

# WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise this morning to speak in support of S. 143, the bill that is on the floor and will be on the floor later today, the job training bill.

Mr. President, I first want to commend Senator KASSEBAUM for the work she has done on this bill, and the others as well. I am not on that committee, but I am interested in this bill and what it seeks to do. I think it is symptomatic of the changes that need to be made in many of the programs, and it seeks to bring together 150, roughly, programs that have been designed over the years, each with a certain amount of merit, of course, and certainly each now with a constituency, and to bring those together and to seek to make them more efficient.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that one of the exciting things about this year in this Congress has been that there has been, for the first time in very many years, an opportunity to look at programs, to evaluate programs, to examine their purpose and then to see if indeed they are carrying out that purpose to see if there are better ways to do it and, perhaps as important as anything, to see if there is a way to shift those programs with more emphasis on the States and local government.

I come from a small State; I come from Wyoming. When I am in Washington, I live in Fairfax County, and there are twice as many people in Fairfax County as there are in the State of Wyoming. So we have a little different and unique need there for the kinds of programs. We still have a need for the programs, whether it be welfare or job training, but we need to have it tailored in a way that, I suspect, is quite different from that of Pittsburgh or New York City, and that is what this program is all about.

I think too often—and I am concerned about this, Mr. President—as we seek to make change—and I think voters want to make change; they said they want to make change in November 1994. Yet, of course, there are people who legitimately do not want to change and want to stay with the status quo. It is much easier to oppose change than it is to bring it about. So we find often those who are, for whatever the reason, opposed to change, saying, well, that is going to gut the program, that is going to do away with the program, and that is going to eliminate the help for the people who have been the beneficiaries of the program. And that is not true. That is not true in this program, it is not true in health care, it is not true in Medicare, and it is not true in welfare.

On the contrary, these programs are designed to bring to those beneficiaries a more efficient program to specifically deal with the needs where those folks live. It gets us away from that idea that one size fits all, away from the idea that Washington knows best.

Instead, it moves the programs where the decisions can be made by local people who respond to local needs. So we have, in this case, lots of money—\$20 billion—going in these 150 programs, and this is an effort to bring them together and to block grant many of them to the States so that the States can say, in effect, here is where we need that education money.

We do need change, Mr. President. There undoubtedly has been a strong feeling that the things that the Government is doing are not succeeding. We have more poverty now than we had 40 years ago. So it is hard to say that the programs that are designed to alleviate poverty have been workable. It is not a matter of not having spent enough money, in my judgment, but rather not spending it as efficiently as we can. I think there is an adage that we need to adhere to, and that is that you simply cannot expect things to continue by doing the same thing. You cannot expect different results by doing the same thing, which is basically what we have done.

So, Mr. President, I rise in strong support. I think we have a great opportunity to make some changes. This is a testing time. Probably the greatest test of representative government, when voters say, look, we are not happy with the way things are, we think we need to change them, the greatest test is to see whether that Government will indeed be responsive to that request for change. I am first to say how difficult it is. And in each year it gets increasingly difficult. As we have more programs and we have more money and we have more people involved in these programs, we have more people involved in bureaucracies, more people involved in lobbying, there is a great resistance to change. I think we have, for the first time in many years, the greatest opportunity to bring about that change.

We need to reduce bureaucracy. We need to increase the private sector involvement. We need, perhaps most of all, to increase the accountability, to measure productivity in these programs, and we can do this.

So, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to move forward with this education bill, this training to work, S. 143. I urge that we pass it. I urge that we shift many of these funds and responsibilities to local government, to State government, so that they can, indeed, be oriented to the problems that we seek to fix.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Virginia is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

## RACHEL SCHLESINGER

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today Senator NUNN and I will speak on behalf of Rachel Schlesinger who just passed on to her reward. She is the widow of Dr. Schlesinger, a mutual friend.

Mr. President, I was privileged to serve in the Department of Defense during the period of 1972–74 with the Secretary of Defense Schlesinger. At that time I had the privilege of learning to know and revere his lovely wife, Rachel, who just passed on.

She was a source of great strength to Dr. Schlesinger as he undertook the important posts of Director of Office of Management and Budget, Secretary of Defense, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Secretary of Energy.

He has had one of the most remarkable public service careers of any living American. I worked with him in each of these assignments through the years and learned to know and to love his late wife.

She was a great source of strength to this fine public servant. I am doubtful he could have fulfilled these important posts without that source of strength given by his wife and his children.

I join today with my distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, [Mr. NUNN], who, likewise, through the years, learned to respect and admire Jim Schlesinger and his wife, Rachel.

Our prayers go to their family, and I express my gratitude for the friendship given me through the years by Mrs. Schlesinger. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Georgia, [Mr. NUNN], is recognized.

## TRIBUTE TO RACHEL MELLINGER SCHLESINGER

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise this morning to pay tribute to a wonderful lady and wonderful friend, Rachel Mellinger Schlesinger. Rachel died yesterday morning in Arlington, VA. Rachel was the wife of James Schlesinger, a remarkable public servant who served in Cabinet positions in three administrations.

In a real sense Rachel served as first lady of the Department of Defense, first lady of the Department of Energy, and first lady of the Central Intelligence Agency, when Jim Schlesinger held these important Cabinet posts.

Rachel was a remarkable and accomplished woman, by every measure. She was a talented musician. She was active in the mental health movement, historic preservation, and in the preservation of the rural lands that she loved so much. She was also founder and first chairman of the Ballston Symphony and a deacon in her church.

Rachel rarely involved herself in public issues. She always had her own convictions and opinions, but her capacity to deal with crisis was famous. She accompanied Jim to many distant places in connection with his work and on several occasions, by putting herself willingly in dangerous situations, she helped calm and reassure her friends and our friends around the world and our allies around the world.

On one occasion which reached public attention, Jim was then Chairman of

the Atomic Energy Commission. A Spartan missile warhead test was scheduled in the Aleutians, and there was widespread fear that it would cause an earthquake and a tidal wave known as a tsunami in that area. Rachel packed up her two daughters and her husband and moved them to the island where the test was to take place. The family's presence was widely publicized and calmed much of the alarm in that area.

Rachel traveled with Jim on an extended trip to Asia in 1975 when Jim became the first United States Secretary of Defense to visit Japan for many years. It was after the fall of Saigon, and there were widespread demonstrations. But the trip also generated an outpouring of support, due in no small part to Rachel Schlesinger's presence by Jim Schlesinger's side.

Rachel served as college editor of *Mademoiselle* magazine after graduation from Radcliffe with honors in American history and literature. After her marriage to Jim, she did some freelance writing for a time, but she soon devoted herself entirely to their growing family, and of course she was very, very proud of their eight wonderful and successful children. After their eight children had grown up, she became active again in charitable and cultural affairs. One of those eight, their daughter, Clara, served very ably in my office as an intern in 1985.

Rachel was a violinist with the Arlington Symphony since 1983. She was on the board of directors and on the executive committee of the symphony. She served on the overseers' committee of the Memorial Church at Harvard, was a deacon and Sunday school teacher at Georgetown Presbyterian Church, and distributed food on many, many occasions to the homeless over a large number of years.

Rachel was absolutely committed to mental health, and she worked closely with the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, including testifying before the Congress. Rachel always retained her love of the land, from her childhood days on the family farm in Ohio. In the 1980's, she began to raise Christmas trees in the Shenandoah Valley, delivering them herself near Christmastime, including the delivery of several to the Nunn home just in time for our Christmas celebration.

Rachel's long battle with cancer is now over, but the memory of her rare spirit will comfort and sustain those she loved and cared for in a life of courage and a life of commitment.

I thank the Chair.

#### RACHEL SCHLESINGER

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, sadly we learned yesterday of the death of Rachel Mellinger Schlesinger, the wife of Jim Schlesinger and the mother of his eight children. On behalf of the Senate, I want to convey to Jim our deepest sympathy on the loss of his beloved companion of more than 40 years.

I also want to say something about Rachel who, quietly and without fanfare, did those good works that the Book of Proverbs praises. She genuinely did open her hands to the poor and reach out her hands to the needy, distributing sandwiches to the homeless and testifying before Congress on the problems of the mentally ill. Rachel was a gifted, energetic, and compassionate woman, but such a private person that few Americans know of her contributions to the quality of our community life. I would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of what she did for us.

Rachel Line Mellinger was born on a farm in Springfield, OH, and always considered herself a country girl. She loved gardening, and in the 1980's, she bought a farm in the Shenandoah Valley to raise Christmas trees which she delivered personally to satisfied customers and delighted children. Thanks to her interest in the preservation of historic sites and rural land, Americans will have more of both to enjoy in times to come.

Like Thomas Jefferson, a fellow Virginia farmer, she was a talented writer and musician. She played the violin, not only for her own pleasure, but to give pleasure to others. She played with the Arlington Symphony Orchestra for 12 years and served on its board of directors. She was the founder and first chair of the Ballston Pops, a May festival which she originally organized 10 years ago.

She was active in the community both publicly and privately. She served as deacon of the Georgetown Presbyterian Church and on the overseers committee of the Memorial Church at Harvard, but on Sundays she could be found in the Sunday school where she taught classes. She was active in the mental health movement, and worked with the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill.

We all know that in public life, public service can be hard on families. Jim Schlesinger served in Cabinet positions in three administrations. Rachel Schlesinger also served, in strength and dignity, preserving the privacy of her children and supporting her husband with the warmth of her presence. It is not an exaggeration to say that in all the agencies in which her husband served, she was universally loved.

Rachel Mellinger Schlesinger was a wonderful person, wise, kind, and thoughtful, who did good and not harm all the days of her life. She will be missed.

Mr. President, I was please to be able to see her 3 days ago and can report that in her last days she was cheerful and reassuring to all of those around her. She will be greatly missed. I yield the floor.

#### THE POLITICS OF FEAR

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, my Minnesota office is located in the town of Anoka, the Halloween capital of the world.

For most of my neighbors there, a good scare means nothing more than a Halloween visit to a haunted house, or maybe a roller coaster ride at the amusement park, or an evening in front of the TV watching old horror movies. So who would have ever guessed that, in 1995, the list of ways to give somebody a good scare would include handing them a letter from their U.S. Congressman.

There is a campaign of fear and misinformation being waged around us, Mr. President, and I come to the floor today to share with you my absolute contempt for it, and my sincere sympathy for its innocent victims.

The perpetrators? My colleagues in the minority party, in both Chambers, who are sinking to new lows as they fight desperately against the tide of public opinion that came crashing down on them last November.

Their victims? Senior citizens, who have done nothing to deserve this kind of treatment, except, apparently, to grow old.

Let me tell you about one of those victims.

She is 91 years old, and for the last couple of years, she has lived in a nursing home in the town of Cambridge, MN.

Her name is Ethel Grams, and she is my grandmother. My grandmother received a letter, delivered right to her nursing home bed, from her Representative in the House. And I am appalled that older Americans, who are among the most vulnerable in society, are being subjected to these kinds of scare tactics, fear-mongering, and blatant, self-serving distortions.

The letter is about Medicare, and is sprinkled—liberally—with inflammatory phrases like drastic cuts and benefits coming under attack.

Her Congressman writes of Republicans, quote "coercing seniors into health plans" and "herding as many seniors as possible into managed health care programs."

"Republicans in Congress are proposing to cut Medicare by \$270 billion over the next 7 years," he writes, "in order to pay for a tax cut of \$245 billion for the wealthiest of Americans—those making over \$350,000 a year."

Those assertions would be laughable if they were not so serious.

Mr. President, imagine suggesting to a 91-year-old woman, bedridden in a nursing home, that her health care plan is under attack, that with Republicans in the majority, the medical benefits she is relying upon will be slashed.

What is she supposed to think? How could she not be scared?

I cannot speak for every senior citizen, but I know how much it frightened my grandmother.

Unfortunately, this is not the only example of the damage being spread through this campaign of fear.