced homemakers are included under the dislocated workers definition, but the reality is that this will not—I repeat will not—result in programs or services for these women. Displaced homemakers were included in the definition of a dislocated worker when Congress passed the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Act in 1988. And in 1994, a survey of 35 States found that virtually no services were provided to displaced homemakers under EDWAA.

Another argument that I have heard is theoretically everyone is eligible for services under this act under the discretion of the States. Well, given that we are already reducing the funding by 15 percent under this block grant, it is clear that funding will be inadequate to serve even the populations that are specifically referenced. I have been hearing from many people in Ohio who have benefited from these services. I read one such account a moment ago. And these women are now gainfully employed, and they are providing for their families. Recent data from just my home State of Ohio shows that displaced homemakers in Ohio who have gone through training programs are

now working an average of 32 hours per week.

For example, Rebecca Richards, from Fairfield, OH, wrote how she and her child's life changed since she participated in a displaced homemaker program.

She said:

As a result of the programs available, I was able to become a productive person in society.

And she concluded by saying:

With the program, I found a friend who counseled me, listened to complaints and successes, gave me useful information and training, and helped me meet with other single parents to form a network of friends.

Let us face it. The traditional vocational training programs will not provide this type of training.

Another Ohioan, Diane Cook, wrote me saying that:

Everyone makes mistakes but they all should be allowed a second chance. Give us that second chance.

The bottom line is to employ single parents so they can support their families. And what better way to accomplish this objective than encouraging the States to conduct tailored training programs which will affect over 17 million displaced homemakers all over this country?

Mr. President, I would say let us give them a second chance. I would only repeat two major facts. This is the one area that was not picked up out of Perkins and used as examples in this bill. It is included by an overwhelming vote that the House had on it, included in the House vote.

I urge adoption of this amendment. At the appropriate time I will move for a record rollcall vote. And I reserve the remainder of our time on this side.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I would like to ask the Senator from Ohio a couple questions because, as I understand it, in his proposed amendment he redefines the term "displaced homemaker" to include anyone who has been on welfare and has a child under the age of 16; is that correct?

Mr. GLENN. Would you repeat the question, please?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. As it is defined in the Senator's amendment, "displaced homemaker" would be anyone who has been on welfare and has a child under the age of 16?

Mr. GLENN. If they had been on welfare, yes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. If they had been on welfare.

Mr. GLENN. If they had been previously.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Then the Senator also adds employment training for displaced homemakers to the list of permissible job training activities?

Mr. GLENN. Permissible job training activity, correct. Permissible, not required. That is an important point.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Programs for single parents and displaced homemakers and single pregnant women—the list required educational activities?

Mr. GLENN. Was the question whether they are required to participate in educational activity?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes. Are they required to do that?

Mr. GLENN. No, they are not required to; they would be permitted to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Well, I guess I thought that under the language, as I read it, the State would be required to offer that.

Mr. GLENN. We have no amount required to be set aside in this. It permits the States a lot of flexibility to do what they think is best in each individual case, but we do not set aside a specific amount of money for this program.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Well, I am very sympathetic to what the Senator from Ohio is saying. I have been a strong supporter of the displaced homemaker programs. But I think that under the language of his amendment, as I read it, it significantly expands the concept of "displaced homemaker."

Under "Education Activities" it says that the State educational agency shall use the funds made available to the State under this subtitle for work force education activities. To carry it out, there are certain State activities that are included. It then lists these activities in this section.

Mr. GLENN. The States could permit the program. It does not require that the States actually set aside a certain amount of money for this program. In other words, it includes them in the same category as the rest of the ones I read into the RECORD.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I suggest that if it is only something the Senator is wanting to list as a permissible activity, we already do that under the Workforce Development Act. It is listed as a definition. It is included in the dislocated workers as one of the benchmarks in the bill. Although displaced homemakers are not counted separately, I will argue this is still a population that is very much a part of the training, both education and jobs, under the work force development bill.

Mr. GLENN. The difficulty, I believe, is that displaced homemakers have not automatically been considered displaced workers in the past, so they get left out of these programs.

Mr. KENNEDY. Can I ask the Senator a question? As I understand it, there are a number of programs that are available now for this population as defined by the Glenn amendment. There are about a half a dozen programs which are utilized in order to reach that population. This is a program that has proven to be an impressive success and provides a great sense of meaning for individuals who qualify. The fact that their lives are changed has a direct impact on the communities in which they reside.

I understand that what the Senator wants to do with his amendment is to make sure that the definition, which is used in other programs, will be used in this program and that the States will

have at least a requirement to develop a program. The Senator is not saying how much.

Mr. GLENN. That is right.

Mr. KENNEDY. The clear expectation is that the respective States are going to provide some form of assistance to displaced homemakers. The Senator from Ohio is hopeful, and I agree, that States will recognize the importance of these services and they will find an area with which they will provide further support. But the Senator from Ohio is not prescribing a percent or amount.

What my colleague is basically doing, as I understand the amendment, is making sure that the need is going to be highlighted so that some attention is going to be focused on the program. If the States want a robust program, they can do it. If the States want a very modest program, they can do it. But nonetheless, this function, which is of such importance to many women in our society, will not be lost. That is the way I read the Senator's amendment, and it is a reason why I think it is commendable. I think that it is an extraordinarily vulnerable population and one which justifies this kind of support and attention.

Mr. GLENN. The Senator stated it very, very well. I agree with his statement.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I will only say, the definition as we traditionally thought of is one which is defined as a full-time homemaker for a substantial number of years and who no longer receives financial support previously provided by a spouse or public assistance. That is what we traditionally thought of as a displaced homemaker.

I will suggest that this expanded definition includes anyone who has been on welfare and has a child under the age of 16 will be, obviously, someone who is receiving some duplicative assistance as well.

I just suggest while it is a very vulnerable population, the amendment does make a dramatic change, and I suggest, at least of my reading of it, under the education requirements that it is a required education activity. While it is permissible under job training, as I read it, it is required under education activities.

I just think, Mr. President, that it runs contrary to the thrust of this bill which is attempting to get away, again, from our practice of narrowly defining programs and eligible recipients. Not that we do not all have some real sympathy; I believe it is important to be able to reach that population. But this practice is the reason we have, again, so many separate programs and I think have not served any of them as well as they could be and why we worked hard to try and do a totality of the system that could provide better quality assistance.

So I have to oppose this. I think that it really goes in a different direction to

a larger degree than we had intended by creating the programs that we had under this legislation.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might require.

The displaced homemakers are not mentioned in the bill itself, yet at the same time, the bill singles out, as I understand, the veterans, singles out out-of-school youth, youth in correctional facilities, adults in correctional facilities, older workers, at-risk youth and individuals with disabilities. So it is not that the bill does not specify some of these specific difficulties that people have and try to address them.

As the Senator from Massachusetts said a moment ago, we estimate there are some 17 million displaced homemakers across this country. These can be men as well as women. The wife has died, a person is having a problem trying to raise the kids and that qualifies as a displaced homemaker as well as the usual definition of the wife who may be divorced or may have lost her husband for whatever reason or another. The figures are outstanding with regard to this program.

Approximately 80 percent of women served in the programs are placed in employment and postsecondary education; 80 percent. That is an amazing success story. It is very successful, and that is the reason I brought it up. It does not require the States to put money aside. It does not require that they set up programs. It says that they will be permitted to. On programs that have been successful and are continuing to be successful, they will be permitted to and, obviously, encouraged to because there is a need, and that need can be addressed if we adopt this amendment.

I do not want to cut off debate. I will be happy to yield back time and move to a vote at the appropriate time, if no one else wishes to speak.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, just to clarify, displaced homemakers is listed in the bill. It is a category under "dislocated workers," and that is true with the definition that I gave earlier. But it is a benchmark under the dislocated worker section as something that should be addressed without setting aside any special allocation.

So just to clarify, we were conscious of it being an important population. It was not addressed as the Senator from Ohio would like to see it by his amendment. I do not want people to think we did not debate this and were not cognizant of that group.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I think both Senators are correct. It is not defined as the Senator from Ohio wanted. It is defined as the Senator from Kansas has referred. It does seem, as I mentioned earlier and for the reasons the Senator from Ohio has spelled out, that we want to make sure this population is highlighted. As the Senator has pointed out as well, it will be up to the State to decide whether they are going to have an enhanced and ro-

bust program or not. But the Senator is trying to make sure that it is a population that is not overlooked.

Mr. President, if this completes the debate on this issue and it is agreeable with the Senator from Ohio, I would hope we could move onto the Senator from Connecticut's amendment which is yet to be considered. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. GLENN. I have concluded. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Glenn amendment to the Workforce Development Act. Although, the Senator from Ohio and I may be at odds this week over baseball's American League Championship, I could not agree more with his amendment that includes displaced homemakers and single parents in workforce education programs.

It is difficult to understand why these individuals, displaced homemakers, and single parents, are not currently included in this act. Congress has long mandated that these women had access to the job training and vocational education services needed to become and remain economically self-sufficient. Without including these single parents, we are severely penalizing women who choose to raise families and are then forced to cope without income due to the loss of their husbands or divorce.

I must emphasize that this amendment is not a set-aside, with no mandated funding and it adds no cost to the bill.

Further, the amendment preserves State flexibility and only clarifies that these services are permissible and not required by the State. The decision about how to serve displaced homemakers and single parents and at what level remains with the State.

The amendment's definition of "displaced homemaker" is the same as under Federal legislation under JTPA, Perkins, the Displaced Homemakers Self-Sufficiency Act, and the Higher Education Act. When displaced homemakers are defined as dislocated workers, they are simply not served through workforce training programs.

We cannot ignore this important segment of our population. These single parents are as deserving of career training as any other segment of our dislocated worker population.

Further, this amendment continues the theme of the recently-passed welfare reform legislation that moves citizens from public assistance to payrolls through education.

Let us come together on this amendment that truly supports family values. If we are to prioritize the working family in our society, we cannot forget those parents that have sacrificed economic gain for the growth of their children. When those single parents are left without a monthly paycheck, we

must at least be willing to provide educational assistance that puts their family back on the road to self-sufficiency.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Glenn amendment be set aside and that the vote occur after the previously scheduled votes on the Moynihan amendment and the Grams amendment, which will occur after 5:20, with 4 minutes of debate in between those amendments.

I believe the Senator from Michigan wants to speak for a few moments on Senator MOYNIHAN's amendment before Senator DODD offers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 2887

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Kansas for letting me go in at this point and yielding me time off of the bill so that I can speak for a moment on the bill and also on the Moynihan amendment.

Mr. President, from World War II until the 1980's, American families saw a steady rise in their standard of living. The poorest 20 percent saw their incomes increase by over 130 percent, and the middle 40 percent of American families doubled their income. Paraphrasing the words of John Kennedy, "a rising tide raised all boats."

A bedrock truth of American life virtually since our creation as a Nation has been the assurance that, with initiative and hard work, men and women can pull themselves up, and even more importantly, generations of Americans confidently expected that their children would have better lives than they had.

Unfortunately, most Americans no longer feel that for a variety of reasons, including Government policies in the 1980's, the increasing Federal deficit, our toleration of discrimination against American products in foreign markets, and a wider labor base in the United States. People are working harder to advance more slowly and, in some cases, only to slide back down.

Individuals who enter the labor market today expect to change jobs at least seven times within their lifetimes. This requires an extraordinary and unprecedented flexibility on their part. Workers are required to adapt to new situations and master new skills quickly if they are to succeed. But this cannot be done alone.

The Federal Government has a critical role in providing a system of training and retraining programs to help people through these transitions. In today's world marketplace, these programs are more important now than ever. However, as new programs to meet new needs have been designed and

implemented, the system has become needlessly complicated. Many people who require job training services become lost within the maze of programs. A recent GAO report cited over 100 Federal programs that offer job training services. So, clearly, some consolidation and restructuring is necessary.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York, however, has offered an amendment to this bill which I think is critically important. It would maintain the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act as a separate program. This is a critically needed program which was set up to help workers who lose their jobs because of trade agreements into which we enter. And given the growing role of exports in our Nation's economy, a program of that type is required.

But even more important, a commitment was made during the debate in the presentation of both NAFTA and GATT. A commitment was made that trade adjustment assistance would be there if those two agreements were entered into and were implemented by the Congress. We knew when those agreements were passed that there would be a loss of jobs in some sectors and, knowing that, those agreements were entered into. And we decided, as part of that approach, to compensate for what are the harsh consequences to many in some sectors of our economy.

NAFTA-specific trade adjustment assistance provisions were added to NAFTA. They were added in order to gain more support for NAFTA in Congress. It was a commitment that was made and should be kept. And now that NAFTA has passed and American jobs are indeed being lost in some sectors, the least we can do is carry out our commitment that was made at that time and which helped to get approval of those two agreements. And the least we can do is provide a safety net for those Americans who have lost their jobs because of those agreements, either because the jobs have relocated to Mexico, or because they were displaced by imports from Mexico as a result of NAFTA.

Mr. President, the workers that frequently lose those jobs because of trade agreements are people who have worked their whole lives at one place. Their skills have been developed to suit the workplaces. Often they require extensive retraining. Trade adjustment assistance provides that training and it does so successfully. Over 85 percent of the workers assisted by the TAA have found permanent employment.

Mr. President, workers from my State of Michigan have benefited from TAA. From January 1993 to August 1995, over 4,000 workers in the State of Michigan received trade adjustment assistance. As I said, it has been 85-percent successful. We have had \$4 million in training money, over \$7 million for job location assistance and supplementary income. Those funds were used to help support families until they could get on their feet again and obtain permanent employment.

So while I generally support the goals of this legislation, Mr. President, some consolidation and reorganization of the system, I believe, is indicated. Surely, we ought to keep the commitments we made just a few years ago to the people who we knew were going to be displaced by trade agreements and keep our commitment to have a trade adjustment-specific program kept in place for them.

Mr. President, we should strive to pass a bill which recognizes the Federal job training network and provides more flexibility for States, but does so in a way which empowers individuals and provides maximum access to needed services.

The bill before us, S. 143, accomplishes these goals to a considerable extent. It would provide States with a substantial amount flexibility, institute benchmarks for service that States must meet, establish a reporting system to track recipients of services, and coordinate the program more closely with the private sector. All of these are important changes which I support.

Under S. 143, States will be required to formulate a State plan which explains how they will provide services with particular attention paid to how they will meet the needs of special population groups, like older workers. This will allow States to better tailor services to the local market demands.

In Michigan, in recent years, this has unfortunately often meant responding to large, sometimes permanent layoffs of factory workers. Several towns in my State are undergoing this process as we speak.

Compounding the problem within Michigan is the fact that many of our larger urban centers have entirely different employment problems. This bill would better enable us to respond to this type of variety by tailoring the program to address such situations.

I am very concerned, however, about changes to the Job Corps Program in the bill. Administration of the program would be turned over to the States and 25 Job Corps centers would be closed.

I support the approach to be offered by Senators SPECTER and SIMON that would maintain Federal standards and administration while increasing State and local involvement. Governors would have an opportunity to review a community's application before it was submitted to the Department of Labor. Community organizations and local work force development boards would actively participate.

The State of Michigan currently operates two Job Corps centers, one in Detroit, one in Grand Rapids, and a third is slated to open in Flint in 1996. As an indication of the Flint community's commitment to this program, over 30 local organizations have raised \$2 million in resources to help support the program. Michigan, like many other industrial States, has a number of economically depressed communities struggling to train workers and gen-

erate jobs. Job Corps is one of the programs that many of these communities rely upon to help meet that challenge.

I am concerned that the block grant approach will not adequately retain the commitment to special population groups like older workers or at-risk youth which require different services than the rest of the population. Although the bill does contain benchmarks which the States would establish for themselves, I would like to see a clearer commitment to serving these groups.

Also, while the bill also allows for the establishment of local work force development boards to help integrate local officials into the process, they are not mandated. One of the important and productive parts of the current system is the private industry councils, or PIC's which work with local and county officials to design training programs that meet the needs of local businesses. It is fundamental to the success of job training programs that we prepare people for jobs which exist in their communities. Local work force development boards can be an important part of assuring that that happens. Therefore, I would like to see an expanded role for local participation.

Finally, I would like to highlight two organizations within my state which demonstrate the great potential of job training. Focus:HOPE, a retraining center in Detroit, was established in 1968 to meet the needs of the city's low-income residents. This program has been a shining success story. For example, a recent study found that 85 percent of the graduates of Focus:HOPE's Machinist Training Institute are employed in machinist trades. This is a tremendous step forward for people who come to the center with little educational background and very low skill levels. They leave with advanced training in computer-assisted machining. The average salary for this group is \$25,000 to \$35,000 per year. And, their skills are closely matched to the area's labor market. Some students are even recruited by local manufacturers before they finish their program. Focus:HOPE works. It provides an enormously valuable service to both the students and the Detroit community.

Similarly, OperationAble, founded in 1989, has become one of the most successful job training centers of its kind in the country. It serves older workers, in an innovative way. Job counselors carefully examine each individual's background, future needs and aspirations before helping them to plan a training program. Over 83 percent of OperationAble's students are placed in permanent jobs. OperationAble is mobilizing a vital part of our community, our older workers, one which should not be left out in a proposed consolidation.

Mr. President, the legislation before us has some pluses and minuses. I am hopeful that we will strengthen it. If

we focus on the needs of working families caught in a changing marketplace, and eliminate unnecessary duplication and waste; if we learn from experience and build on what has worked best, we will have taken an important step forward.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I was going to inquire of the managers of the bill, through the Chair, if it is appropriate that I send an amendment to the desk at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. We hope that the Senator will send his amendment to the desk.

AMENDMENT NO. 2890 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2885
(Purpose: To improve the voucher provisions)

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PELL, proposes an amendment numbered 2890 to amendment No. 2885.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 51, line 6, strike "deliver" and insert "deliver, to persons age 18 or older who are unable to obtain Pell Grants under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.)."

On page 53, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(D) INFORMATION.—A State that determines that a need exists to train persons age 18 or older through activities authorized under paragraph (6) shall indicate in the State plan described in section 104 for the State, or the annual report described in section 121(a) for the State, the extent, if any, to which the State will use the authority of this paragraph to deliver some or all such activities through a system of vouchers, including indicating the information and timeframes required under subparagraph (C).

On page 104, line 2, strike "or".

On page 104, line 7, strike the period and insert " ; or".

On page 104, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(3) beginning with program year 2000, in the case of a State that elects to offer activities for persons age 18 or older under section 106(a)(6), the State uses the authority of section 106(a)(9) to deliver some or all of such activities through a system of vouchers.

On page 114, line 3, strike, "or".

On page 114, line 9, strike the period and insert " ; or".

On page 114, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(C) in the case of a State that elects to offer activities for persons age 18 or older under section 106(a)(6); uses the authority of section 106(a)(9) to deliver some or all of such activities through a system of vouchers.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I want to first start off by thanking the distinguished managers of the bill, the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, and the Senator from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, for all of the work they have been able to put into helping us draft this amendment. I

think it is an amendment that should be enthusiastically supported by all of our colleagues.

Mr. President, just as a concept of the background of the entire bill, what we are doing is consolidating about 90 Federal programs that currently serve people who are in need of job training, to meet the needs and the skills, or demand, as we move into the 21st century.

I think the essence of the legislation is really monumental. It is historical that the U.S. Senate and, hopefully, the other body, at the appropriate time, can realize that all of these programs we have written over the years—90 different programs—aimed at encouraging people to become better trained so they could meet the demands and challenges of the work force in the 21st century need to be consolidated. If I found myself unemployed and I wanted to get help from my Government, I do not know if I would know where to go. There are 90 programs, and if somebody dumped them in front of me and said, "pick one," I would say, look, I have to be a rocket scientist to figure out which program fits my need.

The reason for that is basically that I think in the last several decades, we as a Congress have tried to create a solution or program for every problem. As a result of trying to address every problem with a program, we ended up with all of these programs and tried to address every conceivable need of every citizen in the country. Some would suggest that the proper role of Government is to help solve everybody's problems all the time. I suggest that that is really not the proper role. The proper role is to help people to solve their own problems, help equip the citizens of this country to be in a position to solve their own problems. On the other extreme, some in Government think there is no role for Government at all, and that if somebody loses his job, so be it, let him survive if he can. That is the survival of the fittest theory, that suggests there is no role for Government that is proper or appropriate in helping the citizens of our country meet the needs that are facing them. If a plant is closed because of downsizing, tough luck. If a military base is closed in your area and all the jobs associated with that base are lost, tough luck. If, in fact, we have a disaster, or because of some trade policy, foreign imports are increased and you lose your job in the domestic industry here in this country, tough luck. There is no role for Government to help at all.

That, I think, should be rejected categorically by all Members of this body as an improper response from Government. But we cannot, at the same time, create a program for every problem. What this legislation does is consolidate these 90 programs, make them more efficient, make them function better, make it easier for people to get help from the Government so they can help themselves. Because each of us

has a duty in life to be responsible, to utilize the gifts we have, to help develop those gifts and be a better citizen. I think, by consolidating these programs, we move a long way toward accomplishing that.

My amendment is, really, patterned after the great success we have had in this country with the GI bill. The GI bill's great success was not that it created a whole bunch of programs, because it did not. It created one program. It told the people of this country if they served in the military that when they got back, the Government was going to help them go to college. Under the GI bill we did not tell them which college they had to go to, and we did not tell them which program or which studies they had to take when they got there. We did not tell them what they had to major in, and we did not tell them what they had to minor in. But we said, here is some financial help. Go to the school you think can serve your needs the best and take the courses you enjoy, that you are best adapted for. The great success of the program was really its flexibility, calling on people to be challenged in what they want to do and figure out where they can best go to meet those requirements.

The amendment I am offering with the managers of the bill provides incentives in this bill to encourage States to use vouchers, to give States the right to issue vouchers to the people in their State and let those individuals make the decisions as to how they best can get the proper training to meet the needs they have. Instead of what is usual in Washington or in some State capital, saying, "You have to go here to get your training and it has to be this type of training," the voucher system will say to the individual, "We trust you to make the right decision. We trust you to pick the best school, the best program, the best course that is going to meet your needs. No one in Washington is going to tell you where you can best be served. No one in your State capital is going to tell you what you have to do."

We, in this Government, trust the individual's instincts to do what is right when the proper choices are in front of him or her. So what we do in this amendment is fairly simple. It gives States two incentives, two incentives to adopt the voucher system.

First, it authorizes the Secretary to provide incentive awards to States that have begun providing services through these vouchers of up to \$15 million extra money that a State would be able to receive if it sets up a voucher program within the States to give vouchers to individuals to allow them to go to the particular program they think best fits their particular needs.

The second incentive is that my amendment will allow Governors to use flexible funds on economic development activities if they have established a workforce development board

or a voucher system. This is in the third year of the program. We are saying to the States, you are going to be able to use your flexible funds on economic development if you put together this workforce development board or if you have established the voucher program. And, in the third year, under my amendment, if a State decides to set up a voucher program, then it would be able to use the flex funds for economic development activity.

So this amendment essentially puts two additional incentives in the legislation to encourage the States—not demand the States to do it, but to encourage the States—to set up vouchers for the people who need the benefit of the programs. Then let that individual take those vouchers and go to where he or she thinks the needs they have can best be met within the program.

That would increase competition because all of these programs would start competing for the vouchers of the individuals. People in this society know if they provide a better service, people are going to use that service. They are going to go to the school that meets their needs. They are going to go to the best school, not a worse school; not a second-class school, but the best school. So schools, I think, because of competition, because of this amendment, will do a better job because they know people will be going to them based on their ability to deliver the training that individuals who are unemployed actually need.

I think it also teaches individuals responsibility, because they are going to have to make that decision. They are not going to just sit back and say, "Tell me where I have to go, tell me what I have to do, and tell me how I have to do it." They are going to say, "I have to make a decision." Maybe for the first time in the lives of some individuals, they are going to start taking responsibility for their future by saying, "I want to make sure I pick the best school, that I pick the best program. And after I finish with it, I know I am going to be a much better citizen." That individual will become a person who can market his or her abilities after receiving the training for the program they pick as opposed to the program that someone has picked for them.

In addition, I point out that in return for accepting the vouchers, school and training providers will be required to provide performance information. That means the completion rates of the people who go to their schools, the licensing rates, placement retention, wage rates, which voucher recipients and others could use to make good decisions about where to go to get the training they need.

In other words, schools that provide training to unemployed workers are going to have to provide information to the workers, the unemployed workers who are looking for the training, on how their schools perform so those unemployed workers will then have infor-

mation they can use to determine which school is the best for their needs.

If I had a list of performance results based on schools, and at one school 95 percent of the people who went to that school and got the training became employed, and there was another school that only got jobs for about 15 percent of their people, is there any question about which school I would want to go to or anybody would want to go to? Of course, the answer is simple: They would want to go to the school that finds jobs for people that complete their programs.

That is competition and that is what this amendment does. It allows individuals to become more responsible. It allows them to make the decision based on what is best for them while at the same time it requires responsibility on the part of the institutions that they would be going to, to make sure that fly-by-night groups and organizations that have been created overnight just to take advantage of these programs are not going to be successful. With the information they are required to present, everybody will have a chance to make the right decision.

Mr. President, I think this amendment adds to the bill. I think it is an important step. It makes the bill an even stronger piece of legislation, one that we can all be proud of supporting.

I thank the managers of the bill, Senator KENNEDY and Senator KASSEBAUM, for their involvement and their assistance and their encouragement in this effort. I encourage all our colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his cooperation on this innovative and creative concept, and thank as well Senator DASCHLE and others who have favored this improvement in the legislation. The way this has been crafted, those who will be eligible will be over 18 years of age, who are unable to obtain a Pell grant.

We can imagine a situation where there has been a significant closing of a plant or phasing out of a defense industry, or perhaps as a result of a merger, as we saw with the Chase Manhattan Bank and the Chemical Bank, affecting some 12,000 workers in different communities out there. We can see local community colleges or other educational facilities in communities responding to those particular needs. They will be developing programs which are designed to place individuals and upgrade their skills so they can be successfully employed.

We are maximizing the flexibility with this amendment and giving an individual the opportunity to take advantage of that situation, or maybe they will decide that they want to go to a different part of the country and will be able to go into a different program. We are permitting the States to

make the judgment about what that voucher will be worth. It may be worth a couple of thousand dollars in Massachusetts, and it may be valued less in a different part of the country. So there is maximum flexibility within the State and maximum versatility for the displaced worker.

For the reasons that the Senator has spelled out, I think it is a very, very creative and imaginative way of trying to make us do better with training programs. I want to thank him for his cooperation. He has had legislation on this over a period of years and has worked very closely with all of the members of the committee.

We have tried to capture the essence of his proposal. I think we have, and we look forward to its success and, hopefully, building on it over the period of the future.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana. At an appropriate time, I hope the amendment will be accepted unanimously.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I, too, am pleased that we have been able to work out an agreement on the language with the Senator from Louisiana. He spent a lot of time on this. He has given a lot of thought to it. And I have supported the limited use of vouchers for job training services but only as an option for the States. I think there is a recognition that there is a place, but we need to be careful on how we move in that direction. I have been very concerned about mandating vouchers because it is a new and untested concept. Therefore, I think the direction that this amendment would take us is an important one.

I very much value the effort of Senator BREAUX to speak to this. He cares a lot about it. And the amendment will not mandate that States provide vouchers but, rather, will provide additional means to assist and encourage States to implement a voucher system. I am pleased to be a supporter of this amendment.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, if I can just add one short note, I thank my colleagues for their most generous comments. Lt. Gov. Buddy McKay, of Florida, who served in the House with some of us when we were in the other body, in behalf of Governor Chiles, has a statement which is a couple of sentences that I want to read because I think it really makes the point very well. He said:

In this country we trust citizens to choose their elected officials, but we don't trust them to choose training programs. Currently, leaders of Government employees in Washington, in Federal regional offices, in State capitals and State regional offices, and in service sites dictate those decisions for their own citizens. That is bunk. Informed citizens can make the best decisions for themselves. It is a simple enough premise in this country, but it is a revolutionary idea for government.

I think the point is well made that we trust citizens to make decisions on who their elected officials are but we

do not trust them to decide which programs are best for them. I think, as the Lieutenant Governor said, that is "bunk." And this amendment would, I think, help us overcome that current situation and allow, through the voucher program, people to make the best decisions for themselves and trust the American citizen to do what is right instead of requiring the government to make that decision for them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we are prepared to yield back time and ask for the consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment (No. 2890) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

AMENDMENT NO. 2891 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2885

(Purpose: To provide for a migrant or seasonal farmworker program and for national discretionary grants)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), for himself and Mr. PELL, proposes an amendment numbered 2891 to amendment No. 2885.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 7, line 19, strike "186(c)" and insert "187(c)".

On page 74, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 108. MIGRANT OR SEASONAL FARMWORKER PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Using funds made available under section 124(b)(3), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, acting jointly on the advice of the Federal Partnership, shall make grants to, or enter into contracts with, entities to carry out the activities described in subsection (d).

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant or enter into a contract under this section, an entity shall have an understanding of the problems of migrant or seasonal farmworkers, a familiarity with the area to be served, and a previously demonstrated capacity to administer effectively a diversified program of workforce development activities for migrant or seasonal farmworkers.

(c) PROGRAM PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant or enter into a contract under this section, an entity described in subsection (b)

shall submit to the Federal Partnership a plan that describes a 3-year strategy for meeting the needs of migrant or seasonal farmworkers in the area to be served by such entity.

(2) CONTENTS.—Such plan shall—

(A) identify the education and employment needs of the population to be served and the manner in which the services to be provided will strengthen the ability of the individuals served to obtain or be retained in unsubsidized employment;

(B) describe the services to be provided and the manner in which such services are to be integrated with other appropriate services; and

(C) describe the goals and benchmarks to be used to assess the performance of such entity in carrying out the activities assisted under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Funds made available under this section shall be used to carry out comprehensive workforce development activities, and related services, for migrant or seasonal farmworkers.

(e) CONSULTATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS AND BOARDS.—In making grants and entering into contracts under this section, the Federal Partnership shall consult with the Governors (or, where established, the State workforce development boards described in section 105) and with local partnerships (or, where established, the local workforce development boards described in section 118(b)).

On page 74, line 8, strike "108." and insert "109."

On page 74, line 10, strike "124(b)(3)" and insert "124(b)(4)".

On page 117, line 7, strike "92.7" and insert "90.75".

On page 117, strike lines 11 through 15 and insert the following:

(3) 1.25 percent shall be reserved for carrying out section 108;

(4) 0.2 percent shall be reserved for carrying out section 109;

(5) 5.0 percent shall be reserved for making incentive grants under section 122(a), for making national discretionary grants under section 184, and for the administration of this title;

On page 117, line 16, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

On page 117, line 18, strike "(6)" and insert "(7)".

On page 117, line 19, strike "184 and 185" and insert "185 and 186".

On page 162, line 17, strike "186(c)" and insert "187(c)".

On page 163, line 4, strike "108, and 173" and insert "108, 109, 173, and 184".

On page 163, line 6, strike "108, 122(a), 161, and 184" and insert "108, 109, 122(a), 161, 184, and 185".

On page 163, lines 12 and 13, strike "186(c) and 187(b)" and insert "187(c) and 188(b)".

On page 166, line 22, strike "186(c)" and insert "187(c)".

On page 183, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 184. NATIONAL DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.

(a) NATIONAL GRANTS.—Using funds made available under section 124(b)(5), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, acting jointly on the advice of the Federal Partnership, may in a timely manner award a national grant—

(1) to an eligible entity described in subsection (b) to carry out the activities described in such subsection; and

(2) at the request of an officer described in subsection (c), to such an officer to carry out the activities described in such subsection.

(b) RAPID RESPONSE GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) MAJOR ECONOMIC DISLOCATION.—Funds made available under this section to an eligi-

ble entity described in this subsection may be used to provide adjustment assistance to workers affected by a major economic dislocation that results from a closure, layoff, or realignment described in section 3(8)(B).

(B) EMERGENCY DETERMINATION.—Such funds may also be used to provide adjustment assistance to dislocated workers whenever the Federal Partnership (with the agreement of the Governor involved) determines that an emergency exists with respect to any particular distressed industry or any particularly distressed area. The Federal Partnership may make arrangements for the immediate provision of such emergency financial assistance for the purposes of this subsection with any necessary supportive documentation to be submitted on a date agreed to by the Governor and the Federal Partnership.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section for activities described in this subsection, an eligible entity shall be a State or local entity.

(3) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section for activities described in this subsection, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Federal Partnership at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Federal Partnership determines to be appropriate.

(c) DISASTER RELIEF EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available under this section to officers described in this subsection shall be used solely to provide individuals in a disaster area with employment in projects to provide clothing, shelter, and other humanitarian assistance for disaster victims and in projects regarding the demolition, cleanup, repair, renovation, and reconstruction of damaged and destroyed structures, facilities, and lands located within the disaster area.

(2) OFFICERS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section for activities described in this subsection, an officer shall be a chief executive officer of a State within which is located an area that has suffered an emergency or a major disaster as defined in paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1) and (2)) (referred to in this section as a "disaster area").

On page 183, line 9, strike "184." and insert "185."

On page 183, line 12, strike "124(b)(6)" and insert "124(b)(7)".

On page 188, line 4, strike "185." and insert "186."

On page 192, line 1, strike "186." and insert "187."

On page 204, line 9, strike "187." and insert "188."

On page 207, line 16, strike "186" and insert "187".

On page 207, line 21, strike "186" and insert "187".

On page 207, line 24, strike "186" and insert "187".

On page 208, line 2, strike "186" and insert "187".

On page 208, line 6, strike "186" and insert "187".

On page 208, line 17, strike "186" and insert "187".

On page 211, line 17, strike "188." and insert "189."

On page 216, line 10, strike "187" and insert "188".

On page 293, line 9, strike "186(c)" and insert "187(c)".

On page 307, line 25, strike "124(b)(6)" and insert "124(b)(7)".

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL.

Mr. President, this is an amendment which we worked on for some time. I believe it will be accepted by both the floor manager and the ranking minority member.

Very briefly, this amendment is designed to establish a rapid response service where you have national disasters or national needs that would go beyond the capacity of States to respond to them. Our distinguished colleague from Louisiana talked about some of those when he mentioned base closures. Often, States cannot anticipate those results. All of a sudden States find themselves in the situation where a significant number of people lose their jobs—in the case of base closures because the Federal Government has made a decision affecting the economy of the local area. There are also, of course, other situations where you have natural disasters.

I think all of us at one time or another have certainly seen our States afflicted by unanticipated events with weather or climatic conditions. Again, we can find people who, through no fault of their own and no fault of the business, are displaced. This amendment allows for some additional funds to respond to people who find themselves out of work under those circumstances.

As the Presiding Officer will no doubt recall, I offered this amendment in the committee. There was a good discussion at the time, and we lost the amendment on a tie vote 8 to 8. But there was a strong enough feeling there that I brought this up to see if we could work out some of the language, which we are able to do.

As a result of that, today I offer this amendment which will allow us to respond in those kind of situations. I think it is in the national interest for the Federal Government to provide assistance to our States under those circumstances and, just as importantly if not more importantly, the very people who find themselves without work and unable to provide for their families.

I just want to underscore the point that has been made by others. We all know how well the economy is doing in certain areas. Profitability is up and productivity is at its highest level in many ways. The stock market has been doing very, very well. But, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out a few moments ago, look at 12,000 to 20,000 people losing their jobs as a result of a merger between Chemical and Chase Bank. And in another act of downsizing, DuPont laid off some 5,000 or 6,000 people recently. All of this downsizing contributes, I suppose, we are told, to the strength of the economic well-being of the country. Yet, the people who lose their jobs are oftentimes forgotten in the discussion.

We need to focus on what happens to these people and what happens to their families.

This amendment does not address that situation specifically, but much of what is included in this bill does.

For those reasons, I commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the chairman of the committee, for the work in this area. I think we need to be thinking creatively when we end up with a tax proposal, a tax bill coming up—which we are apt to—as to how we might pay more attention to what happens to those people who lose their jobs not from a natural disaster, not from some accident or something undertaken by Government, but when you have great mergers and acquisitions which may result in a real need—the merger itself may be worthwhile—but when results of that activity cause thousands of people to lose their jobs, I think we have a responsibility to respond to them, and we need to be thinking about how we can do that.

I appreciate the efforts of Senator KASSEBAUM and staff to work the specifics out so this is now acceptable.

This amendment offers real protection to States and workers affected by mass layoffs due to economic downsizing, plant and base closings, and natural disasters.

It preserves the ability of the Federal Government to respond quickly and in a meaningful way to concentrated economic employment difficulties—the kind no one State can predict or pay for. Without this amendment, this assistance, which gets communities and workers through the worst of times, would no longer be available.

We keep hearing about an economic recovery, a rising stock market. But we have to remember that one result of the improving economy is downsizing in many industries all across the country. All of a sudden people are being thrown out of work through no fault of their own.

We may not be able to prevent these Americans from losing their jobs, but we should try to give them some aid in the form of training and other support to help them get back in to the work force.

The need for such assistance will not diminish in the coming years. Defense-related layoffs in the private sector alone are continuing, with up to an additional 25- to 30-percent reduction expected within the next 2 to 3 years. Mergers in the banking and other industries are resulting in thousands of layoffs. And the downsizing trend is expected to continue. Natural disasters, like the flooding in the Midwest, cannot be predicted. We cannot just turn our backs on Americans in need.

This amendment ensures that the resources will be available to provide emergency funds in order to get people back on their feet. Specific examples of how we have helped out recently are:

In addition to the grants that will go to Connecticut, which I mentioned earlier, Washington State received \$14.6

million to assist workers laid off by Boeing. More than \$4 million in retraining dollars have been made available for 9,500 GTE employees expected to be severed from their jobs in 22 States, including Missouri, Washington, and Illinois. More than \$100 million has been spent in the last 4 years in response to natural disasters. For example, for the 1993 Midwest floods, funding went to Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Kansas.

This kind of vital assistance will continue under my amendment. The Secretary of Labor, with the Federal partnership, will be able to provide States, communities, and workers with critical assistance when there is a mass layoff, base closing, or natural disaster.

The need for this assistance is broadly recognized. Just last week, the National Governors' Association strongly endorsed this concept.

This amendment also ensures that migrant farmworkers continue to receive training services. There could not be a needier population, yet, because they move so much, they are difficult to serve. This amendment provides the Secretary with funds to assist these workers, as he currently does.

Mr. President, this amendment represents the kind of good compromise we can reach when we share the same goal—to assist workers in times of crisis.

I appreciate the efforts of Senator KASSEBAUM and am pleased the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might use. I will be very brief.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Connecticut for bringing this up, both in the committee and on the floor, and thank him for all of his work on this extremely important program, which I am pleased to say will be accepted.

I am grateful to the Senator from Kansas for her support of the program as well.

This amendment is particularly timely as we consider the events of the last few days with Hurricane Opal and the devastating economic impact it has left in its wake. It has been estimated to have caused over \$2 billion in damage in that particular region of the country. What Member of this body would want the kind of devastation that has affected the Southern States? Not many years ago New England was similarly affected and we saw similar damage in the Midwest by the floods.

I see my friend and colleague from California, which has been devastated by a wide variety of natural disasters, by extraordinary fires, earthquakes, and other natural disasters. I think we are also very mindful of these dramatic changes that have been taking place in terms of mergers, downsizing, and the changes in the defense procurement where we find men and women that have devoted their lives working for

this country. They have been in the defense production industry for 20 or 30 years during the cold war, and now with these dramatic shifts in changes in the procurement policies in defense, we see them virtually pink-slipped from these companies. They are older workers. We have some important responsibilities certainly to them. I think if you look at the record of this program particularly in the recent years under the Secretary of Labor it is really a commendable example about how these limited resources can be leveraged to give new hope and opportunity to tens of thousands of workers here in this country.

I think it is an extremely important measure and we are enormously grateful for the willingness of our Chair to consider this. Because I know, for the reasons she has outlined in the committee and expressed otherwise, of her concern about the general shape of this whole legislation, this has been modified, it has been adjusted to try to respond to some of her particular concerns and we are hopeful it will be accepted and included.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I, too, am pleased that we have been able to come together in agreement on the amendment put forward by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Rhode Island. Senator DODD has been an eloquent advocate for wanting to make sure that these workers who may be laid off due to some sort of natural disaster would be taken care of, and we had some lengthy debates in the committee. This is an issue on which Members on both sides of the aisle have worked hard to address.

The national interest in addressing major economic dislocations from natural disasters is something that affects all of our States and goes often across State lines. It is difficult for States to adequately prepare to handle themselves when there is a disaster that may happen without any advanced notice.

While I have been reluctant to set aside a large amount at the Federal level which would further diminish moneys going to the States, this amendment will allow those funds already set aside at the national level for incentive grants to also be used for rapid response grants. This will assist workers affected by plant closures or mass layoffs or natural disasters.

In addition, a small amount of funds are being made available for migrant and seasonal farm workers, and this I believe is also something that the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Rhode Island have been particularly concerned about as well.

So I am pleased that this amendment does not substantially reduce the amount of funding that is going directly to the States under this bill, which was my primary concern when it was offered in committee.

I appreciate the willingness of my colleagues on the committee, Senator DODD and Senator PELL, to try to work

out some language that we could all come together and support and I believe this is it.

So for all these reasons, Mr. President, I think it is a good amendment. I am very appreciative of the efforts of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Rhode Island to help work out the language.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Chair. Just very briefly, I meant to point out that while this is not directly a result of the amendment that hopefully will be adopted shortly, it is an indication of the kind of difference this amendment will make. Just today, the Department of Labor announced it would provide \$1,500,000 in retraining assistance to some 600 employees of the Southern Connecticut Telephone Co., who just lost their jobs. Also, recently, Allied Signal, a defense contractor, closed a facility in Connecticut. The Federal Government is able to provide an additional \$4,300,000 to assist those 1,500 employees who will have lost their work.

This is an example of a national policy affecting a major local employer in that area, and so this the kind of thing in which we think the Federal Government can play a proper role in assisting in these kinds of emergencies.

That first grant was announced today, and we are very pleased they are going to be offering some assistance to the people of Connecticut with that kind of support.

Mr. President, I again thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to again join with Senator DODD in sponsoring this amendment. Unfortunately, when a similar version was offered at the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee markup, it was defeated on an 8 to 8 tie.

Senator DODD and I know all too well how a State is affected by sudden, unexpected, large-scale worker dislocations. It is our strong belief that under S. 143 States would not be able to react go the large dislocations my home State has become familiar with recently. By their nature, these massive dislocations are abrupt events. In designing its general work force plan called for under this new legislation, no State would, or should, reserve a portion of its limited job training money to prepare for an event that might or might not take place at an undetermined time in the future.

This is why we have introduced this amendment that reserves a small pool of money at the Federal level to be dispersed to States when and if they are in need. This program works well now and I believe it should be allowed to continue.

I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if there is no one else who wishes to speak on this amendment, I would urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the remainder of the time.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If all time is yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2891) was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I understand it correctly, I see my friend and colleague, the Senator from California who wanted to speak, and the Senator from New York also wanted to speak briefly. After these speakers it was the hope that we might move towards the votes which had been ordered. Is that the understanding of the Chair?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes. Did I understand the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] wanted to speak?

Mr. KENNEDY. If we can hold that in abeyance. She had talked to me, and then I received other instructions. But if we could work out perhaps for the benefit of the Members who have been inquiring about how we might be proceeding, how long did the Senator from California desire?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I have about 12 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The only question is—how long did the Senator from New York wish to speak?

Mr. D'AMATO. Five minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am just trying to think about how we might proceed. Does the Senator then want to speak after the three votes? Is that agreeable?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would be happy to do that. That will be helpful.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I think it would perhaps serve us best to have the Senator from California and the Senator from New York make their comments and then go to the three votes that have already been ordered, the one on trade adjustment assistance, the amendment of Senator GRAMM, and the amendment of Senator GLENN. And then at that time the majority leader I think is to make a decision about whether we will continue this evening or put the rest of the amendments off until tomorrow.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is fine. I yield the time, 12 minutes, to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Let me begin by saying that I very much appreciate the job that has been done by the chairman of the committee and the ranking member, and I know it has not been easy to put together this kind of consensus. I am led to believe

this bill will pass the Senate. However, I have to make my own point of view on it clear because what is sauce for the goose is not necessarily sauce for the gander, when you begin to change the formula on which some of these programs are based.

I have come to the conclusion that I must oppose this bill. I must oppose it for basically two reasons. The first is that the bill cuts dramatically into the ability of California to provide job training.

Let me point this out. While the United States added 3 million jobs from May 1991 to December 1993, California lost nearly 450,000 jobs during that time. As a matter of fact, in the last 5 years, our unemployment rate has never dropped below 7 percent, with a high of 10 percent in 1994.

So we have more people unemployed in the State of California than 13 other States have people today. So job training becomes a very important factor. Compared to current funding, this bill shifts funds from California to other States. Under the revised formula in the managers' amendment, almost one-half of all funds of the losing States come from California.

This is a proportion that is very high. I think the No. 1 determinant of a job training program should be existing unemployment needs and data. Instead, this block grant consolidation bases 10 percent only on unemployment. This is a major departure from the way these programs were determined in the past.

My major concern about this bill is that it gives greater weight to things other than unemployment, and the bill does not give adequate weight to unemployment. So with a 7.2-percent unemployment rate in September, while the national rate was 5.6 percent, California will lose about \$7 million in this bill despite the fact that that is just a 4-percent reduction. It translates into \$7 million based on the change in formula application.

The new managers' amendment drops the 20 percent for AFDC to 10 percent and increases from 10 percent to 20 percent the weight given to poverty. My State, has high rates of AFDC recipients and unemployed people. For example, California is home to 18 percent of all AFDC recipients. That translates into 909,000 AFDC cases. That translates into 2.6 million people on AFDC.

By deemphasizing AFDC recipients and unemployment with the low-weighting factor, the bill essentially gives California short shrift. Under current law, we receive 14.8 percent of job training funds. Under this approach, we will only get 14.2 percent. That is the \$7 million difference. And it is a big difference.

Let me mention what has happened in California by way of Federal policy. California has struggled through the closing or realignment of 9 military bases in this round alone following 22 in previous rounds. In total, these have eliminated more than 200,000 direct and indirect jobs. The closings and realign-

ments have drained about \$7 billion out of the California economy.

Corporate defense downsizing has claimed 250,000 layoffs in the past 5 years, and that is expected to double. So from defense downsizing alone, before it is through, in the corporate sector and from base closures, California will lose over 1 million jobs. Now, that is something this formula does not take into consideration.

I mentioned California has 18 percent of the country's welfare caseload but 12.2 percent of the Nation's population. Now, what does this show? It shows that our need is actually higher than the population-driven formula number. So this formula and the redesignation of formula clearly does not work for California. This is not a case in this bill where as a product of consolidating 80 programs, States are going to be held harmless. That is not true. The money taken from California by this new formula is essentially given to other States that have less poverty and less unemployment.

So it is very hard for me, representing California, to turn around and vote for this bill. I am willing to say, sure, we should do our fair share, and I voted for the welfare reform bill despite the fact that I lost on major amendments that addressed the fact that we have a huge immigrant population. That bill will cost California billions of dollars.

Republican Medicare and Medicaid plans will cost California billions of dollars. Our own Governor has up to this point indicated he will not accept \$42 million in Goals 2000 education funds. I cannot understand that—\$42 million for schools when we have schools that are crumbling, elementary schools that have 5,000 youngsters in them, the highest class size in the Nation, and he plans to turn down these funds. I am hopeful he will reconsider. This is one more diminution of revenues to address the needs of 32 million people.

In summary, I very much recognize the good work done by both Senators here and by the committee, and I am appreciative of it. It is just when the State takes hit after hit after hit, when other States benefit and California with its needs, as has been referenced earlier—base closures, earthquakes, fires, riots, you name it—all the things that have happened, and when we know that job training is as important as it is, to take a loss of over \$7 million in this bill, through the consolidation of programs and see the money essentially go to other States—under a different formula albeit—is very hard for me to do.

I appreciate the forbearance of the chairman and the ranking member, and I appreciate the opportunity to explain my vote.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I am very sensitive to the concerns of

the Senator from California. She is a very effective advocate for her State in wanting to protect, of course, what should come to her State.

I would just point out that California gets twice what any other State gets. The closest States to California are New York and Texas. So while California has a large population, a population that has many needs, it also is a population that is getting a significant amount in this formula. No one knows better than the Senator from California how difficult these formula debates are.

We all want to get as much as we can. I think that when we are taking formulas from some 80 programs and combining them into one formula, that will be the fairest to most States, it obviously is not an easy task.

But we made 60 percent of the formula focus on population, which I think is the fairest way to distribute funds among the States. And the Senator from California has already pointed out 20 percent is based on poverty, 10 percent is based on the number of welfare recipients and 10 percent is based on employment.

I would also suggest that we are going to be continuing to reduce appropriations to each of the various programs. I think combining the programs as we do provides a greater sense of certainty to the States about what they will be receiving. It is also bound to do better under a single appropriation than trying to split it up among all of the other efforts that really do not provide the continuum of planning and certainty that I think is in the work force development legislation.

We did decrease the emphasis on welfare recipients because the JOBS program, which is the job training program for welfare recipients, was taken out of the bill during the welfare debate.

Finally, and most importantly, we put a cap on the maximum amount a State can gain or lose. It cannot gain more than 5 percent. It cannot lose more than 5 percent.

California, under this formula, does lose about 4.2 percent. This means, I think, that we have tried to again provide a balance over the previous year's allocation through the 5-percent provision. That is not such a dramatic shift that it cannot be accommodated. I certainly realize that some States can be adversely affected. But I believe, all in all, that this is the fairest approach that we could devise.

It is, as I say, very difficult when we try to get into allocations. The Senator from California represents a State with a large population, and many parts of that population really need some significant assistance. It would be my hope that with the moneys that presently are going to California, that this one appropriation will be a far more effective means of delivering those funds to the State and provide a more effective job training system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I do not know if the Senator from California wishes to respond in any other way to those comments. I will be happy to yield any other time that she might need.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in strong general support for the Workforce Development Act of 1995. I commend the chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, Senator KASSEBAUM, for her tireless efforts over the last several years to restructure our vocational education and job training systems. Both the chairman and the ranking Democrat of the committee, Senator KENNEDY, have made this subject a focal point of the committee's deliberations. I supported this measure in the Labor Committee, and I continue to support the bill here.

Of course, I do not agree with everything contained in the bill. It is a large undertaking and I do have my disagreements with portions of it. Later today I will offer an amendment with Senator PELL to adjust the funding allocation for adult education activities. I may also support one or more of the other amendments that will be offered to the bill. However, I consider myself a strong supporter of this effort, and I heartily commend Senator KASSEBAUM for her unwavering efforts to make this much needed change a reality.

Mr. President, I believe this legislation is very badly needed. Let me briefly explain why I have reached that conclusion. Since the late 1960's, the Federal Government has invested huge sums helping people find employment through participation in a myriad of employment and training programs. From a few limited programs, this effort has now ballooned today into a confusing maze of over 160 separate programs. The administration of these is scattered across 15 separate Federal agencies, with a total cost to the taxpayer of more than \$20 billion per year. Not surprisingly, Mr. President, these programs are hamstrung by duplication, waste and conflicting requirements that too often leave program trainees no better off than when they started.

I am a great believer in job training, and I count the Job Training Partnership Act among the legislative achievements of my years in Congress. However, the facts that illustrate the problems with our job training system, and which demonstrate the need for wide ranging reform, are not really in dispute. For example, Mr. President, there are more than 60 separate programs targeted at the economically disadvantaged. There are 34 literacy programs designed to help that same group. The system has six different standards for defining income eligibility levels, five for defining family and household income, and five for defining what is included in income.

For me, one of the most distressing aspects of this problem is that the system has no effective means of deter-

mining whether programs really work. The General Accounting Office has released several reports on this issue, and its findings have not been encouraging. One GAO report studied 62 programs. Of these, fully half had no means of checking whether participants obtained jobs after training. During the past decade, only seven of those programs were ever evaluated to find out whether trainees would have achieved the same outcomes without Federal assistance.

At this point, I need to digress for just a moment to speak about one new effort at self-evaluation undertaken this year. The Department of Labor has initiated a longitudinal study aimed at answering the question whether the Job Corps Program improves the employment opportunities and earnings of its participants. I support longitudinal studies and have encouraged their use in connection with job training program evaluation. However, this particular study, which is being directed by Mathematica Policy Research, has a very ugly underbelly that I want to explore a bit today.

This study employs a control group methodology. John A. Burghardt, director of the Mathematica project, offered this explanation to me in a September 29 letter responding to my inquiry:

The National Job Corps Study is based on a random selection process in which approximately 11 out of 12 eligible applicants are selected to enter Job Corps, and 1 out of 12 eligible applicants is selected for a control group. The control group members are not eligible to enroll in Job Corps for a period of three years (but may do so after three years if they are eligible at that time).

What this means is that a kid can go through the Job Corps application process, qualify, be selected for training, and then be told that he or she cannot enroll for 3 years because we want to see him or her sink or swim as compared to the other applicants who were admitted. This "twist-in-the-wind" aspect of the study is unconscionable. It may make sense from a social science point of view, but it is inhumane in the extreme.

In my State of Vermont, a young man by the name of Donovan De Leon has been caught in the Job Corps study control group. He is heartbroken, and his family is in disbelief that he would be asked to make this sacrifice. In essence, they feel that the authorities are allowing him to fail in order to demonstrate the success that Job Corps can bring about. They have asked me if there is not another way to conduct this study that does not punish the innocent few in this fashion. I have to agree with their view, there must be another way.

This has just come to my attention and, with the current parliamentary situation, I may not be able to do anything to address the issue in the context of this bill. However, I will look for a way to take on this study either here or in other legislation. Further, I suspect that many other Senators, who

have youngsters like Donovan De Leon in their States, will be of like mind.

Another problem proving the need for this legislation, Mr. President, is the confusion that the patchwork of conflicting programs causes. There are no clear entry points and no clear path from one job training program to another. The programs targeted for consolidation have conflicting eligibility criteria. They apply program incentives that are not always compatible with helping individuals find jobs. These program requirements may encourage staff to assist individuals who are the easiest to serve, rather than the most difficult. There is limited coordination across programs. There is no systematic link between educational services and job training services.

Providers of employment and training services range from public institutions of higher education to local education agencies; from nonprofit community based organizations to private for-profit corporations. Further, different programs very often target the same client populations. Youth, at-risk youth, veterans, native Americans, the poor and dislocated workers all have many programs designed for their benefit. Not surprisingly, people have difficulty knowing where to begin looking for assistance. As a result, they may go to the wrong agency, or worse, give up altogether.

Employers also experience problems with the multitude of employment programs. Employers want a system that is easy to access and that provides qualified job candidates. Instead, they must cope with solicitations from over 50 programs that provide job referral and placement assistance to individuals. Often, employers are not even involved in designing programs that should be responsive to their labor market needs. There is no clear linkage between economic development activities and employment and training programs to help employers meet their labor needs. Training programs are a waste of Federal dollars if employers cannot hire newly trained workers because their skills do not match employer needs.

Our principal international competitors do a much better job than we have matching worker training and skills to the needs of their industries and potential employers. The changes initiated in this bill are needed to enable us to compete effectively in the international arena. If employment and training programs are to succeed, a simple, integrated work force development system must be established that gives States, local communities, and employers both the assistance and the incentives to train real workers for real jobs. The Workforce Development Act takes on the challenge of structuring such a system. It will enable all segments of the work force to obtain the skills necessary to earn wages sufficient to maintain a high quality of living. Further, it will insure a skilled

work force that can meet the labor market needs of the businesses of each State.

We are at a defining moment in our Nation's history. The United States is still the most productive country in the world. But we are losing our edge to other industrialized nations such as Japan and Germany as well as other rapidly developing countries such as Taiwan, Korea, and China. Our enormous Federal trade deficit is testimony to our deficiencies. Over the past 25 years, the standard of living for those Americans without at least a 4-year postsecondary degree has plunged. This, too, serves as an example of our Nation's declining productivity. In the next decade, we will be surpassed as the world's foremost economic power if we do not begin to redefine our priorities on national, State, and local levels.

In response to this problem, education must be a top priority and we must connect education with the workplace.

Our international competitors have been leaders in making the important link between education and work. Germany, for example, has long been a model for vocational education. As early as the sixth grade, students opt for a college-prep or vocational education program. In Germany's vocational education system, students receive extensive training in industry through collaborations with business along with pursuit of an academic curriculum.

Unfortunately, in the United States, misconceptions about vocational education abound. Some think of vocational education as a second rate education for students who could not otherwise succeed on a so-called traditional academic path. Nothing, could be further from the truth. Vocational education courses hold appeal for all students. In my home State of Vermont, over 4,500 students participate in vocational education courses, of which 12 percent are adults.

Another misconception is that there are few similarities among Federal vocational education and job training programs. In fact, a strong vocational education program is the best kind of job training and should be viewed as a major step in the lifelong learning process.

The Workforce Development Act is a major effort that strongly links education with job training. In addition, it also establishes a very strong linkage between the three levels of government: local, State, and Federal. The bill also calls on the private sector to be a major participant in work force development activities.

S. 143, the Workforce Development Act creates a unified system for vocational education and job training programs. The Governor and the State education agency work together with State and local panels to devise a comprehensive vocational education and job training system that will respond to the needs of all those who seek its

services. This is already being done in my home state of Vermont through the establishment of work force investment boards. S. 143 will support a strong school-based infrastructure for vocational education of students from all age groups, and the foundation for a strong and competitive work force.

The Workforce Development Act emphasizes the important role business must play in devising vocational education and job training strategies. This past spring, the first detailed American business survey was released by the U.S. Department of Education. The study found that "a 10 percent increase in the educational attainment of a company's work force resulted in an 8.6 percent increase in productivity. Whereas a 10 percent increase in the value of capital stock such as tools, buildings, and machinery only resulted in a 3.4 percent increase in productivity."

In the book "Reinventing Education," Louis Gerstner, the chairman and CEO of IBM, writes:

Business . . . [i]s not only a major stakeholder in the issue of education quality, it is the only potential source of major institutional pressure on the system. Without business pressure to improve the schools there will be no one else to act. And if no one acts, the schools will ultimately fail to change and fail to prepare our students and citizens adequately for the next century.

I urge my colleagues to act today and support S. 143, the Workforce Development Act.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator KASSEBAUM and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources for their work on S. 143, the Workforce Development Act. I support this bill, and commend and thank the distinguished chairwoman for responding to my concerns regarding employment and training programs for veterans and for the disabled.

Currently, there are 160 Federal job training programs administered by 15 different Federal agencies. This bill will consolidate and restructure these programs into a single block grant that will go directly to the States with a minimum of Federal requirements. By eliminating the additional administrative costs of overlapping employment training programs at the Federal, State, and local level, this bill will drastically reduce the \$20 billion spent each year to fund these programs. The purpose of S. 143 is not to eliminate the opportunities provided by these programs, but to maximize their effectiveness through reorganization and consolidation.

In particular, I am pleased that S. 143 addresses the special needs of unemployed individuals with physical or mental disabilities. Under title I of the Rehabilitation Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Program has provided special job training to persons with disabilities. Of the 160 Federal job training programs, this is the only one that targets the special needs of the disabled. This bill recognizes the importance of training individuals with dis-

abilities by preserving the integrity of the current Vocational Rehabilitation Program. Title I of the Rehabilitation Act will be amended so that vocational rehabilitation will be coordinated with the comprehensive workforce development system. A vocational rehabilitation representative will participate in the overall employment and training efforts for each State, providing technical assistance on training individuals with disabilities. By ensuring that the special needs of the disabled are met, S. 143 will strengthen an important service to a valuable element of our work force.

Another significant feature of this bill relates to veterans employment. This Nation has a long history of providing assistance to our veterans, dating back to colonial days. Since World War I, several laws have been enacted to reaffirm and strengthen the Federal Government's role in promoting wider employment and training opportunities for veterans.

Currently, the primary programs to assist veterans are those administered by the Department of Labor, through the Veterans' Employment and Training Service [VETS]. These include the Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program [DVOP], the Local Veterans' Employment Representative [LVER], and Veterans Employment Program, which are grant programs to the States.

Because of the national interest in veterans' programs, these grant programs will continue in their present form. In addition, the committee included language in the bill which first, added a veteran representative to the State workforce development board; second, added a veteran representative to the local workforce development boards; third, included veterans in the collaborative process developing a State plan; and fourth, designated veterans as a population group for benchmark measurement.

These provisions of the bill will ensure that veterans employment and training programs get the priority and visibility they need at a national level to address the unique concerns of veterans. At the same time, the bill provides that veterans employment and training programs will be integrated into the overall strategy, at the state and local level, for improving employment and training opportunities.

Again, I thank Senator KASSEBAUM for her excellent work on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, just to put everyone on notice, there will soon be a vote, as we had suggested earlier. Just so everyone will have a chance to get here in fashion, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I believe, if I am correct, the pending vote would be on the Moynihan amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I believe we are prepared to vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, would it be agreeable, since we have three votes, that the second and third vote be 10-minute votes?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that the second and third votes be 10-minute votes, with 4 minutes in between for further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2887

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] is absent due to a death in the family.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 482 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham	Feingold	Mikulski
Akaka	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Ford	Moynihan
Biden	Glenn	Murray
Bingaman	Graham	Nunn
Bond	Harkin	Pell
Boxer	Heflin	Pryor
Bradley	Hollings	Reid
Breaux	Inouye	Robb
Bryan	Johnston	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Kennedy	Roth
Byrd	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Campbell	Kerry	Simon
Conrad	Kohl	Specter
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Thompson
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dodd	Levin	
Dorgan	Lieberman	

NAYS—45

Ashcroft	Gramm	Mack
Bennett	Grams	McCain
Brown	Grassley	McConnell
Burns	Gregg	Murkowski
Chafee	Hatch	Nickles
Coats	Hatfield	Pressler
Cochran	Helms	Santorum
Coverdell	Hutchison	Shelby
Craig	Inhofe	Simpson
DeWine	Jeffords	Smith
Dole	Kassebaum	Snowe
Domenici	Kempthorne	Stevens
Faircloth	Kyl	Thomas
Frist	Lott	Thurmond
Gorton	Lugar	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

Cohen Exon

So the amendment (No. 2887) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2888

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 4 minutes, equally divided, on the Grams amendment.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I see the Senator from Minnesota. We have 4 minutes evenly divided.

Mr. GRAMS. I have nothing more to add.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield back any time I might have.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield the time and urge support for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] is absent due to a death in the family.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 483 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Ford	Mack
Akaka	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Glenn	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Gramm	Moynihan
Bingaman	Grams	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Murray
Boxer	Gregg	Nickles
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Breaux	Hatch	Pell
Brown	Hatfield	Pressler
Bryan	Heflin	Pryor
Bumpers	Helms	Reid
Burns	Hollings	Robb
Byrd	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Campbell	Inhofe	Roth
Chafee	Inouye	Santorum
Coats	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnston	Shelby
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simon
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Simpson
Craig	Kennedy	Smith
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Leahy	Thurmond
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Faircloth	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feingold	Lott	
Feinstein	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Cohen Exon

So, the amendment (No. 2888) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 2889

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, could we have order in the Senate so that the Senator from Ohio could be heard? There is a brief time limit, as I understand it, of 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes equally divided.

Mr. KENNEDY. May we have order in the Senate so we can hear the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have order in the Chamber?

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I offer this amendment because I think it is important we do not overlook displaced homemakers in this bill. What the amendment does is simply incorporate the definition of displaced homemaker in currently found law—the Perkins Act, the Higher Education Act, and the Displaced Homemaker Self-Sufficiency Act.

In the bill itself, the current language includes displaced homemakers only as a subcategory of dislocated workers. I do not think that is good enough.

My amendment, second, clarifies that employment services for displaced workers are permissible—not required by the States, they are permissible. Governors and States have the flexibility to decide whether displaced homemakers will receive employment services at all.

Third, my amendment gives States flexibility in providing work force education programs for displaced homemakers and single parents. I think there was some confusion about that earlier in the debate. The Senator from Kansas pointed out in my amendment there is a requirement that States give some attention to work force education programs for displaced homemakers. However, States do retain total flexibility.

Also, the amendment adds displaced homemakers to the list of populations in the bill for which States need to set or need to require performance benchmarks. I think it is very reasonable. Some 17 million Americans are displaced homemakers.

I urge support of this amendment, and I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support this proposal. If there is any group of Americans who are left behind it has been the homemakers, and they have to be able to develop the high-level skills needed in order to compete in the economy. This does not require an allocation of funds by the States, but it does require that the States are going to at least have to give some consideration to this program. I think it is well justified. I hope it is accepted.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Madam President, I am also a strong supporter of the displaced homemaker program, but the amendment of Senator GLENN will start an entirely new program. It will create another set-aside effort for a particular special category. It is an expanded category because it substantially distorts the concept of what was thought of as a displaced homemaker by including anyone with a child aged 16 or younger who has received AFDC assistance.

Madam President, I feel strongly that the way we have addressed it in

the bill, by listing it as one of the considerations under dislocated workers, which provides a benchmark but does not require it being set aside as a special program, is a very important rationale. Otherwise, we get right back into trying to serve a special population. If we do serve this one, then why should we not serve that one? This would put us right back where we started.

I think expanding the definition is a mistake. I think the requirement that it be so defined is a mistake, and I urge opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] is absent due to a death in the family.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 484 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihhan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pell
Breaux	Inouye	Pryor
Bryan	Johnston	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Robb
Byrd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kohl	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Simon
Dodd	Leahy	Snowe
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	

NAYS—53

Abraham	Gorton	Mack
Ashcroft	Gramm	McCain
Bennett	Grams	McConnell
Bond	Grassley	Murkowski
Brown	Gregg	Nickles
Burns	Hatch	Pressler
Campbell	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Heflin	Santorum
Coats	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Jeffords	Specter
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Dole	Kerrey	Thompson
Domenici	Kyl	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lott	Warner
Frist	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Cohen
Exon

So the amendment (No. 2889) was rejected.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Madam President, for the information of Senators, there will be no further rollcall votes this evening. However, we will continue to debate several amendments this evening. First, we will consider the amendment of Senator CRAIG, from Idaho, that I believe has been worked out on both sides.

Then we will move to debate the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] followed by, I believe, an amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM]. Rollcall votes on those two amendments will occur tomorrow, as well as the disposition of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] and then there will be final passage.

It is my understanding the Senator from Ohio would like to offer a few minutes of comments as in morning business.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I will not object. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. GLENN. Not more than 5 minutes for a short eulogy.

Mr. CRAIG. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL M.
SCHLESINGER

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, the United States lost a wonderful woman and we lost a good friend today. Rachel Schlesinger died today in Arlington, VA, after a long-time struggle against cancer. She was the wife, the partner, indeed a wonderful supporter of James Schlesinger, who served in Cabinet positions in three separate administrations for this country. In all the agencies in which her husband served, she was universally loved.

I do not think I ever heard a hint of criticism about Rachel Schlesinger in all the years in Washington. She was born in Springfield, OH, in 1930 and grew up on the family farm, which she still owned with her sisters up to the time of her passing. Her father's family had come to southwestern Ohio from Pennsylvania Dutch country. Her mother's family had migrated from the German Palatinate and settled in rural Missouri. Her father was a livestock raiser and so called himself a dirt farmer who managed to survive the Depression, which was tough back in those days, of course. Rachel was an outstanding student at Springfield High School. She won a scholarship to Radcliffe College, which was then a woman's college at Harvard University, in 1948. She won honors in American history and literature. She graduated with honors in American history and literature.

After college, Rachel moved to New York and became a college editor at

Mademoiselle magazine, and in 1954, she married Jim Schlesinger, whom she had known since her college years. She became a freelance writer but devoted her time mainly to family life.

Over time, they lived in Arlington, MA, Charlottesville, VA, Newport, RI, Santa Monica, CA, and Arlington, VA. Jim and Rachel had eight children: Cora, Charles, Ann, William, Emily, Thomas, Clara, and Jim, Jr. They all reside in Arlington, save for Charles, who is an engineer in Texas, and Ann, who lives with her husband and children in Prague.

Rachel had mixed feelings about her husband's Government service, but only rarely did she involve herself in public issues. One such occasion did occur in 1971 when her husband was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission was about to test the warhead for the Spartan missile in the Aleutian Islands. There were widespread protests developed in this country and overseas primarily associated with the peace movement and the environmental movement. It was said that the underground detonation would probably initiate an earthquake and maybe even a Sunami wave that would inflict widespread damages throughout the Pacific.

Well, Rachel simply packed up two of her daughters and headed with her husband to Amchitka Island, where the test was to take place. The action of the family in going to the island quieted much of the alarm that the prospective test had generated.

In 1975, she accompanied her husband on an extended trip to Asia. It was the first trip to Japan by a United States Secretary of Defense since World War II. Needless to say, the trip, again, generated very widespread protests, but also an outpouring of support along with it. The trip occurred after the fall of Saigon. Kim Il-Song was uttering threats to overrun South Korea, just as South Vietnam had been overrun. And in Korea, there was great concern regarding the strength of the American commitment. The visit of Mrs. Schlesinger and her husband did much to reassure the Korean Government and public that American support was steadfast and that North Korea would be given no latitude for aggressive action.

In the 1980's, with her children departing from home, Mrs. Schlesinger again became active in local and charitable affairs. She was a very dedicated and accomplished musician. She served as a violinist with the Arlington Symphony Orchestra since 1983 and served on the board of directors with the symphony since 1987 and on the executive committee since 1990. She was founder and first chairman of the Ballston Pops, which she originally organized and continued to organize each May, and which will soon celebrate its 10th anniversary.

Mrs. Schlesinger served on the overseas committee to visit the Memorial Church at Harvard. She was deacon of