

might eliminate it and still maintain the central thrust of the legislation; and that is that there ought to be some standards and goals, but to let the States establish their own standards and goals.

This program, Goals 2000, was very carefully crafted after a 1983 report by then-Secretary of Education Terrell Bell, a very conservative educator, who found something we all know: That the American educational system is in a state of disarray.

Some schools are very good, like the high school I went to in Russell, KS, with 400 people, small classes, a good debating team, and a first-rate education. Notwithstanding other distinguished universities which I have attended—the University of Oklahoma, the University of Pennsylvania, Yale Law School—I think my best educational days were in high school, which underscores, at least in my view, that some schools are very good. It also emphasizes the importance of elementary school.

But educational standards across the country are in a state of disrepair. Remedial action is necessary. Some of the items coming out of our subcommittee involve experimentation with privatization to take over the public school system, not competing with private school systems, but trying to eliminate the bureaucracies in schools in cities like Washington, DC, or in Baltimore, MD, Boston, MA, Hartford, CT, some schools in Florida.

I am not saying that privatization is the answer, or the charter school concept, which is also a program contained in the bill coming out of my subcommittee. But I think it is clear that the basic concept of goals is a valid one; that there ought to be a measurement, illustratively into the 4th year, at the end of the 8th year, at the end of the 12th year, but they do not have to be necessarily Federal standards.

I compliment a distinguished legislator in the State of New Hampshire, the Honorable Neals Larson, who is the chairman of the house of representatives education committee. Representative Larson is trying very, very hard to see to it that New Hampshire would accept funding under Goals 2000 in its current form.

Candidly, I agree with Representative Larson that there are no strings attached which are intrusive and that, if you take a look at other Federal funding for the disadvantaged, for school to work, that it is not unusual to have some articulation of standards. But notwithstanding all of that, let us see if we cannot move ahead and find a way to accommodate those who may have a contrary view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, time is limited to 5 minutes and time has expired.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, stated very briefly, and the statement which was submitted yesterday will amplify these comments, this legislation will eliminate the requirement that the Secretary of Education approve and review State plans. Secretary Riley has been very accommodating and cooperative. He has expressed some concerns about this legislation. There may be others who will have concerns, others who were involved in the original Goals 2000 legislation, and we will make an effort to work with them on those concerns.

As a result of a public meeting which I participated in at Nashua High School back on September 9, an interesting thought was advanced, and that is to have funds go directly to local school boards for those States which decline to accept Goals 2000 funds.

Mr. Ovide Lamontagne, the chairman of the New Hampshire State Board of Education, thought that was an idea which would be acceptable. I am not suggesting that he made a final commitment to it, but at least from his point of view, it had merit subject to the power of the State to intervene if something extraordinary was done which was contrary to the State's views.

So, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to take a look at the legislation as a way to amend Goals 2000, as a way of seeking an adjustment and accommodation with the House on the appropriations process and encouraging States which are not now entering into compliance with the ultimate view that we have to better the education of school children in America.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor, and 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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

WORK FORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 143, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 143) to consolidate Federal employment training programs and create a new process and structure for funding the programs, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Kassebaum amendment No. 2885, in the nature of a substitute.

Ashcroft amendment No. 2893 (to amendment No. 2885), to establish a requirement that individuals submit to drug tests, and to ensure that applicants and participants make full use of benefits extended through work force employment activities.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Ashcroft amendment be set aside for the consideration of the amendment being offered by Senator SPECTER and Senator SIMON.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2894 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2885 (Purpose: To maintain a national Job Corps Program, carried out in partnership with States and communities)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. JOHNSTON, proposes an amendment numbered 2894 to amendment No. 2885.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under Amendments Submitted.)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in the interest of time—and I understand my distinguished cosponsor, Senator SIMON, will be arriving in the Chamber shortly—I will proceed with some of the opening considerations.

This is a carefully crafted amendment which builds upon the work of the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator KASSEBAUM. It is responsive to concerns raised by the General Accounting Office to maintain the Job Corps Program in its current structural form with reforms addressing many of the needs identified by Senator KASSEBAUM and the GAO report.

In my capacity as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee which has the responsibility for funding Job Corps, I have been intimately familiar with the operation of Job Corps. During the 15 years that I have been in the U.S. Senate, I have been an advocate for its implementation and have worked to secure funding of almost \$1.1 billion for the program.

It is my view, after seeing the application of the Job Corps in my home State of Pennsylvania and in other States, after working assiduously with my former colleague, Senator Heinz, for the opening of a major Job Corps center in Pittsburgh and having seen the successful implementation of the other three Job Corps centers in Pennsylvania, that the current requirements operating as a Federal program ought to be maintained.

I appreciate the general concept of block grants, but it is a concern of

mine that we may be going too far on the block grant concept at the outset, especially at a time when we have given the States great authority on welfare reform. To lump the funds for Job Corps with the other block grants which are being given to the States, in my judgment, is an open invitation to have these very important funds on job training diverted to other purposes.

There is no question about the need for a well-trained American work force, and there is no question about the importance of people having the ability to find jobs. If there is one core answer for the problems of crime, it is that people are able to hold a job and support themselves. I have long been interested in providing early intervention including education, job training, and realistic rehabilitation for juveniles and for first-time offenders. I believe that Job Corps goes a long way toward achieving that objective.

The legislation Senator SIMON and I have crafted and introduced here incorporates many of, if not most of, the remedies which have been proposed by Senator KASSEBAUM, such the provision regarding zero tolerance on drugs, alcohol, and violence. We have also responded to integrating the Job Corps into the overall work force development scheme, which is part of Senator KASSEBAUM's legislation.

This amendment works on issues identified by Senator KASSEBAUM, by strengthening State and local ties to the Job Corps, and by requiring that any plans to operate a center be submitted to the Governor for comment and review prior to submission to the Secretary of Labor. This allows for the integration of local interests of the Governor, but not total discretion to abolish the Job Corps or to abolish the great strides which have been made in so many Job Corps centers.

The amendment also requires screening and selection procedures for participating at-risk youth to be implemented through local partnerships and community organizations with the local work force development corps and one-stop career centers, again being responsive to concerns raised by Senator KASSEBAUM.

The Specter-Simon amendment relies on Chairman KASSEBAUM's national audit approach, but we submit that measure calls for the closing of five poorly performing centers by September 30, 1997, and five more by September 30 of the year 2000. We do allow discretion to the Secretary of Labor regarding this important provision which will allow him to close additional centers after an appropriate audit.

In essence, Mr. President, what we are looking at here is very extensive work done by the Committee on Labor and Human Resources under the direction of my distinguished colleague from Kansas. The GAO has identified certain problems which this Senator acknowledges to be true. But in the context of block grants being made this year beyond welfare such as with

Medicaid, it is my judgment and the judgment of the other cosponsors, and I think a large part of the Senate, that we ought not go too far too fast.

The Job Corps has been an effective program that ought to be corrected, but we ought not allow the States to abolish the program at their own discretion. I have total confidence in my State of Pennsylvania. However, there are other States where that kind of confidence does not exist.

Now, Mr. President, without really trying to filibuster or speak at any undue length, I note the arrival of my distinguished colleague, Senator SIMON. However, first I yield to my distinguished colleague from Utah, Senator HATCH, 4 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Thank you. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues, Senators SPECTER and SIMON, to maintain the Job Corps as a national program.

Now I have to say that I understand what the distinguished Senator from Kansas is trying to do and I generally support her on this bill.

With regard to Job Corps, I really do not believe it can work unless it is a national program, because much of the Job Corps Program depends upon the in-resident training. People coming to the actual Job Corps centers, living there, many of these kids culturally deprived, economically deprived, child abuse, kids that are in real trouble. This is the only program that works or that we have, in essence, for hard-core unemployed youth, and it does work. It is expensive. On the other hand, not nearly as expensive as if these kids wind up on welfare or wind up in the drug culture or wind up in the criminal culture of our society.

As my colleagues know, Utah is the home of two outstanding Job Corps centers. Wever Basin is a conservation center that is consistently rated in the top 10 centers; Clearfield Jobs Corps Center is run under contract by the Management Training Corps of Ogden, UT, which has a long and stellar history of managing Job Corps programs throughout the United States and has been named contractor of the year by the Labor Department. We are very proud of Utah's contribution to the Job Corps Program.

The Job Corps itself is unique. It is unlike education and training programs offered under the Job Training Partnership Act which I helped to author, the Carl Perkins Vocational Act, which I also worked on, or any other Federal initiative. First of all, it is geared to those young people who have failed in traditional settings and whose traditional support systems and often their own families have failed them.

Second, the Job Corps is primarily, as I said, a residential program. It is designed specifically to get these young people out of the streets, off the streets, and out of harm's way, away from the influences of gangs and drugs and violence. Job Corps centers can provide clean, structured, positive, environments, and they do.

For many young people, it makes little sense for them to spend 8 hours a day in a constructive learning situation only to return at 5 p.m. to abusive homes, pressure from unenlightened peers, or the temptations of drugs and alcohol.

Frankly, it would be hard for me to support the Job Corps if it were only another job training program. I think I would have great difficulty. I cannot justify \$1 billion to duplicate something that States and local governments are already doing.

On that score, I think the Senator from Kansas is absolutely right. We need consolidation, and we need more State and local flexibility.

We learned during last year's debate on the crime bill we have over 150 separate job training and youth development programs, all having differing sets of regulations, reporting requirements, and so forth.

That is a waste of bureaucracy, pure and simple. I want to commend the Labor and Human Resources Committee for putting together this bill to do something about it. This is a commonsense solution to the proliferation of programs and to the needless expenditure of time and resources just to keep up with the paperwork.

But the Job Corps is not just another program. Its residential capability makes it different, and I believe the current national administration of Job Corps is necessary to promote both continuity and accountability. For that reason, I support the Specter-Simon amendment.

Another reason for supporting this amendment is it deals honestly and forthrightly with some of the legitimate criticisms that have been raised about Job Corps.

Again, I commend Senator KASSEBAUM for holding thorough oversight hearings on the Job Corps. The results of these hearings as well as the reports from the General Accounting Office and the Labor Department inspector general have identified specific areas in which Job Corps must improve.

No program should be immune from congressional inquiry. Any program that is doing its job effectively should welcome such hearings. Should this amendment carry, I encourage the Labor Department to continue its scrutiny of the program in its efforts to improve the identified areas.

Those of us who support this amendment to maintain Job Corps as a national program need to make it clear that this is not a hands-off Job Corps vote or license for business as usual. On the contrary, if Job Corps remains a national program, it remains subject to national oversight, including continual progress reports by the GAO and the Labor Department inspector general.

In this case, however, the way to address these issues is not throwing the baby out with the bath water. The Specter-Simon amendment makes many important reforms in the Job Corps.

For starters, the amendment ties the Job Corps more closely to the integrated job training system being created by S. 143. This only makes sense. Without making Job Corps a State program, we can make sure that Job Corps programs are coordinated with other State and local efforts. We can also utilize the one-stop career centers to make the Job Corps option more available to young people who could benefit from it.

Again, I want to thank Senators SPECTER and SIMON for providing more input for State Governors on this amendment. I believe this change will not only solidify cooperation, but will also be an additional check on Job Corps contractors.

I am also encouraged by the codification of Job Corps' guidelines concerning behavior by corps members. The zero-tolerance policy on drugs, alcohol, and violence must be strictly enforced. Of course, it means nothing if it is not.

By including these provisions in this amendment, we are giving congressional weight to the efforts of the Department of Labor and individual Job Corps contractors and center directors to ensure the state of Job Corps centers. Nothing less than the viability of the residential center concept is at stake.

In short, this is a we-mean-business provision. Students who want to turn their lives around should not have to confront the same negative influences in Job Corps as they left on the streets behind them.

Finally, the amendment requires the closure of the 10 worst performing centers. We have too many needs and too little money to continue to prop up consistently poor performing centers. The costs of operating Job Corps centers will continue to go up along with everything else. We must make tough decisions about where to make cuts.

It seems to me that one obvious place to look is the bottom rung of the performance ladder. While I applaud the efforts DOL made to enforce performance standards, there are still centers that have such a long way to go—that it is more economical to close them than to conserve resources to maintain program quality at other centers.

Mr. President, I believe the Specter-Simon amendment is a balanced response to the criticisms that have been raised about the program, as well as desirable of maintaining the Job Corps as a national program. I urge Senators to support the amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my distinguished colleague from Utah, and inquire how much time remains on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes and thirty seconds remain.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Senator SIMON.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania and I thank him for sponsoring this amend-

ment and I appreciate the comments of Senator HATCH.

Mr. SPECTER. May I inquire of my colleague from Illinois how much time he intends to take? We have had some requests from other Senators.

Mr. SIMON. If my colleague can give me 5 minutes, that will be great.

Mr. SPECTER. Five minutes? Fine.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, first of all, we are not talking about the Sunday school class of Our Savior's Lutheran Church at Carbondale, IL. We are talking about a marginal group of young people: 79 percent high school dropouts, 73 percent have never been employed before. While they have problems, they have been improving.

This is the placement rate for the Job Corps. For those who criticize it and say only 36 percent graduate, those figures are also gradually going up. I point out, U.S. News & World Report just came out with the best colleges and universities in the Nation and I notice that Wichita State University, a great school in my colleague's State, had a 30-percent graduation rate. That is not an abysmal rate, when you take a look at what is happening. With the placement rate, it is not only that you get over 70 percent placed in jobs, it is also that 79 percent—interestingly the same percentage; these are high school dropouts—79 percent of the employers speak very highly of these young people who are marginal, who have really been struggling.

In 1991 the National Commission on Children, a bipartisan body of 34 members wrote, "We recommend that the Job Corps component of JTPA be expanded over the next decade"—not cut back, as this will do, without this amendment—"be expanded over the next decade to increase participation from its present level of approximately 62,000 a year to approximately 93,000 a year."

In 1993, the Milton Eisenhower Foundation, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders—listen to what they have to say, the Milton Eisenhower foundation.

Next to Head Start, the Job Corps appears to be the second most successful across-the-board American prevention program ever created for high-risk kids.

What we are being asked to do is automatically cut back on 25 Job Corps centers and then block grant. There are areas where block grants make sense, but this is sure not one of them. Most States have no experience whatsoever in this field. Here we know we have a program that is working, is being commended by a great many people.

I will have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by Peter Brennan, Secretary of Labor under the Nixon administration, Dick Schubert, Deputy Secretary of Labor under both the Nixon and Ford administration, Bill Usery, Secretary of Labor under the Ford administration, Ray Marshall, Secretary of Labor under the Carter

administration, Frank C. Casillas, Assistant Secretary of Labor under the Reagan administration, Malcolm Lovell Jr., Assistant Secretary for Manpower under the Nixon administration, and Under Secretary of Labor under the Reagan administration, Roger Semarad, Assistant Secretary of Labor under the Reagan administration—all them saying we ought to keep the Job Corps.

I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Times, Letters to the Editor]

KILLING JOB CORPS WILL PUT YOUNG AT JEOPARDY

Job Corps is our country's successful national residential, educational and job-training program for at-risk youth. The Work-place Development Act (S.143) puts Job Corps' future, and the young people it serves, in jeopardy.

If passed, it will close 25 centers and turn over operations of this most comprehensive program to the states. In 30 years, no state has successfully operated such a program. The legislation ignores Job Corps' solid track record and poses a risky alternative.

This bill, which was amended to the welfare reform bill (H.R.4) is in sharp contrast to all other proposed consolidation recommendations.

Four million young people in the United States need of basic education, job skills and job-placement assistance only Job Corps offers. Most youths who enroll in Job Corps have inadequate education. Most do not have the skills or attitudes needed to find and keep good jobs. All are from poor families.

As the largest, most comprehensive and cost-effective program of its kind, Job Corps is a solution for disadvantaged youths between the ages of 16 and 24. Seven out of 10 graduates enter jobs or pursue further education. Job Corps should remain a national program because it works, is accessible, cost-efficient, accountable and helps communities.

The American public, Congress and the Clinton administration should be proud of Job Corps. We implore the members of Congress from other sides of the aisle to continue support for Job Corps as a distinct national program.

PETER J. BRENNAN,

Secretary of Labor, Nixon Administration, New York.

DICK SHUBERT,

Deputy Secretary of Labor, Nixon/Ford Administration, Washington.

W.J. USERY, JR.,

Secretary of Labor, Ford Administration, Washington.

RAY MARSHALL,

Secretary of Labor, Carter Administration, Austin, TX.

FRANK C. CASILLAS,

Assistant Secretary of Labor, Reagan Administration, Chicago.

MALCOLM R. LOVELL JR.,

Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Nixon Administration, Under Secretary of Labor, Reagan Administration, Washington.

ROGER SEMARAD,

Assistant Secretary of Labor, Reagan Administration, Leesburg, VA.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I think the evidence is just overwhelming that we should not put the Job Corps on the chopping block. This is a program that has some difficulties because you are

dealing with marginal young people, but it works. And when we have a program that works we ought to be expanding it and not cutting back on it.

I urge my colleagues to accept the amendment that Senator SPECTER and I have introduced. I think it is in the national interest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today very reluctantly to oppose the amendment from my friends from Pennsylvania and Illinois and Utah. I say reluctantly because I totally agree with their objectives and I totally agree with their analysis of what is one of the gravest problems this country faces and that is the growing number of young people in this country who are literally growing up in a society that is separate from the rest of us.

Someone has come up with the term "at-risk youth." You see these at-risk youth when you go into a Job Corps center site, as I have in Dayton, OH, or in Cincinnati or in Cleveland. You talk to these kids—really not kids, young adults—and you find they have grown up in a family where there is one parent, that one parent may be an alcoholic or drug addict, where no one in the family has worked for years—where no one has in the neighborhood, really. They do not seem to know anybody in the neighborhood who has worked. That is not true in every case, but it is not atypical.

The thing we have to keep in mind, though, is when we go into a Job Corps site and see these young people, for every one you see in a Job Corps site there are 10, 100, maybe 1,000, maybe 10,000 more out there in every one of our States, so we are just seeing a small number of these individuals.

So I applaud the purpose of this amendment but I differ in the approach. We looked at this issue at length in the Labor Committee. The committee adopted an amendment that I offered that ensures that approximately 40 percent of the money that will be spent at the State level will be spent for these at-risk youth and that we will not allow the States to cream off the top, to just help those young people who are between jobs, to help just those in the middle class, but that the States will be required—the total package provides \$2.1 billion that has to be spent on the at-risk youth.

Now we move to the question how do we spend this money the most effectively? There are those who look at Job Corps and say, "Do away with it." They cite the statistics of crime, drug abuse, lack of any definable results or quantitative results. There are others who say very eloquently, "The Job Corps does work and we have to have a residential facility." I believe the Sen-

ator from Kansas, who chairs our committee, has come up with a very rational compromise and it is a middle position. It is a position, I believe, that marries the best of both worlds.

What does it do? It says we understand there are problems with the Job Corps. We are going to try to fix those. It says, of the 111 or so Job Corps sites—we have eight more coming on, that makes 119—we are going to take 25, the worst, in an objective measure, and those will be eliminated. But the rest will stay in existence.

I want Members who are listening back in their offices to keep this in mind. They will continue and they will continue under the authority and the power of the States. Any State that might lose a Job Corps site—25. For example, let us say Ohio might lose one. It may. I do not know. But that money would continue to flow to the State and that money would have to be spent for at-risk youth. It could not be creamed off. It could not be used by the State for any other purpose but to target this at-risk youth. That, to me, is very, very significant.

I think it is important to point out exactly where this bill stands now. As a result of the amendment that I offered and other changes that were made, and the good work of the chairman, the Workforce Development Act now targets \$2.1 billion of the funding on Jobs Corps and other education and training programs directly on the problems of at-risk youth.

States have to spend roughly 40 percent of job training dollars in this bill on the at-risk youth problem. They cannot cream off the easy part for the job training problem. They have to tackle the tough cases.

The bill provides us a framework based initially on a residential concept for Job Corps. But it requires that a major portion of this money be targeted at this at-risk youth population.

I believe that this legislation now represents a rational compromise. In this compromise, States must target the at-risk youth population. But along with this requirement, or mandate, they are given flexibility—flexibility that I think is essential if we are to empower the States and to encourage the States to develop a full-fledged program for at-risk youth.

States should not be in a position to turn and say, "Well, the at-risk youth is the Federal Government's problem. The at-risk youth is what we have Job Corps for." I do not think so. I think it is much better if it is integrated to the State's entire program to deal with all of the at-risk youth in the State.

This compromise keeps most Job Corps centers in place. But it shifts control of the centers to the States to promote a greater focus on local jobs. The goal of the compromise is to make sure States see helping at-risk youth as an integral, very significant part of their mission.

The specific issue of the future of the Job Corps Program is of great concern

to myself and my colleague from Pennsylvania and other Members on the floor. Some people, as I said, want to abolish Job Corps. Some want to keep it with the status quo and make some minor changes. I believe the compromise that we have come up with will actually rescue Job Corps and start it down the path of truly fixing it.

It is clear that many of these at-risk youth that I have talked about will continue to need the kind of residential education that Job Corps provides. I think we need to keep that option open. That is why Job Corps was not abolished in this compromise. That is why the Labor Committee bill provides for a great deal of flexibility in how this fund for at-risk youth will be used. Indeed, the bill cures what has been one of the major complaints about the Job Corps program in the past—the fact that Job Corps is a nationally administered program that does not respond to the needs of the local labor markets. I will come back to that in a moment.

One of the key insights into a recent American political discourse is that we need to rebuild the sense of community. My friend from Indiana, Senator COATS, has talked about that. He has spoken eloquently on the need to rebuild the ties that make for a successful civil society.

But let us look at a typical Job Corps experience. A young woman or young man from Detroit, MI, may be sent to a Job Corps Center in Dayton, OH, and that Job Corps Center in Dayton, OH, may be run by a contractor from Utah. Then when that young man or that young woman goes out to find a job, the agency that is charged with helping that person find a job may be based in Atlanta, GA. You lose the sense of community which I think most people truly understand is essential if the person in the Job Corps is not only going to be trained but if they are going to have a real job afterward, 6 months or 12 months later, because that is the true test of whether it works or not.

The problem with the current system is that very few people involved in this process have any real ties to the local community or to the particular young adult being trained.

This is an extremely disjointed process, not a focused, locally oriented approach. More often than not, the young person does not remain in the community where a Job Corps center is. The person quite naturally tends to go home. I think a truly successful Job Corps Program should look at that young person not just as another client who is shipped somewhere, but as a member of the local community.

That is why streamlining the job training program into block grants to the States is how we have done it in this bill. We have also decided to shift the Job Corps Program to the States. There is a much greater chance that Job Corps will succeed in rescuing an at-risk youth if that program is tapped

into a local community—local youth, local employers, and local jobs. The Job Corps needs to be part of a focused, comprehensive, locally oriented system. I think that is very, very important.

So let me conclude by saying, Mr. President, that everyone on this floor—as I look around at all the Members—has a great concern about at-risk youth. The only issue today is how we best serve these at-risk youth.

I believe that the continuation of Job Corps—and an improved Job Corps providing for residential services but integrated into a State system—is really the only way that we can go. It is a rational approach. It is a rational compromise. I think it has a much greater chance of success than continuing the current system.

So, I ask my colleagues—again, I say this quite reluctantly—to defeat this amendment and assure them that when they look at this bill they will find it is a bill that has considered at-risk youth, and not only has considered at-risk youth but has put a star behind that term, and say we care, we care about the at-risk youth in this society, and that this Congress, this Senate, is not going to forget about them but, even more importantly, the States are not either.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes and thirty seconds.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island with whom I served for many years on the authorizing committee, and who knows the subject very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, when the subject of Job Corps was being discussed on the Senate floor at an earlier time, I spoke about solutions to,

The important problems and challenges facing our young people: the need for originality and new ideas; the need for knowledge to combat ignorance; and, above all, the need for broadening the horizons for youth, so that each young man and young woman in the United States can develop the best of his or her talents in a climate of maximum opportunity.

I delivered those remarks in March 1964 during debate on President Johnson's poverty program, which created, among others, the Job Corps Program. Thirty-one years later, the problems and challenges are surprisingly, and unfortunately, the same. I doubt any of my colleagues would disagree with the importance of allowing our young people to develop to the best of their ability.

For many, colleges and universities are the places they go to develop their talents; still others find vocational schools or service in our Armed Forces

to be the place. Regrettably, Mr. President, there remain some young men and women who do not even know what their talent is.

They are referred to as poverty youth. In reality, they are young Americans who, through no fault of their own, lack the skills needed to get an education or find a job.

It is for these people that Job Corps was created, has flourished, and must continue. It is just as important today as it was 34 years ago to do all we can to look for new ideas to old problems; to replace ignorance with knowledge; and most important, allow all of our young people, no matter who they are, where they live, or how much they make, to discover their special talent and go on to develop that talent.

This is why I am a cosponsor of and will vote for the Simon-Specter amendment. I am pleased the amendment calls for a review and closing of any centers that are not serving their students. I am also pleased about the strong emphasis the amendment places on community involvement. The hearings held by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee certainly pointed out the strong, positive impact an involved community can have on the success of a Job Corps Center. Most important, I am pleased that the Simon-Specter amendment keeps the Job Corps Program as a national program. This, I feel, is vital.

My only lingering regret, Mr. President, is that my own State of Rhode Island is one of four States which so far does not have a Job Corps Center of its own. I continue to hope that this omission can be addressed in the context of strengthening and improving the program.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would like to yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I believe the intent to preserve the Job Corps is a good intent. The Job Corps in the main has been a program that has had a substantial amount of success. However, the purpose of S. 143, of this piece of legislation, is to give not just the States more flexibility but provide, for the first time, taxpayers with a real system of accountability, requiring States to develop a plan, present benchmarks for that plan and suffer monetary penalties if they do not meet the objectives under the plan.

This says we are not just going to block grant money back to the States and allow them to willy-nilly spend the money. This legislation creates, for the first time, an accountable system and allows Governors and people in the States to preserve their Job Corps Program, but it says that we are going to transfer primary responsibility for any Job Corps Center to the State in which the Job Corps Center is located.

States rather than the Federal Government under this legislation, we believe, are in the best position to man-

age and operate these centers and, most important, to integrate them with their statewide work force development system.

I would actually make the case that this is a good area for us to begin to consider what kind of swaps we might be able to work with the States entirely. We are not only talking about giving the States responsibility. We are collecting a lot of taxpayer money here and shipping it back to the States to do a function that I believe is largely something that the States do better than the Federal Government anyway, which is to work with small business, to work with big business, to work with educational institutions to try to develop programs that will help individuals acquire skills they need to either get in the work force for the first time, which is typically what Job Corps does, or to acquire the skills to enable them to move up the economic ladder.

I actually would love to get into a debate, into a discussion as we talk about shifting more power back to the States about whether we want to not just shift power back to the States but whether we want to shift all funding responsibilities. I think it was a mistake for us to block grant, for example, Medicaid and give Medicaid back to the States under a block grant program. I did not support the welfare bill because I do not think income maintenance programs can be run by the States. But some kind of a swap as we are trying to decide what does the Federal Government do well and what do the States do well it seems to me to be appropriate rather than just assuming that everything ought to be shifted back to the States.

Some things the Federal Government does quite well. One of them, however, Mr. President, I do not believe is in the area of job training and economic development. There I believe very strongly the States should be given the principal responsibility and be given not just flexibility but as long as they are asking us for tax dollars that we on behalf of our taxpayers need to hold them accountable for what is going on.

Again, this legislation, S. 143, as I said yesterday when I spoke on it, is one of the very small number—in fact, I only have two on my list right at the moment—of changes in the law where I am certain a couple of years from now people on the street in Nebraska are going to come up and say, “You know, that work force development legislation, I have a job today because of that. I am earning \$5,000 more a year because of that. My family survived as a consequence of that legislation.”

This piece of legislation will produce real change that people will appreciate at the local level, where they are asking increasingly, what is this Congress all about? What are you doing that is relevant to our lives?

The other one, I point out again for emphasis, is S. 1128, the health insurance reform legislation. Mr. President,

25 million Americans will benefit if we end the practice of excluding people on the basis of preexisting conditions and allow people to port their insurance from one job to another.

Last year, in the debate over health care, it seemed no one was for that, and this year it has become popular to suggest it; 25 million Americans benefit from that. Again, by coincidence, it is sponsored by the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Massachusetts. S. 143, like S. 1128, will enable you in townhall meetings to have people stand up and say: This one made a difference in my life. My family is stronger; my income is higher; I have that job; I have adjusted to the marketplace; I have skills and am able to do things I was not able to do before.

So those who are wondering whether or not you are voting against Job Corps, you are not voting against Job Corps by voting against this amendment. Job Corps is still alive under S. 143. We do not kill Job Corps with this proposal.

I have a letter—I suspect all my colleagues do—with a very impressive list of many of my friends here in Washington, DC, advocacy groups urging me to vote for this amendment. I will vote against this amendment and say to my friends and those at-risk youths I believe the States will in fact do a much better job.

We have a Job Corps facility in Nebraska. My guess is my Governor is going to say it does a good job; they are going to integrate it into their plan; they are not going to shut down the Job Corps Program in Crawford, NE, but they are going to integrate it into their development program. If it fails to do the job, Mr. President, they will know that they cannot come back to Washington and have the Congress bail them out. They will know if they do not do the job, they will have to turn to their legislature and their own Governor and try to make a losing program still get funding by the taxpayers.

So I believe this amendment should be defeated because I think it actually undercuts long-term the support for the Job Corps Program. It is much more likely that this particular piece of legislation does the right kind of empowering, does empower people at the local level, empowers small business to participate in economic development markets, enables us to turn to taxpayers and say these 90 different job training programs have been consolidated into one and we have tough requirements for benchmarking and tough requirements for standards. You know that you are going to get your money's worth in this program and much more likely that taxpayers will be satisfied as well.

Perhaps most important for me, S. 143 is going to empower people at the local level to get involved, trying to figure out what we can do to make sure that half of the graduating class that goes directly into the work force has

the skills that the market says they need in order to get a job.

Increasingly, I talk to citizens who say: We are cut out of it; we do not seem to have much power, much opportunity. We try to get to our school boards to get help but we are not able to.

Mr. President, I request 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. KERREY. I say in conclusion, Mr. President, I think the amendment is well intended and I understand there is strong support for the Jobs Corps. I have been a strong supporter of Job Corps as well. But it is much more likely to survive if the taxpayers say: We are getting our money's worth if it is integrated into the State plan for job training and economic development.

So I hope my colleagues who support Job Corps will oppose this amendment and make sure that S. 143 does in fact empower the people at the local level.

Mr. SPECTER. Will my colleague yield for a question on my time?

I just have one very brief question. I inquire of my colleague from Nebraska if he would see a difference between the Job Corps in a State like Nebraska, administered by a Governor like Governor KERREY, or a State like Ohio, by my distinguished colleague, Senator DEWINE, compared to some of the other States in the United States where with a block grant we might not be so confident that we have Job Corps maintained?

Mr. KERREY. It is entirely possible that you are going to get situations where Governors are less friendly to the Job Corps than I would be or he might be, I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but one of the things that I have a difficult time with in general when it comes to Federal programs is people at the local level say: We know this thing is not working but the power to determine whether it survives reverts back to Washington.

And again I wish to say for emphasis there are some things that I do not want to shift to the States. I do not want to shift income maintenance to the States. I do not want to shift Medicaid to the States. I would like to empower people to make more decisions when it comes to health care, empower them to make more decisions. I do not want the Federal bureaucracies to control all the decisions, but when it comes to job training and economic development I really see it as a State role.

I would love to get into a discussion of how we get a swap with the States taking over things that are Federal responsibilities but saying to them where it is a State responsibility, you are going to be required to come up with your own money.

I would say to the Senator from Pennsylvania as well—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. KERREY. I know from my own State of Nebraska, when people cam-

paign for the office of Governor—I suspect it is similar to Pennsylvania—the No. 1 question they have to answer is, What are you going to do to create jobs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KERREY. Economic development is so important, no Governor is going to get away with shutting down a Job Corps center that is doing a good job.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARKIN be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to yield myself 7 minutes on the bill. And then I will yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Iowa.

I want to speak in support of the amendment. I must say I was in such agreement with my good friend, Senator KERREY, yesterday, and I am at difference with him today. We are talking about the same subject matters. But I very much appreciate his longstanding interest in terms of the training programs that have been developed out of the Human Resources Committee under the leadership of Senator KASSEBAUM.

I want to also pay tribute to Senator DEWINE, although I differ with him on this issue as well. He has spent an enormous amount of time as a Lieutenant Governor and in our committee in working across the partisan lines to bring focus and attention to at-risk youth in this country and has made it one of his priorities. I think all of us that care about the issue of at-risk youth are very much in his debt at this time and look forward to working with him down the road on other ways that we can be more effective.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to support the Job Corps amendment. The committee bill on this issue is a classic case of throwing out the baby with the bathwater. I strongly support the basic purpose of the bill, which is to consolidate the current overlapping and often confusing array of Federal job training and job education programs. But it makes no sense to eliminate the Job Corps, which is a program that is not broken and does not need this kind of fixing. The Job Corps is a Federal program that works, and it deserves to remain a Federal program. It works extremely effectively to bring hope and opportunity into the lives of tens of thousands of disadvantaged young men and women every year. And it works extremely cost effectively as well.

A study in the 1980's found that the Job Corps saves \$1.46 in future costs for crime and welfare for every \$1 invested in the program. And there have been more than 200 IG reviews of the Job Corps Program, and they have been overwhelmingly in support of the Job Corps Program over the period of these last 30 years.

I will just quote briefly the IG report of 1991 where it says, "85 percent of the investment in Job Corps resulted in

participants receiving measurable benefits." The GAO report of 1995: "Job Corps is serving its intended population. Employers who hire Job Corps students were satisfied with the students' work habits and technical training."

Mr. President, the Job Corps has its problems, like any social program, dealing with the difficult challenges of assisting disadvantaged youth and helping them to become productive and responsible citizens. We can deal with the program's problems. No one is trying to sweep them under the rug. But it would be very wrong and highly counterproductive to use these problems as a pretext to turn the entire Job Corps over to the States and abandon the many positive features that far outweigh the problems in this innovative Federal program.

Any fair assessment of the Job Corps demonstrates its success. The Job Corps is a unique residential program that provides education and training for at-risk youth. It is national in scope. A third of Job Corps participants are enrolled in centers outside their own States. That means Job Corps can offer a real choice to young men and women about the kind of careers they want. If the Job Corps center in their State does not provide that kind of training, they can enroll in a center in another State that does. If we fragment this national focus and turn the Job Corps into 50 separate programs, at the option of each State, the obvious advantage of this impressive national capability will be lost.

There is no question that Job Corps has succeeded in fulfilling its mission. In 1994, 73 percent of all the Job Corps participants were placed in jobs, joined the military, or went on to some form of further education. I will point out, in response to points that were made earlier about the issues of accountability for the Job Corps that included in the Specter-Simon amendment, there are required evaluations which look at placement rates, verified after 13 weeks, learning gains, placement wages, dropout rates, enrollees obtaining GED's—all different assessments and evaluations of the programs so that we will have a closer review of the success of the programs and also its challenges.

Finally, there is talk by some opponents of Job Corps of eliminating excessive Federal bureaucracy. The total bureaucracy consists of a grand total of about 190 officials. Some bureaucracy. It should be obvious to everyone that three to four officials per State cannot manage the Job Corps if we turn the program over to the States. The committee bill is a prescription for increased Job Corps bureaucracy, not reduced bureaucracy.

For all these reasons I urge the Senate to save the Job Corps. This is a vote for a Federal program that works. It is a vote for hope and jobs and opportunity for young men and women across the country who need our help

the most. For them Job Corps is a lifeline. The Senate should preserve it, not cut it off.

Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for yielding me this time off the bill. I did want to support the amendment and be a cosponsor of the amendment because I feel so strongly that Job Corps has done an outstanding job. There have been problems. Yes, there have been problems. I believe that we have addressed those problems. I believe this amendment addresses those problems.

But just to arbitrarily close 25 centers around the United States and then to turn this back over to the States with almost no benchmarks at all, I think would be the death knell for Job Corps, and it would be the end of it. Job Corps, as has been stated so many times, I am sure, by people who have spoken on the floor of the Senate here, Job Corps serves our most disadvantaged youth. These are not young people who have gone through high school and gotten good grades, maybe got a job; these are hardcore, unemployed, disadvantaged youths. To close them down would be a big mistake.

Despite the disadvantages of the youths that come into this program, the program has succeeded. The last comprehensive study of Job Corps found each \$1 invested returns a \$1.46. Last year, 73 percent of Job Corps students found jobs or entered higher education after leaving the centers. I challenge any State-run job training program to match that kind of figure. You cannot find it anywhere—73 percent. Now, they may place them, but in the Job Corps center that we have in Iowa, 95 percent of those found jobs with an average hourly wage of \$6.20 an hour, and not minimum wage, more than minimum wage.

We have a Job Corps center in Denison, IA. I have to tell you, Mr. President, when this thing first started in Iowa, the Job Corps center, they took over an old junior college that had gone under. When it first started in Denison—Denison is a small community, community of about 6,700 people—when they thought about this Job Corps center there and they were going to bring these inner-city kids in and kids who had been on drugs, there was a public outcry, and it just about did not succeed in being located in Denison.

Finally, some cooler heads prevailed. They opened it up. And I can tell you, Mr. President, it has so much support in Denison and the surrounding countryside you cannot believe it. I know my friend from Nebraska was saying that we have got to get more local level involvement. You cannot get more local level involvement than what you have in the Denison, IA, Job Corps Center and, I daresay, a lot of other Job Corps centers around the country because they work closely with businesses in the community.

They are taught by people with skills in different occupations. They go out and work among people, so they get to understand what it is like to be in the work force. And the people in the Denison area have supported it overwhelmingly since it has come in. Five hundred kids a year go through there. And I might add it is one of the handful of centers that provides child care for students.

The child development center there opened in 1993. It allows parents to keep their children with them while they are enrolled in training programs. So a young mother, maybe with one or two kids, can come there, go through the program and keep her children with her. Children from 6 months to 2 years are in a developmental child care program. And at the Denison Job Corps Center, for children 3 to 5, we have a Head Start Program.

So, again, it is fully integrated with developmental for early childhood, Head Start, and allow these kids to stay there with their parents.

As I said, Job Corps in Denison is the third largest employer. It has 121 full-time employees and a \$3.4 million annual payroll. And the center gives back to the community. It makes civic contributions. They built a new press box at the high school athletic field. The kids went out and built it. They contributed to the community. They built a new stage for the Donna Reed Performing Arts Festival that we have annually to commemorate the hometown of Donna Reed.

So, again—I do not know—when I hear people say that we need more local involvement, you cannot get more local involvement than what we have in the Job Corps Center in Denison, IA. We talk about turning it back to the States so they do not come to the Federal Government when they get in trouble. The fact is, under the bill, if you turn it back to the States with almost no benchmarks, they would not run to the Federal Government because there is nothing for them to meet.

But under the amendment, we set up benchmarks, we set up strict guidelines on drug usage and that type of thing, and we make sure that they meet certain stringent guidelines. So we have, I believe, addressed the problems that we have confronted in some Job Corps centers.

I am not going to stand here and say every Job Corps center has been the epitome of correctness and that they have been run right. But to just take a blunt meat-ax approach and cut them out is, I believe, the wrong way to go. I believe this amendment is the right way to go. It solves the problems. It keeps the centers going. It, indeed, closes 10, but not the 25, and it sets up the strict guidelines we need to make sure we do not have these problems in the future.

I urge those who want to make sure that we instill in these young people

family values and a work ethic so they can get out of the environment they are in and put them in a new work environment in a community, you cannot beat the Job Corps for what they are doing. It is one of the best investments we have ever made. I certainly hope we do not do away with it, and I support the amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if the distinguished sponsor of the bill, Senator KASSEBAUM, would yield, I would like to ask her a few questions about the impact this bill would have on Kentucky. Would the Senator yield for some questions?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. Our State has six Job Corps Centers. These centers currently receive a total of approximately \$51 million annually to operate. Does this bill target any of the Kentucky facilities for closure?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. This bill does not target any particular facility, in Kentucky or elsewhere, for closure.

Mr. McCONNELL. The bill does provide that 25 centers will be closed over a 2-year period. How will the decisions on closure be made.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. The bill mandates that there be a national audit, over a 2-year period, of all Job Corps Centers, and that the national board make recommendations, based on objective performance criteria, to the Secretary of Labor. The national board will recommend that the 10 worst performing centers be closed in the first year after the audit, and that 15 additional poorly performing centers be closed in the following year.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will particular States, for example, with a disproportionate number of centers compared to the State's population, be targeted for closures?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. No, there is no national formula established in this bill, based on geographic or population considerations. For allocating Job Corps funds, the only factors will be performance related. In fact, section 161(c) specifically provides that each State will continue to receive the same amount of funds for Job Corps even if any of the States' centers are closed. In that case, the State could then use those funds for other at-risk youth activities.

Among the factors that will be examined to determine the closure of centers are: Whether the center has experienced high incidents of criminal or violent activity; the physical condition of the facility; the degree to which the center has State and local support; and the costs of the center compared to other centers.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas for her explanation.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Kentucky in the impact of this bill upon his State. And, I would point out that, in the section of the bill dealing with other training programs, the State of

Kentucky, according to the Congressional Research Service, will receive more funds than it currently receives. The reason for this is that the bill alters the funding formula for job training programs, and based on the new formula, Kentucky should receive a 4.2 percent increase in job training funds.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the Senator for her assistance.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I speak today in support of the Simon-Specter amendment to the Workforce Development Act, which seeks to save one of America's most important programs—Job Corps.

For over three decades, the Job Corps has received bipartisan support and has created a tradition of success. In this time, Job Corps has empowered 1.6 million of America's disadvantaged youth to become responsible, tax-paying citizens.

Job Corps has proved its worth as a time-tested national program for at-risk youth. It is the only program offering a unique combination of residential education, support services, job training, and placement services.

This amendment reflects inspector general and Department of Labor testimony and General Accounting Office data that do not suggest or recommend State block granting as a means to improve Job Corps accountability.

The Workforce Development Act, as it currently exists, would close 25 Job Corps centers, one-fourth of the total Job Corps network. This represents an abandonment of \$500 million in Federal facilities and the loss of thousands of jobs. The act would also currently end universal access to Job Corps for students and creates State restrictions for Job Corps programs.

The Specter-Simon amendment takes a much more rational approach to Job Corps consolidation. The amendment would simply close 10 Job Corps centers—5 by 1997 and 5 more by the year 2000, providing weaker performing centers time to improve. It would preserve Job Corps as a national program and protects national partnerships that provide essential support, training and job placement services along with universal access to Job Corps for all eligible at-risk youth, regardless where they reside.

Last year, 73 percent of Job Corps students found jobs with an average wage of \$5.50 or returned to higher education after leaving the program. These numbers speak volumes about the success of the Job Corps Program.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to seek out Federal programs within each of their States that have proven track records. This is clearly one of those programs that has year-in and year-out provided the necessary direction of millions of disadvantaged young Americans.

I applaud the work of my colleagues—Senators SIMON and SPECTER, for their leadership, which strives to maintain a program so vital in each of our States. I believe this amendment

will improve a Job Corps Program already demonstrating continued success.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would like to lay out in some detail why I have reached the conclusion that something is seriously wrong with the Job Corps Program.

I know this program has broad bipartisan support. The Secretary of Labor has called Job Corps the crown jewel of all Federal training programs. We have a Job Corps Center in Kansas, and I initially supported that effort.

I strongly support the concept of a program that truly helps at-risk youth finish their high school education, obtain marketable job skills and get a job on which they can build a career. But Job Corps, as it is not operated by the Department of Labor, falls far short of delivering on those promises.

For years, Job Corps has claimed it places 80 percent of its participants in jobs, the military, or in higher education. I was surprised to learn, however, that half of the students dropped out in their first 6 months. Despite the fact that more than 50 percent of the students find their own jobs, Job Corps claims the majority of those dropouts as successful placements.

I also learned that Job Corps is by far the most expensive job training program operated by the Federal Government, with a budget of \$1.2 billion. That translates to a cost of \$23,000 for each student placement, far more than the average State college tuition.

A year ago last June, I asked for a briefing by the Department of Labor inspector general, which has been monitoring Job Corps regularly for the last several years. One of the most troubling of the inspector general's findings was Job Corps' extremely high dropout rates. One-third of new trainees drop out within the first 90 days and, as I said, 50 percent leave within 6 months.

The IG also found that only 12 percent of students were being placed in jobs requiring the skills they learned in the program. The vast majority of jobs found by Job Corps graduates were low-paying, low-skill positions.

The inspector general also questioned Job Corps' claimed placement rate of 80 percent. The IG found the actual number was closer to 60 percent. However, even this number is misleading because a job placement is defined by Job Corps as being on the job for only 20 hours.

In addition to poor performance and high dropout rates, the IG found very little accountability for Job Corps operators. The Department of Labor rarely took action to improve or upgrade centers that performed poorly year after year after year.

The inspector general also told me about an aspect of Job Corps about which, up until that time, I knew very little about. In addition to operating Job Corps Centers, the program also contracts out to employers and labor unions for advanced training programs for Job Corps graduates.

The inspector general examined one of these advanced training programs

for computer skills and found the cost to be almost \$37,000 per student. Yet, the contractor placed only 9 percent of the students in jobs using the data processing skills they learned in the program.

Almost half of the program's students dropped out and were not placed. Nearly one-fourth of so-called successful placements last less than a year in the job. And yet, Mr. President, this contractor had his contract renewed without competitive bidding.

In fact, none of these advanced training contracts—worth over \$40 million—are subject to competitive bidding. Again, we found poor performance and little accountability within Job Corps.

On October 4, 1994, the first oversight hearing in more than a decade on Job Corps was held by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and then-Chairman KENNEDY, at my request.

The essence of the testimony presented by the Department of Labor was that Job Corps was still an extremely successful program with minor problems. Reports of violence in the centers were dismissed as minor occurrences blown out of proportion.

Yet following the oversight hearing, I began to receive disturbing phone calls and letters from parents, former Job Corps students and Job Corps employees about the violence that existed throughout the program.

On December 13, 1994, Job Corps provided me with information on serious incidents of violence and drug use on Job Corps centers. I was told that 23 homicides were committed by Job Corps students between 1992 and 1994.

For the same period, there were nearly 300 sexual assaults, 993 incidents of violence, and 416 serious drug-related incidents, all taking place on Job Corps centers.

Worst of all, according to Job Corps' own figures, the program admitted 4,520 students with a criminal record, and 9,678 students with a history of psychological or emotional problems.

Mr. President, this flies in the face of the statute, which requires that Job Corps enrollees be screened in order to prevent admission of students who will disrupt the program. It seems this requirement is routinely ignored.

In January of this year, the Labor and Human Resources Committee held two days of oversight hearings to examine performance, accountability and the incidence of violence at Job Corps sites.

Only days before the hearings, a 19-year-old girl was murdered by three other Job Corps students just outside the fence of the Knoxville Job Corps center. The police described the murder as "ritualistic."

Testimony at the hearing confirmed the pervasiveness of violence and lack of discipline throughout the program. The most compelling witnesses were the students themselves. Rhonda Wheeler lasted 10 days at the McKinney Job Corps Center in Texas.

As for the violence on center, I saw twelve fights in the ten days I was there . . . I went to clerical class because that was one of my choices. Five minutes after I got there, two students started punching each other. Both were bleeding and one student picked up a typewriter and threw it at the other . . . Illegal drugs were rampant at McKinney . . . It was another one of those things that was part of the atmosphere of the place.

Fred Freeman, Jr., a former student at the Woodstock Job Corps center in Maryland, made this statement:

The second night I got my "blanket party." This was standard treatment for new guys. A blanket party for those not familiar with the term is when you are sleeping in your bunk, somebody suddenly throws a blanket over you, and eight to ten guys take turns punching and kicking you. I told the residential advisor after it happened. He said he would report it, but nothing ever happened.

Two weeks later, Freeman said:

Someone turned out the lights in the room and I was kicked and punched by him and his buddies. About 20 guys jumped me, and I got kicked from head to toe. After they left, my roommate took me down to the duty officer and they took me to Baltimore County Hospital. I had two cracked ribs and my right temple was swollen up like a balloon . . . No one got disciplined for the incident.

Shortly thereafter, the Knoxville Job Corps center was ordered closed by the Department of Labor. The McKinney Job Corps center was also closed, thanks in no small part to the compelling testimony of the young witnesses before the Committee.

Following the hearings, the Department of Labor agreed to take action to strictly enforce a One-strike-and-your-out policy on violence and drug use. Job Corps also identified, in conjunction with the inspector general, more than 25 Job Corps centers considered to be problem centers due to violence and consistent low performance.

While the new policy has helped, I am sorry to say the violence continues. About 6 weeks ago, a 20-year-old Job Corps student in Oklahoma was murdered by two of his classmates.

Last June, the General Accounting Office released the results of a study I requested they conduct of Job Corps. These results only reinforced the inspector general's earlier conclusions. Mr. President, I think the title of the report speaks for itself: "High Costs and Mixed Results Raise Questions About Program's Effectiveness."

The GAO reviewed outcomes for nearly 2,500 students terminees from six Job Corps centers. This is some of what they found:

Nearly 70 percent of the students dropped out before completing vocational training. Of the 30-percent who graduated with a job skill, nearly two-thirds found no work or found a low-paying, no skill job.

The percentage of students obtaining jobs that matched their training was only 13 percent. This corroborates the IG's earlier findings. GAO also found that half of the graduates who do get jobs only lasted two months or less at first job.

Mr. President, I know that Job Corps is circulating information to show that their performance has recently improved. My colleagues should be aware that none of the recent figures have been independently audited, and if their past records are any indication, Job Corps numbers are unreliable at best, intentionally misleading at worst.

The GAO also found that national training contractors who get paid substantial sums for finding students jobs, accounted for only 3 percent of all job placements. They also questioned the current Job Corps policy of awarding nine major national training contracts—at a cost of \$41 million annually—without competitive bidding.

The report also noted that 84 percent of Job Corps vocational training is in construction, a field in which the number of job openings have steadily declined.

Mr. President, why are we spending tens of million of dollars for training for jobs that don't exist? It is little wonder Job Corps' placement rate is so low. We do a great disservice to our youth if we give them the expectation of a job where none really exists.

The inspector general continues to question the improper use of millions of dollars spent by Job Corps contractors, including some of those awarded contracts on a sole source basis.

Some of the costs these contractors claimed were identified by the IG to include: liquor and dry cleaning bills for more than \$100,000; travel to China and South America by the president of one group; The son of the contractor's college tuition; \$500,000 for an office in Tokyo; \$300 a night rooms in resort hotels; and excessive salary increases and bonuses for company executives.

More recently, the inspector general found that Job Corps was forced to write off nearly \$1.76 million owed by terminated students during program years 1992 to 1994. The write-offs were partly the result of job placement bonus payments to students which later proved to be nonexistent.

Mr. President, I could go on and on with more facts and figures. But I think the case for reform is clear. Even more compelling than the facts and figures are the complaints I have received from students and staff across the program, as recently as this past weekend.

Let me conclude with an excerpt of a letter I received from a Job Corps recruiter, dated August 1 of this year. He writes:

I could not morally, ethnically or consciously send my friend's children and community members of Northeastern Wisconsin to these (Job Corps) centers and expect them not to be harmed physically and emotionally. . . .

. . . All in all, the program is very dysfunctional and mismanaged at all levels of operation. It needs to be reorganized. The best way of doing this is to block grant it to the states. Let the states have responsibility for assisting young adults into the program—the states have a stronger commitment in helping become productive and well-

rounded individuals. This is not happening under such a mismanaged oversized federal bureaucracy . . .

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will only perpetuate a national program that has clearly gone awry. I urge my colleagues to support true reform of the Job Corps Program, and reject the Specter amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I must reluctantly oppose the Specter amendment. This is clearly a difficult vote for many of us, particularly for those of us who strongly support Job Corps, because I know there will be many who argue that a vote against the Specter amendment represents a vote against the Job Corps Program. I want to make it very clear that my vote should not in any way be interpreted as a lack of support for the Job Corps Program. Quite the contrary is true. I have been a strong supporter of local Job Corps programs, and I believe my vote only reinforces that support.

Job Corps is our Nation's oldest, largest, and most comprehensive residential training and education program for unemployed and under-educated youth. It is also one of the best-loved Federal programs we have in place, and it has had strong bipartisan support over the past three decades. I have heard all the accolades showered on Job Corps here on the floor. I join my fellow Senators in their praises and I share in their endorsement of the program.

However, as Senator KASSEBAUM has pointed out, over the past decade, Job Corps has fallen short of its promise. At any one time, Job Corps serves around 44,000 young men and women at a cost of around \$23,000 per individual. That is a hefty investment. For the most part, it has been a worthwhile investment. But as hearings have shown, and as the Department of Labor and the inspector general have reported, there is increasing evidence that the program is not meeting the needs of students or remaining fully accountable to the taxpayer.

Clearly, reform is in order. Both sides of the aisle acknowledge this, the administration acknowledges this, and even Job Corps, I think, would acknowledge this. And I think Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator SPECTER largely agree on how we go about improving the program. For example, both require a zero tolerance policy on drugs, alcohol and violence. Both require an external audit to determine which centers are not operating efficiently and closes those that perform poorly. Both require increased community participation and integration into the State's overall workforce development system.

I also want to make it clear that the underlying bill language does not eliminate Job Corps. Nor does it eliminate or reduce the funding for the program. Both the Specter amendment and the underlying bill acknowledge the role of the Job Corps Program, and

there is certainly no intention of abolishing the program.

However, there is one major disagreement between the underlying bill and the Specter amendment. While the Specter amendment maintains the Federal oversight of the program, the Kassebaum bill places management for the program where it belongs: with the local communities.

In New Mexico, we have two outstanding Job Corps Centers, one in Albuquerque and one in Roswell. I have visited these centers, and I have seen first hand the kind of work they do. They each have a no-nonsense approach to placement and training, and they get results. They each have a proven record of success, and I anticipate they will continue with this track record under a statewide workforce development system.

I know local Job Corps have expressed concern that if we turn management over to the States, their administrative costs will go through the ceiling. The Department of Labor, for example, has estimated that the number of full-time staff will increase by 6.1 full-time administrative staff per center, and that annual administrative expenses will increase by \$650,301 per center.

Frankly, Mr. President, I don't think the Department of Labor is giving these centers enough credit. New Mexico's Job Corps Centers can do a better job than that. New Mexico's Job Corps Centers already actively seek strong community involvement. With increased local activity and control, our local centers can manage themselves more efficiently and can make an already successful program even better. But the Department of Labor would have us believing otherwise.

If I sound as if I have high expectations of New Mexico's Job Corps Center, it is because I do. Are my expectations unrealistic? I don't think so. If Job Corps is truly made an integral part of the statewide system—and if our Governors seek the input of Job Corps Administrators when developing their State plans, as I believe they will—I think the returns will be enormous.

I have full confidence that New Mexico's centers will continue in their remarkable records of success. When they have shown such promise, such a commitment to these young men and women, and have shown that their programs do make a difference, I think it would be a shame not to let them take control of their own programs. Why must we continue to insist that Federal management of the program is necessary to maintain the integrity of the program? Again, let's give our local centers a little credit.

I do not believe this program marks the end of Job Corps. If anything, I believe it marks a new beginning for a program with a great deal of potential. My vote today reflects my commitment to ensuring that Job Corp lives up to that potential by sending the de-

cision-making home and into the hands of those who have shown that they can produce results: the local communities.

Mr. President, I want to thank New Mexico's Job Corps Centers for all their input during this debate, especially the input of Sue Stevens, program director of admissions and placement. I want them to know that my vote reflects my full confidence in their abilities to continue Job Corps' tradition of excellence in New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has 3 minutes and 30 seconds; the Senator from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield myself 10 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would like to answer some of the questions that have come up during the course of this debate, but first I would like to thank the Senator from Ohio for an excellent statement on exactly why the language that is in the bill answers the concerns that we have for the population being served by Job Corps centers. This is one of the reasons I must oppose the amendment offered by Senator SPECTER and Senator SIMON.

What is of concern to us is the at-risk youth population. The Job Corps is not on the chopping block. The same amount of funding will go for Job Corps centers. The Denison center in Iowa is an excellent Job Corps center, and there is not any reason to believe that operation will necessarily change, except it will be under the responsibility of the State instead of the Federal Government. This means the State can contract with a private contractor to continue running the center or any center that is being run by a private contractor. That does not change for those centers.

As to the question about whether a Governor will be responsive, any Governor worth his salt is going to care about the population of his or her State. Certainly, the most vulnerable population is the one that we are trying to reach with improving and building on what was started with the Job Corps Program. The Job Corps was an excellent idea and is an excellent purpose still.

But, Mr. President, I hear over and over again that this is a very difficult group of young people to train and we should not expect a high success rate. I could not disagree with this view more. I think we do a disservice to the very young people that we are wanting to reach, and we are sending them a message that somehow they are at risk and this is the best they can do. When we fail to challenge at-risk youth we peg them by saying that the best they can do are menial jobs. Many times that is where they ultimately end up after

spending time in the Job Corps Program, and we will never help them to move toward a better future.

I will be glad to yield in just a moment.

Mr. HARKIN. I just have one question.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that in our desire to try and improve upon the record of the Job Corps centers. We are really wanting to say that we need to be able to look at a different delivery service that will help us meet a growing population, at-risk youth, and which I think can be held to greater success by stronger accountability.

Frankly, I think it is rather patronizing to suggest that these children cannot be motivated and accept the kind of discipline that they need to have to be higher achievers. We must do better, and we can do better.

Father Cunningham of Detroit, MI, who runs a program called Focus Hope, and has done a superb job with that program, takes inner-city youth from Detroit and turns them into machinists and engineers. He has a remediation program which increases the math and reading levels of at-risk youth at the third and fourth grade levels in 7 weeks. It can be done. I have seen other programs that do the same thing. He has a 6-month machinist training program that places graduates in jobs, often on an auto assembly line in Detroit earning \$12 to \$15 an hour to start. He has created a university-level school of engineering to train these same at-risk youth to be engineers at Chrysler and Ford and General Motors.

How has he done that? He does that by challenging them to be the best that they can be, by really making sure that they themselves are going to be self-disciplined enough to care about the program and strong work requirements that they have to meet.

That is what the Job Corps is supposed to be all about. I think we have seen a population that has changed since the beginning of the Job Corps Program, and we need to recognize that change and provide some of the requirements that will allow it to be what it should be.

I feel very strongly that we must recognize that we are falling short of the promise that the Job Corps Program has made. At a cost of almost \$23,000 per student each year taxpayers are not getting their money's worth. More importantly, the at-risk youth for whom the program was designed are all too often being left empty handed as well.

The placement rate was mentioned by the Senator from Iowa. Different figures will meet different facts. Maybe it is 73 percent; maybe it is a much lower rate. But the important thing is that the placement rate in the Job Corps Program right now is being based on finding a job for 20 hours. If a person finds a job for 20 hours, that then is the placement rate on which that percentage is based. I do not think

that is really the kind of figure that we need to strive for and I think we do a real disservice to the youth who are in the program.

In short, I feel strongly the Job Corps must change. Rather than leaving assistance for these vulnerable young men and women in the hands of the Federal Government, as the amendment before us offered by Senator SPECTER and Senator SIMON would do, S. 143 would return the program to where I believe it best belongs—the community.

I suggest, again, what S. 143 does not do, because there have been many myths that have gone around about what would be accomplished under the Workforce Development Act. It does not eliminate the Job Corps, and it is not just another job training program. It does not eliminate residential capability. That is entirely a decision that would be made by the Governor, and my guess is that where there is a residential program that is going well it will be maintained.

It does not reduce funding for the Job Corps, and Senator SPECTER, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for these funds, has always maintained a strong support funding level for Job Corps. It is in a section of a bill for at-risk youth. And if that amount of money is not used on the Job Corps center, as designed for use by the State, it stays with the at-risk youth program. It cannot be used somewhere else. As the Senator from Ohio says, it puts a star behind the at-risk youth, which is where we want to focus. It does not prohibit the use of Job Corps centers by private contractors. It will not prevent well-run centers from operating. It will not prevent construction of newly proposed centers. It does not prevent a State from recruiting nonresident students. It links Job Corps centers to the community and statewide training systems established under the bill. It gives States, not the Federal Government, the primary responsibility for the operation of the Job Corps centers. It eliminates wasteful national contracting abuses documented extensively by the GAO and the inspector general. It closes the 25 consistently poor-performing centers as determined by an independent audit. It establishes strong antiviolence and antidrug policies at the Job Corps centers and reforms the entire program by returning Job Corps to local control, which I believe can be and is a proven recipe for success.

I just suggest, Mr. President, that we sometimes have to be willing to be innovative and take some risks. This is not to, in any way, diminish the concept or the idea of the Job Corps program. It was a great concept when it was initiated. I believe it continues to have merit. I suggest that we are in a different time, with a different at-risk population of youth today that need to be addressed in a different way. It is not the same young men and women

today that need assistance that were once there when the program started. We have to be willing to change it here and provide some different guidance to make it a more constructive, successful program.

Mr. President, I reserve any time that I may have remaining.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, how much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes—30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield 1 minute 15 seconds to my cosponsor.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, someone said this does not kill the Job Corps. It sure severely wounds it. I have not had a letter from a single Governor saying we want to do this. Yet, the Job Corps in Denison, IA, and Golconda, IL, across State lines, takes care of people. That will not happen anymore.

Look at the language of the bill:

The State shall use a portion of the funds made available through the allotment to maintain the center . . .

A portion. That means 5 percent, 50 percent. Mostly, these are residential right now. You can be sure if the State can save that money and use it for some other purpose, they are going to knock out those residential centers. Make no mistake about it, if you vote against the Specter-Simon amendment, you are voting to severely wound the Job Corps.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know the proponents of the amendment wanted to speak last, so I will yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. President, the reason for the job Corps is probably more urgent today than at any other time. We set national priorities. We said the Head Start and other national programs are a national priority. We take the title I program for young people to try and bring them up, to try to make sure they are going to be competitive in our public education system. I think if we look around this country, these are the individuals that, without at least a helping hand, are going to fall into the class of the criminal element in our society.

This is the last best chance. The only problem I have with the Senator from Kansas is when she says we have problems and therefore we ought to take this rather dramatic step which, as I think the Senator from Illinois points out, can really undermine or end the program.

We say, let us do the evaluation and strengthen the program, let us build on this program, let us find out what needs to be done and deal with its particular problems. That is what this issue is. Are we going to give a focus and attention to the young people of this country that need focus and attention the most? I believe that is what is behind this amendment. I hope that it will be accepted.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

(Mr. GORTON assumed the Chair.)

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished colleague from Kansas when she says that we have a different group of youth. But I say that the differences in our society today from when the Job Corps was established, simply underscores the need for intensive job training and intensive care and intensive effort be made to see that the young people in America are trained to hold jobs and do not require welfare or enter the crime cycle.

My colleague and cosponsor from Illinois puts his finger on a key point, and that is that under a changed position of the bill there would be only an obligation to use a portion of the funds. Although we have \$1.1 billion allocated, that really is not too much.

Mr. President, the four Job Corps centers which are available in my home State of Pennsylvania have done really an outstanding job. I had occasion to visit the Job Corps training center in Denison, IA—an outstanding job. My able staffer, Craig Higgins, has visited Job Corps centers across the country and finds an outstanding job. It is true that there are some that need to be closed. Our bill, in a more modulated way, provides for closure of 10 Job Corps centers, plus more closures if it is determined, after an audit, that more ought to be closed.

I believe that in an era where we are looking to block grants, we ought to proceed with a bit of caution, and that a program like Job Corps, with remedial reform measures, as suggested by GAO and Senator KASSEBAUM, will enable Job Corps to complete this very important function.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point a letter to me from the National Job Corps Coalition, setting forth an impressive list of sponsors be printed in the RECORD; that a letter from the Pennsylvania Job Corps Leadership Coalition, with a recitation of a considerable number of student success stories, as compiled by the Pennsylvania Job Corps Leadership Coalition, be printed in the RECORD; that an open letter to Congress from the Secretaries of Labor and Assistant Secretaries endorsing the Job Corps center be printed in the RECORD; that a letter from Mayor Tom Murphy of the city of Pittsburgh be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL JOB CORPS COALITION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, DC, October 6, 1995.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: On behalf of the more than 70 undersigned organizations representing business, labor, non-profit, advocacy and volunteerism, we are writing to express our collective and strong support for the Job Corps amendment that you and Senator Simon will offer during consideration of S. 143, the Workforce Development Act.

This amendment reflects 3 decades of solid bipartisan support for Job Corps and its tra-

dition of success. Over the past 30 years, Job Corps has empowered more than 1.6 million of America's dis-advantaged youth to become responsible, tax-paying citizens.

We support the Specter-Simon Job Corps amendment because it preserves Job Corps as America's time tested national program for at-risk youth. It is the only program offering a unique combination of residential education, support services, job training and placement services. The amendment incorporates reforms suggested by the Inspector General, Department of Labor, Congressional testimony and General Accounting Office data. It should be noted that none of these reports and studies have recommended a state block grant approach as a means to improve or strengthen Job Corps' performance or accountability.

We are encouraged that the amendment preserves universal access to all eligible at-risk youth in need of Job Corps comprehensive services—regardless of where they live. Additionally, the amendment will continue to provide these youth access to strong national and regional labor markets for job placement. Overall, the Specter-Simon amendment codifies the strongest reforms to the program in Job Corps history. We support these reform efforts.

Senator Specter, we appreciate that you recognize that S. 143, as currently drafted, is counter to all other evaluations, recommendations and reforms offered in the spirit of helping young people through Job Corps. Your amendment will maintain Job Corps so that another 1.6 million youth will be able to participate in our nation's most effective residential education and training program.

Respectfully,

LAVERA LEONARD, ED.D.,
Chair, National Job Corps Coalition.

ORGANIZATIONS COMMITTED TO SUPPORT THE
SPECTER-SIMON JOB CORPS AMENDMENT

AFL-CIO Appalachian Council; AFL-CIO International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades; AFL-CIO International Union of Operating Engineers; AFL-CIO National Maritime Union of America; AFL-CIO United Auto Workers; Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.; American Youth Policy Forum; Association of Jewish Family & Children's Agencies; Bread for the World; Career Systems Development Corporation; Cavillo and Associates; Center for Law & Social Policy; Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma; Child Welfare League of America, Inc.; Children's Defense Fund; Chugash Development Corporation; Coalition on Human Needs; Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Council of Jewish Federations; Coyne American Institute; Dau, Walker & Associates; Dynamic Education Systems, Inc.; and DMJM/HTB.

Education Management Corporation; Empire State Organization of Youth Employment Services; Fresh Air Fund; FECS—New York City; General Electric Government Services; Grand Rapids Public Schools; Home Builders Institute, the educational arm of the National Association of Home Builders; International Masonry Institute; ITT Job Training Services, Inc.; Jobs for Youth—Boston; Jobs for Youth—New York; Joint Action in Community Service; League of United Latin American Citizens; Management and Training Corporation; The MAXIMA Corporation; MINACT, Inc.; National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies.

National Child Labor Committee; National Association of Social Workers; National Congress of American Indians; National Youth Employment Coalition; National Urban League; Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International; Opportunities Industrialization Centers for America; Pacific

Education Foundation; Puerto Rico Volunteer Youth Corps; Res-Care, Inc.; Teledyne Economic Development Company; Texas Educational Foundation; The EC Corporation; Training and Development Corporation; Training and Management Resources; Transportation Communications International Union; Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Indian Reservation; and Tuskegee University.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; U.S. Conference of Mayors; U.S. Department of Agriculture—Forest Service; U.S. Department of the Interior—Bureau of Reclamation; U.S. Department of the Interior—Fish and Wildlife; U.S. Department of the Interior—National Park Service; U.S. Department of Labor; University of Nevada—Reno; Utah Youth Employment Coalition; Vinnell Corporation; Wackenhut Educational Services, Inc.; Women Construction Owners and Exces.; Women in Community Service; American G.I. Forum Women; Church Women United; National Council of Catholic Women; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women; YWCA of U.S.A.; YWCA of Los Angeles; and Youth Build USA.

PENNSYLVANIA JOB CORPS
LEADERSHIP COALITION,
Edwardsville, PA, October 5, 1995.

Sen. ARLEN SPECTER,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I write on behalf of the Pennsylvania Job Corps Leadership Coalition to applaud your efforts to save Job Corps. The Amendment you and Senator Simon are cosponsoring is testimony to your support of this one-of-a-kind program. It is also a credit to your leadership and vision, as you have forged a bipartisan alliance that institutes reforms but retains Job Corps' national mission.

The PJCLC continues to be adamantly opposed to the Job Corps provisions of the Workforce Development Act (S. 143) as its passage would be detrimental to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and its four Job Corps campuses. S. 143 mandates the closure of 25 centers, but exempts those states with one or no centers. The burden of center closures would fall disproportionately on states with more than one center, such as ours. State management would force an untested Pennsylvania administrative system to operate the most complex and challenging of programs for at-risk youth.

The failure of your amendment would constitute a national tragedy as thousands of young people would be deprived of the opportunity that is Job Corps. Its passage will mean the chance of the American Dream for millions more. Thousands of Pennsylvanians stand tall in their support of the Specter/Simon Amendment to S. 143. Thank you for your unwavering commitment to and steadfast support of Pennsylvania and America's Job Corps.

Sincerely,

ERIC S. LERNER,
Chair.

PENNSYLVANIA STUDENT SUCCESS STORIES

Anthony R. Bowling, 25, graduate of the Keystone Job Corps Center.—Anthony is the first black police officer hired in Hazleton, PA. After graduating from Job Corps, he earned an associate's degree in criminal justice from Luzerne Community College, where he was named to the Dean's list.

Mark Berry, 25, graduate of the Philadelphia Job Corps Center.—Mark completed his training in business-clerical and is now employed as a computer analyst for PNC Bank

in Philadelphia. He earns \$25,000 a year. He attends college in the evenings, and he's majoring in business management. He wants to eventually operate his own computer programming business.

Etta Jones, 20, graduate of the Keystone Job Corps Center in Drums.—During her year-and-a-half stay in Job Corps, Etta earned her GED and enrolled in Luzerne County Community College through the Job Corps center's partnership with the college. She earned an associate's degree in human services. Now she works with mentally challenged individuals at the Allegheny Valley Schools. Her goal is to become a supervisor in the near future.

Delroy Bolton, 18, graduate of the Pittsburgh Job Corps Center.—Delroy trained in carpentry for his year-and-a-half in Job Corps. He served as president of student government. Now, he is employed as a carpentry apprentice for A&B Contractors in Pittsburgh.

Robert Hunt, 18, graduate of the Pittsburgh Job Corps Center.—Robert, a very recent Job Corps graduate, described himself before Job Corps as "a menace to his neighborhood." After nine months in the program, he says: "I am a better person. I will continue to be a positive person." He earned his GED through Job Corps and was vice president of the student government. He is now employed as a maintenance technician with ICF Corporation in Philadelphia.

Shao Xu, 28, graduate of the Keystone Job Corps Center in Drums.—Shao earned an associate degree in architectural engineering. He is currently a student at Temple University in Philadelphia completing a degree in architecture.

Crystal Mouzon, 22, graduate of the Philadelphia Job Corps Center.—Crystal is now employed as a secretary earning \$18,000 a year. "I'm a positive role model for the first time in my life," she said.

Grant Johnson, 20, graduate of the Red Rock Job Corps Center.—Grant trained in landscaping and is currently employed as a groundskeeper for Ninety Four, Inc. in Wilkes-Barre, PA.

Abby Eisenbach, 17, graduate of the Red Rock Job Corps Center.—Abby trained in building and apartment maintenance and is currently employed as a carpenter for Eric Anjkar, a custom wall builder. Abby's residential advisor described her as a "young woman with extremely low self-esteem from a troubled family who needed the structure Job Corps provided." While in Job Corps, Abby earned her GED. She was a dorm leader, a Big Sister, and a member of the Student Government.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS: KEEP JOB CORPS A NATIONAL PROGRAM

Job Corps is our country's most successful job training and education program for at-risk youths because it is a national program. The Workforce Development Act (S. 143), puts Job Corps' future in jeopardy. If passed, it will close 25 centers and turn operations of our nation's most challenging residential education and job training program over to the States. In 30 years, no state has successfully operated such a program. The legislation ignores Job Corps' solid track record of success and invites a risky and tenuous future.

This bill is in sharp contrast to all other job training consolidation recommendations including the House of Representatives CAREERS Act of 1995, which has strong bipartisan support.

Four million young people in the U.S. are in need of the basic education, job skills and job placement assistance only offered by Job Corps. Most youth who enroll in Job Corps

have inadequate education. Most do not have the skills or attitudes needed to find and keep good jobs. All are from poor families.

Job Corps is a solution for them. Over the years, Job Corps has helped 1.6 million young men and women become self-sufficient citizens. Job Corps is the nation's oldest, largest, most comprehensive and cost-effective residential education and training program for disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 24. Seven out of 10 graduates get jobs or enter further education. Job Corps works. Job Corps should remain a national program because: Job Corps is cost-effective.

Job Corps is a public-private partnership that ensures consistently good residential education and training services for young people. Residential services are among the most complex services offered to youth. Few states have the expertise or desire to take on this challenge.

Job Corps returns \$1.46 for every dollar invested in it through increased taxes paid by graduates and decreased costs of crime, incarceration and welfare.

Job Corps uses economies of scale to offer comprehensive services, including basic education, job training, counseling, social skills training, medical care, and leadership training. All this costs just \$65 a day per student.

Job Corps is accountable. No other job training program is so rigorously monitored. Job Corps is evaluated on national, regional, and local levels, by the private and public sectors, and by the Inspector General and Government Accounting Office.

Job Corps is also fiscally accountable to America's taxpayers. Those who complete the Job Corps program boost their earnings by 15 percent. While in Job Corps, young people jump an average of two grade levels. They are most likely to complete high school and attend college.

Job Corps is accessible. Job Corps has always been available to all eligible youth.

If the Workforce Development Act of 1995 passes, local youth will not have equal access to Job Corps. All young people in need of Job Corps' comprehensive services should have the opportunity to succeed—like millions before them—regardless of state boundaries. Job Corps graduates should also be able to continue crossing state lines to take advantage of strong job markets.

Job Corps is a part of its community. Job Corps centers work for youth and for their communities. Job Corps students across the U.S. have completed more than \$42 million in construction and service projects for their communities, including flood and disaster relief.

The American public, Congress and Administration should be proud of Job Corps. We implore the Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle to continue your support for Job Corps as a distinct national program.

PETER J. BRENNAN,
*Secretary of Labor,
Nixon Administration.*

W.J. USERY, Jr.,
*Secretary of Labor,
Ford Administration.*

RAY MARSHALL,
*Secretary of Labor,
Carter Administration.*

FRANK C. CASILLAS,
*Assistant Secretary of
Labor, Reagan Administration.*

MALCOLM R. LOVELL, Jr.,
*Assistant Secretary for
Manpower, Nixon
Administration,
Under Secretary of*

Labor, Reagan Administration.

DICK SCHUBERT,
*Deputy Secretary of
Labor, Nixon/Ford
Administration.*

ROGER SEMORAD,
*Assistant Secretary of
Labor, Reagan Administration.*

CITY OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, PA, September 1, 1995.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
*U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I understand that the Senate will be taking up Senator Dole's welfare reform package (H.R. 4) in the next few weeks. I am writing to express my concerns about the decision to incorporate Senator Kassebaum's workforce development consolidation legislation into this package.

First, as you know, I support efforts to consolidate our nation's training and employment programs. Members of the Pittsburgh Private Industry Council, appointed by me, assure me that clients, service providers and employers will all benefit from a more coherent workforce development system.

I do not believe, however, that welfare reform provides an adequate context in which to address workforce development consolidation. Although many welfare recipients receive services, employment and training programs benefit a much broader clientele. In order to ensure their diverse needs are considered, workforce development legislation deserves its own forum.

Such a forum would provide you and your colleagues with the opportunity to analyze the provisions of the Workforce Development Act in depth. At least two aspects require attention. First, local governance is still an issue. Although the legislation refers to local workforce development boards, there is no guarantee that these employer-driven boards will continue to play a strong role in the planning and implementation of employment and training programs. Having worked closely with the Pittsburgh Private Industry Council, I understand the extent of expertise and experience that members bring.

Second, the legislation contains a provision that jeopardizes the future of Job Corps. The Pittsburgh Job Corps center is vital to the region. Since 1972, it has provided opportunities for disadvantaged youth to develop the attitudes and skills required for productive employment. Given the high rate of unemployment, particularly among African-Americans, employment and training programs like Job Corps represent a critical component of our economic development strategy.

The proposed legislation would transfer governance of Job Corps to the states without providing any incentives for continued operation. Furthermore, twenty-five unspecified centers would be closed. In light of the evidence demonstrating Job Corp's success with at-risk populations, these measures are unjustified and should be stricken.

In summary, I urge you to support efforts to decouple the Workforce Development Act from H.R. 4. If these efforts are not successful, I request your assistance in ensuring that my concerns about local governance and the future of the Job Corps program are addressed.

Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely,

TOM MURPHY,
Mayor.

Mr. SPECTER. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-five seconds remain.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. How much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield briefly to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to respond to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Pennsylvania. They are absolutely correct in what they read. But the rest of the story is that all of that money, in that area, that title, has to be spent for at-risk youth. So it is not a question of the State being able to take part of that money and divert it over here for some other purpose. You cannot even use it for some other purpose that has to do with job training. It has to specifically be targeted at at-risk youth. To me, that is the significant part.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I appreciate the observation made by the Senator from Ohio. He is exactly correct. In the section of the bill that is "At Risk Youth" there is an authorization for \$2.1 billion, of that, \$1.1 billion is for Job Corps.

If there are any savings to be found in Job Corps with the elimination of extra administration layers that money stays with the at-risk program in this section.

I cannot stress enough that those centers being well run will continue to be well run. I appreciate the Senator from Pennsylvania saying that the intensive training and intensive care are things that we would all want to accomplish with these initiatives.

I believe strongly that it can be better done by the State than by the Federal Government at this point in time. I hope that my colleagues would oppose the Specter-Simon amendment.

I yield the floor and yield my time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 25 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand that it is the desire of the leader to conclude the debate on this and then move to the conclusion of the Ashcroft amendment, of which there was a 20-minute time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum to me from Craig Higgins and Jim Sourwine be printed in the RECORD, as well as a table on the impact of the Job Corps in Pennsylvania.

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

MEMORANDUM

OCTOBER 10, 1995.

To: Senator Specter.
From: Craig Higgins and Jim Sourwine.
Re: Staff visits to Job Corps Centers.

As per your direction, outlined below is a description of staff visits to Job Corps centers.

TIMBERLAKE JOB CORPS CENTER

January 1990, staff visited the Timberlake Job Corps Center outside of Estacada, Oregon. Estacada is a small town located high in the Cascade mountains about 2 hours from Portland, Oregon. It is a Civilian Conservation Corps center operated by the Forrest Service serving about 250 students annually. The strength of their training programs was in forestry related jobs, however, they did offer vocational training in some construction trades, culinary arts and building maintenance. What was most striking was that the majority of the students were not from Oregon, but from large urban areas, such as Detroit, Chicago and Los Angeles. Most of the kids had been uprooted from their "street life" in the city and been transported high in the mountains of the Northwest to study and receive vocational training. There was nothing else to do but to study. The nearest town was 8 miles down the mountain and was not much more than a gas station, a country store, and a post office. Therefore, according to the staff, the kids worked hard to finish their training so they could get back to "civilization." Additionally, the staff reported most of the students who completed their training did not return home to the big cities, but found jobs in the Northwest.

The Kassebaum bill establishes Job Corps as a state-based program and would eliminate the possibility of students from Chicago or Detroit from receiving training from a center in Oregon, Pennsylvania or Arizona. For some kids, being far from the home environment is just what they need.

WOODSTOCK JOB CORPS CENTER

In 1988 or 1989, staff visited the Woodstock Job Corps Center located in Randallstown, Maryland. This was a large center which served approximately 500 students annually. The majority of the students came from the Baltimore/Washington area. The bulk of the training offered was in the construction trades and the culinary arts. This was a clean, well organized, center on property which had once been a monastery. Center staff reported having good ties with local businesses in the construction trades, which made job placement once the training was completed easier. The one problem identified was the difficulty in getting to jobs in suburban communities due to the lack of transportation.

At the time of the visit, Center staff reported that while there were discipline problems, they were controllable and were not unexpected given the size of the center and the severely disadvantaged population they served. In recent years, however, the Center has had more serious problems with violence.

IMPACT OF JOBS CORPS IN PENNSYLVANIA

[Data for Program Year 1994 (July 1, 1994–June 30, 1995)]

| | In percent— | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| | Total overall placement rate (all terminees) | Placement rate job training match | Average hourly wage |
| Keystone JCC | 74.8 | 68.0 | \$5.61 |
| Philadelphia JCC | 90.4 | 61.0 | 6.28 |
| Pittsburgh JCC | 74.8 | 47.9 | 5.37 |
| Red Rock JCC | 80.1 | 66.5 | 5.53 |
| Pennsylvania Composite rates ... | 80.0 | 60.9 | 5.70 |
| National rates | 73.0 | 47.0 | 6.16 |

Note: Pennsylvania provided service for approximately 3,000 at-risk youth of which 65% were from Pennsylvania and 35% were from other states. Students average 2 grade level gains in an average of 7.5 months.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in conclusion I say that Congress has oversight; the committee, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Kansas,

can correct any problems which arise. When they do arise from time to time, that action can be taken.

I very much think we ought to keep this Job Corps with the corrections, but keep it a national program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that Senator PELL be added as an original cosponsor.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment offered by Senator Specter; that the Senate resume consideration of the Ashcroft amendment numbered 2893; that there be 20 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form on that amendment, to be followed by 4 minutes equally divided for debate on the Specter amendment, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Specter amendment; further, that following that debate there be an additional 4 minutes debate on the Ashcroft amendment numbered 2893, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Ashcroft amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2893

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Ashcroft amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] proposes an amendment numbered 2893.

Mr. ASHCROFT. 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 text of the amendment is located in the RECORD of Tuesday, October 10, 1995.)

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for providing this time for explanation and debate regarding the amendment I have proposed.

The amendment which I have proposed is an amendment which would allow us to target and focus our scarce job training resources on individuals who would be most likely to use those resources effectively, most likely to benefit from training.

The amendment requires random drug testing for all job training applicants. The number of the individuals tested and the frequency would be left to the localities. The amendment would also ask the States to test participants in the program based on a standard of reasonable suspicion. If an applicant or participant tested positive they could reapply after 6 months from the date of disqualification but they must show for reapplication that they passed a drug test within the last 30 days.

Mr. President, as the chart behind me indicates, 89 percent of all the manufacturers test for drug utilization; 88

percent of all people in the transportation industry. It is true that in the financial services sector only 47 percent of employers test for drugs. The fact of the matter is, however, we are not in the business of developing mutual fund managers. We are talking about applicants and participants who will seek jobs in major industries like manufacturing and transportation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we have a scarce resource, we ought to focus it on individuals who will be able to get jobs at the conclusion of the program. Those individuals who are going to be placed are the ones who are drug-free.

Let us not perpetuate the myth that you can travel down the road of drug utilization and job development at the same time. You cannot. The truth of the matter is if you want a job, you are going to have to be drug-free. These are the facts, and to suggest otherwise is both inaccurate and inappropriate.

So a vote "yes" for this amendment is a vote for the belief that a finite resource should be focused on individuals who are employable.

Are we interested in saving millions of dollars for the taxpayers? That is what the American people have asked us to do. Why should we spend thousands of dollars to train individuals who are going to hit this wall? Do we want to reduce the \$140 billion companies lose to drug-addicted workers every year?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 6 minutes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I yield myself another minute and 30 seconds.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse indicates that \$140 billion a year is lost in this country from theft, loss of productivity, accidents, and absenteeism related to drug use. Let us send a clear message that drug use is incompatible with the kind of productive employment necessary to our survival.

I think an intelligent policy is to say that we should have a random drug testing policy. Random testing will send a clear signal that drug utilization and job training are incompatible. A message that the Congress has failed to send in the past, but that we can and should send today.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri would require applicants and participants in job training programs to submit to drug testing. I am opposed to the amendment because it represents an unwarranted and unprecedented intrusion into the privacy of the thousands of ordinary Americans who use job training services.

In addition, the amendment is a costly and unfunded Federal mandate. One of the innovations of this job training bill is the degree of flexibility it gives States and localities. The Ashcroft amendment is completely out of step with that goal.

Drug testing has an important role in certain job training settings, just as it

has in certain workplace settings. But the proposal by the Senator from Missouri is overbroad, excessively expensive, and an example of the intrusive Federal policy role that this bill is designed to combat.

The vast majority of the people who will use the job training services authorized in this bill are upstanding citizens, not criminals. They are displaced defense workers. They are blue collar workers who have been laid off as a result of a factory closing. They are professionals seeking to improve their skills in specialized fields.

The Ashcroft amendment says to these people: If you want this assistance to try to improve your skills and obtain employment, you have to agree to submit to a Government test for possible drug abuse. I do not believe that the privacy of ordinary citizens hoping to improve their job skills should be routinely invaded in this intrusive manner.

The Government uses drug testing today for airline pilots, train conductors, and other employees involved in sensitive public safety tasks. If programs funded by this bill train people in sensitive jobs, there is nothing that would prohibit drug testing.

But routinely testing of everyone is too extreme. We do not do it in other programs, and we should not do it in this one.

We do not drug-test people seeking Government assistance in financing a mortgage; we do not drug-test flood or earthquake victims applying for disaster relief; we do not drug-test crime victims seeking assistance from the Federal Office of Victim Services; we do not drug-test farmers seeking crop subsidies.

We do not drug-test corporate executives seeking overseas marketing assistance from the Commerce Department.

Why are job training recipients singled out for this stigma? No case has been made that this population is more susceptible to drug abuse than the population at large.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri requires drug testing in two situations. First, every applicant to a job training program is subject to testing on a random basis. Second, participants in training programs are subject to testing based on reasonable suspicion of drug use. Both random basis and reasonable suspicion are undefined concepts. They raise the specter that excessive distinctions will be made based on stereotypes and prejudices.

As we have often been told, Washington does not have all the answers. We should not replace one set of Federal mandates with another set of Federal mandates. This bill is designed to maximize local flexibility, but the Ashcroft amendment goes in the opposite direction.

Indeed, the Ashcroft amendment would actually preempt some State laws. A number of State legislatures

have addressed the circumstances under which drug testing can be utilized, but the Ashcroft amendment would actually override the considered judgments of those legislative bodies and put in place a one-size-fits-all Federal mandate.

Drug testing on the scale contemplated by this amendment would be enormously expensive. By some estimates, 1 million Americans use the job training services included in this bill. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that the average cost of a drug test is about \$35.

That means it would cost \$35 million each year to administer an average of one test to each person. Either this amendment saddles local governments with a huge unfunded mandate, or it eats up a large portion of the Federal funds made available under this bill.

It is also important to note that drug testing technology is not infallible. Depending upon the type of testing technology that is used, as many as 4 percent of all drug tests result in false positives. That means that if a million drug tests are administered, some 40,000 Americans might be inaccurately labeled as drug users.

Of course there are often opportunities for appeals and confirmation tests and retests. But we should think long and hard before we adopt this amendment and subject tens of thousands of ordinary, law-abiding Americans to the Kafka-esque nightmare of being falsely accused of drug use.

The amendment requires those who test positive for drugs to obtain drug treatment. But who will pay for treatment? Right now, only a third of the Americans who need substance abuse treatment receive it because insurance coverage and public funding are inadequate. At the very moment that we debate this proposal, the Appropriations Committees of Congress are poised to slash Federal support for drug treatment. The House has already passed a bill that cuts Federal spending on drug treatment and prevention by 23 percent.

In light of that fiscal reality, it makes no sense to institute a massive new Government drug testing program.

Perhaps the intent of the Ashcroft amendment is to require local governments or job training programs themselves to pay for the treatment of those who test positive. That would at least guarantee that treatment is available, but it would cause the price tag of this amendment to reach an even more prohibitive level.

Finally, the amendment is objectionable because it may deter people who need job training services from seeking them. The threat of an intrusive drug test may put off drug users and non-drug users alike. We want to encourage people to improve their skills. We want to encourage the unemployed to become employed. We should not erect barriers to the services authorized in this bill.

Job training programs do not need the Federal Government to tell them

how to deal with drug abuse. They have the tools they need. Where drug testing is appropriate, it will occur. But a sweeping Federal mandate is completely unnecessary and excessively expensive, and I urge the Senate to reject this amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment is a complete conflict with the whole spirit of the legislation. Rather than the Federal Government and Congress setting the rules, leave this up to the States and local communities.

I have concerns about the privacy issue, concerns about the cost issue, preempting State laws, the whole issues on quality control for random tests and what the circumstances are, what the definitions would be for reasonable suspicion. There are all kinds of reasons.

Mr. President, 6 years ago we had a very similar amendment. It was focused on welfare recipients. We say we have scarce resources and we need to be careful with our spending. But simply because they are on welfare should we require drug testing? The Senate said no and that amendment was soundly defeated.

I do not know what it is about the workers of this country. The Senator has in effect said that the displaced Raytheon workers who built the Patriot missile ought to be required to take some kind of a test.

In this legislation, under the national activities, if there are hurricanes, as we have just had, there will be members of communities in south Florida who will be eligible for help and assistance. What does the Ashcroft amendment say? You have to go out and take a drug test. If you are going to have people take a drug test, what about farmers? Are we going to say, because we have had national disasters, you are going to have to go out and get a drug test? We do not say that to the small business men and women. We do not say that to all the students in the country. We do not say that to all the people who are going to get generous tax breaks on mineral rights. We do not say that cattle growers who are going to get benefits from the Federal Government must take a drug test first. Why are we picking out workers in this country? Where is the case for it? Where is the justification? Where is the right to do that? Yesterday it was the people on welfare. Today it is the American workers. The case has not been made. It is a mandate to the various States and communities. You are going to be preempting the States.

If there is a justification, for example in terms of safety, if there is a justification in terms of security—like airline pilots and those who are in public transportation—they have the right to go ahead and do that now. There is no prohibition against them doing it now. There is no prohibition, if they set up training programs where public safety is at risk, that prohibits them from going ahead. We give that flexibility to the local community. So why

should we superimpose a Federal mandate on it? It makes no sense. The case has not been met.

It may be a feel good amendment, but when we talk about scarce resources going to training—we see significant cuts in these programs in any event. And for the reasons the Senate soundly defeated a similar amendment just a few years ago, that targeted those individuals who are poor and needy and need some help and assistance, this amendment should be defeated as well. I do not think we ought to put at risk the workers of this country, who, generally because of the downsizing or because of mergers, are thrown off and become unemployed. It is clear that all they are trying to do is get into a training program and get a job, why should we threaten their rights of privacy.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I regret the fact that not everyone in the Senate was in attendance last night when we debated these issues.

The Senator raises the question of why deal with job training? It is because reality is going to deal with job training applicants and participants on drugs. Mr. President, 89 percent of the employers will test for them in manufacturing; 88 percent in transportation. Why do we not move that test up and help people get started down the right path, instead of going through some kind of training and then being hit by this wall. We do not have that problem in farming. There is not going to be a drug test that keeps a farmer from selling his cattle. That issue is totally specious.

I do not know why we choose to discuss the welfare situation here, but we just passed a welfare bill that provides that States may suspend benefits to welfare recipients who test positive for drugs. I do not know what we did in 1986, but I know what we did in 1995 and that is part of the welfare reform measure we just passed.

The point is we do have scarce resources. Why waste them on individuals who are not going to be employable when they are through with the work training program? Since the resources are scarce, let us focus them on the individuals who are responsible enough, who care enough about their families, who care enough about their future to be able to benefit from the training program because they are not high on drugs. Let us not stick our heads in the sand, while someone else is sticking a needle in his arm.

Let us say if you have to be drug free to work then drug testing ought to be a fundamental part of your training. You have to learn to be drug free because that is the way the work force is going to survive. It is that simple.

Let us not perpetuate a myth that somehow you can go down the dual highway, one of the roads being drug

utilization and the other road being job training or job seeking. The truth of the matter is, American industry is clear. Mr. President, 77 percent of all employers test for drugs, 89 percent in manufacturing, 88 percent in transportation.

We ought to send a signal loudly and clearly to individuals who are part of our training program. Part of your training is to adopt a lifestyle which will be productive and which will result in employability, not to persist in a lifestyle which will send you slamming into a wall of unemployment and despair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes. The fact of the matter is, many of the defense-related industries require reasonable cause, not just suspicion or random selection, which the Senator has talked about here. I do not know why the Senator has a feeling that all displaced workers, like the 12,000 workers that were laid off when Chemical Bank and the Chase merged the other day in New York City, is where the problem is. Why is it that the Senator believes that workers are more at risk than farmers are? Than family-farmers are? Where is the justification to say the workers who work in the States of this country, that work in plants, work in small business—may even be a homemaker, because homemakers are included in here—where is the Senator's justification for it? It just is not there. We have asked for the justification. He has not been able to demonstrate it. And I fail to understand why we would single out those individuals.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I am pleased the Senator asked the question, because I have the answer. The farmer who gets assistance does not have to pass a drug test before he sells his cattle. But the employee who seeks training will have to pass a test before he can be hired. In the latter case, the benefit is denied, the benefit for which the training was undertaken. That is the answer to your question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I listened. I was prepared to yield. I fail to understand why the farmer who gets price subsidies, which are taxpayers' dollars, are not expected to have a drug test but our workers are. I am not out there to say every farmer who gets price supports ought to have this kind of test, because the case has not been made for any such test.

If we are going to say about farmers or small business men and women the case has not been made, then they should not be tested. Why are you going to say the workers ought to be? That is what the Senator is saying. You have not made the case that there is a requirement, you have not shown that there is a need for it, and you do not set any other kinds of standards.

You say, return this activity to the States. What are the States going to do? They are going to use the least expensive methods, which in many instances are the most faulty systems.

There are standards which are established and should be established when you are talking about public safety and transportation, which are going to provide for the safety and well-being, the lives of the public. There should be standards and there should be adequate inspection and investigation and tests when necessary. We support that. There is nothing in the bill that denies anybody the opportunity to do it. But to suddenly say to those workers who are going to be affected by national activities, because of the hurricane you are going to be tested, or the homemakers, you are going to be tested. The Senator has not made the case.

I just wonder why we ought to be doing that, let alone preempting, which the Senator would do, any of the State laws that provide protections in terms of privacy, or set requirements in terms of various standards. You are preempting a number of State laws that are in effect, and you are effectively running over those.

The case has not been made for it. If the States want to be able to do it, there is no prohibition under the Kassebaum amendment. If there is a need for it, desire for it, if it is necessary, you can do it. I do not think the justification has been made that we should do it for all of those covered by the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Missouri has 1 minute 56 seconds, the Senator from Massachusetts, 3 minutes 12 seconds.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment. We have a limited number of dollars we devote to job training. We can either train people regardless of whether they use drugs, or we can decide to train people who are drug-free. If we train people who are drug-free, there will more people who will get jobs than if we train both the drug free and abusers of illicit drugs. It seems to me, if our ultimate objective is to train people to be employed, we should train people who care enough about working that they are willing to put aside a lifestyle of drug addiction and abuse.

In the end, the reason this amendment is worthy of our consideration is that 77 percent of all firms test for drug use. So, we can continue to waltz people along in the sleepy myth that you can be on drugs and get a job or we can embrace the truth.

Why waste the \$2,000 or \$4,000 in training a person only to have them disqualified when they get finished with the training? That is the difference between the farmer. That is the difference between the welfare recipient. There is reality at the end of the training. It is called employment and you cannot get it if you are on drugs.

I urge the Members of this body to respond, to allocate our training funds

to individuals who are drug-free. Thank you.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes and 12 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is interesting that in the Senator's amendment it provides that if an individual applicant fails the drug test, they can seek treatment through a drug treatment program. How much does the Senator think will be allocated for drug treatment programs?

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am not sure how much is available in drug treatment programs. There are drug treatment programs.

Mr. KENNEDY. How much does the Senator allow in his amendment? Does he expect the drug treatment programs to be paid for out of this?

Mr. ASHCROFT. No. There are separate funds available in every jurisdiction for drug treatment programs, some of which are Federal funds and some of which are State funds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator know what happened to those treatment programs in the appropriations bills this last year? They have been reduced by close to a quarter, Mr. President.

This amendment just does not make any sense.

I yield the remainder of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2894

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). There are 4 minutes remaining on amendment No. 2894 offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER.

Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes. Senator KASSEBAUM has 2 minutes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I would be prepared to yield back time.

Mr. SIMON. I will take 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there is no question that without the Specter amendment, we severely wound Job Corps. It is the only program we have working with at-risk young people which is really working, and working effectively. When the legislation says they have to use a portion of the money that we give to them to maintain Job Corps centers, they can use this for parole agents. It is revenue sharing with the States. It really is important. If you believe in helping at-risk young people in our Nation, pass this, the Specter-Simon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I want to say in closing that I think we have had a good debate on the pros and cons of the needs of the Job Corps program and at-risk youth.

I suggest that this debate is about whether the Federal Government should continue in the same way as it has in running the Job Corps programs, or whether the States can do a better job. Can the local community be more involved and bring about a greater sense of accountability and responsibility for helping this very vulnerable population, which with the right set of guidelines and expectations can achieve more than it has done.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Specter-Simon amendment, and to be willing to invest in trying to achieve even greater success with the Job Corps Program.

I yield back any time that I have remaining.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Specter-Simon amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and 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 New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 485 Leg.]

YEAS—57

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------------|
| Akaka | Feingold | Lieberman |
| Baucus | Feinstein | Mikulski |
| Bennett | Ford | Moseley-Braun |
| Biden | Glenn | Murkowski |
| Bingaman | Grassley | Murray |
| Boxer | Harkin | Pell |
| Bradley | Hatch | Pryor |
| Breaux | Hatfield | Reid |
| Bryan | Heflin | Robb |
| Bumpers | Hollings | Rockefeller |
| Burns | Inhofe | Santorum |
| Byrd | Inouye | Sarbanes |
| Campbell | Johnston | Shelby |
| Cochran | Kennedy | Simon |
| Conrad | Kerry | Snowe |
| Daschle | Kohl | Specter |
| Dodd | Lautenberg | Stevens |
| Dorgan | Leahy | Warner |
| Exon | Levin | Wellstone |

NAYS—40

| | | |
|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Abraham | Gorton | Mack |
| Ashcroft | Graham | McCain |
| Bond | Gramm | McConnell |
| Brown | Grams | Nickles |
| Chafee | Gregg | Nunn |
| Coats | Helms | Pressler |
| Coverdell | Hutchison | Roth |
| Craig | Jeffords | Simpson |
| D'Amato | Kassebaum | Smith |
| DeWine | Kempthorne | Thomas |
| Dole | Kerrey | Thompson |
| Domenici | Kyl | Thurmond |
| Faircloth | Lott | |
| Frist | Lugar | |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|-------|----------|
| Cohen | Moynihan |
|-------|----------|

So the motion was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2893

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, their will now be 4 minutes for debate on amendment No. 2893, offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT].

Who yields time?

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask for order in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

There will be 4 minutes of debate before the next vote. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Thank you, Mr. President. This amendment would provide for random drug testing for individuals in job training programs. The truth of the matter is that 89 percent of all manufacturers, 88 percent of all those in the transportation industry, 77 percent of all employers provide for drug testing prior to employment. If we expect for people who move through our job training programs to be really employable, we need to ask them to participate by getting drug free in the process. We need to send a clear signal that being on a track of drug use and job training or employability are incompatible and inconsistent tracks.

We have limited job training resources. We do not have enough to go around. Let us make sure that we use them well by saying that those individuals who are drug-free will be the individuals for whom we provide job training. To ask that individuals undergo random drug tests in job training is merely to reflect the reality of the marketplace where 89 percent of manufacturers will require it.

Let us not perpetuate a myth that somehow drugs are compatible with employment and that productivity and achievement are compatible with drugs. Let us say that we provide for random drug testing that will focus our job training resources on those who care enough to be drug free and will be employable upon the completion of the program.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. President, there are job training programs where this kind of testing is appropriate. When we talk about public safety, when we talk about the airlines, when we talk about the railroads, that is appropriate and that is permitted under this bill.

Effectively, what this Senator is saying is that every worker in this country is somehow under the suspicion of

drug usage. The case has not been made. The people eligible for these benefits are the people in Florida who suffered under Hurricane Opal. They are going to be the homemakers, they are going to be the displaced workers, they are going to be the 12,000 workers from Chemical Bank and Chase Bank squeezed out as a result of mergers.

The case has not been made. Random, there is no definition of random. Reasonable suspicion, there is no definition of what reasonable suspicion is. There is no definition of what the cost is, plus preempting the States.

In the Kassebaum bill, if there is a desire and need for that kind of testing it can be done locally. Why should we have an additional Federal mandate that is going to interfere with the workers of this country? We do not require it of farmers who get various benefits. We do not require it of small businessmen. We do not require it of defense contractors. We do not require it in the timber industry or the mining industry or those who use the public lands for grazing, who all get benefits. Why should we say to the workers who have been displaced with downsizing or mergers that you are going to be subject to this random testing? It was tried 6 years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 30 seconds.

We had a similar amendment to do it for all welfare recipients. That was rejected overwhelmingly. For the same reason it was rejected for welfare recipients, we ought to reject it for the workers of this country.

I yield back the remainder of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2893. 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 New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 486 Leg.]

YEAS—54

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Abraham | DeWine | Lott |
| Ashcroft | Dole | McCain |
| Baucus | Domenici | McConnell |
| Bennett | Faircloth | Murkowski |
| Biden | Feinstein | Nickles |
| Bingaman | Frist | Nunn |
| Bond | Glenn | Pressler |
| Bradley | Gorton | Reid |
| Brown | Gramm | Roth |
| Bryan | Grassley | Santorum |
| Burns | Gregg | Shelby |
| Byrd | Hatch | Simpson |
| Campbell | Hefflin | Smith |
| Coats | Helms | Stevens |
| Cochran | Hutchison | Thomas |
| Coverdell | Inhofe | Thompson |
| Craig | Kyl | Thurmond |
| D'Amato | Lieberman | Warner |

NAYS—43

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------------|
| Akaka | Hatfield | Mack |
| Boxer | Hollings | Mikulski |
| Breaux | Inouye | Moseley-Braun |
| Bumpers | Jeffords | Murray |
| Chafee | Johnston | Pell |
| Conrad | Kassebaum | Pryor |
| Daschle | Kempthorne | Robb |
| Dodd | Kennedy | Rockefeller |
| Dorgan | Kerrey | Sarbanes |
| Exon | Kerry | Simon |
| Feingold | Kohl | Snowe |
| Ford | Lautenberg | Specter |
| Graham | Leahy | Wellstone |
| Grams | Levin | |
| Harkin | Lugar | |

NOT VOTING—2

Cohen Moynihan

So the amendment (No. 2893) was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2895

(Purpose: To reduce the Federal labor bureaucracy)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator GRAMM of Texas, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], for Mr. GRAMM proposes an amendment No. 2895.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. 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 201, strike lines 18 through 22 and insert the following:

(B) SCOPE.—

(i) INITIAL REDUCTIONS.—Not later than the date of the transfer under subsection (b), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall take the actions described in subparagraph (A) with respect to not less than ½ of the number of positions of personnel that relate to a covered activity.

(ii) SUBSEQUENT REDUCTIONS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the transfer under subsection (b), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall take the actions described in subparagraph (A)—

(I) with respect to not less than 60 percent of the number of positions of personnel that relate to a covered activity, unless the Secretaries submit (prior to the end of such 5-year period) a report to Congress demonstrating why such actions have not occurred; or

(II) with respect to not less than 40 percent of the number of positions of personnel that relate to a covered activity, if the Secretaries make the determination and submit the report referred to in subclause (I).

(iii) CALCULATION.—For purposes of calculating, under this subparagraph, the number of positions of personnel that relate to a covered activity, such number shall include the number of positions of personnel who are separated from service under subparagraph (A).

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. This amendment pertains to provisions of S. 143 dealing with reductions in the Federal work force, as we consolidated offices at the Federal level to oversee the new work

force development system. This language was worked out with the Senator from Texas, and I believe it is acceptable on both sides.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I urge the support of the amendment, which clearly is in focus with what the intention is for this legislation—that is, the reduction of personnel and manpower.

There has been a dramatic reduction in the period of the last 3 years. That flow line we expect to continue. This establishes some additional benchmark to be able to achieve it.

I think it is a reasonable amendment. I hope it would be accepted.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 2895.

The amendment (No. 2895) was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. 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.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would like to discuss the important issue of encouraging competition between the private and public sectors in the delivery of training and employment services at the State and local levels.

As you know, the Workforce Development Act consolidates nearly 100 separate education and job training programs into a single, universal work force development system through block grants to the States.

I want to commend the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Alliance of Business, and other business groups for their efforts to help shape legislation to restructure the Nation's education and training system. These representatives of the business community are advocating a comprehensive work force development system that is market-based, customer-driven, and that gets results.

Would the Senate majority leader, my colleague from Kansas, please comment on the role of business in restructuring Federal training programs?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Kansas. America needs a work force that is trained for private sector occupations—especially those generated by small businesses and entrepreneurs—that will help ensure a competitive U.S. economy. I believe the system must be private sector driven to ensure it is flexible and responsive to the evolving dynamics of the labor market, international competition, and technological advances over the coming years and decades.

I believe small business should be able to compete with the public sector in the delivery of training and employment services and in the operation of the one-stop centers. If the consolida-

tion of Federal programs is to adequately reflect the realities of today's labor market, business—particularly small business—absolutely must play a lead role in ensuring workers are equipped with the skills needed by America's employers. Incorporating competition and free market principles into training services at the local level will also encourage public sector programs to operate more effectively. Opportunities for private-public sector competition in the implementation of local work force development plans is an area strongly pursued by U.S. business interests. In particular, I want to recognize the work by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers in this area and welcome their input in education and job training services on behalf of small business.

Does the distinguished chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee agree on the unique role of small business?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the bill I introduced enables both local chambers and small businesses to compete with the public sector in the course of restructuring the Federal training system. I believe local chambers of commerce—in addition to small businesses—are uniquely positioned to operate one-stop centers and to serve as training providers. Today, local chambers are leading the way in many of the Nation's most innovative and effective work force development initiatives. I understand the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has undertaken a major initiative to mobilize local chambers of commerce to be in the vanguard in this effort to revolutionize training for America's private sector.

Similarly, regional and local affiliates of the National Association of Manufacturers serve as a strong intermediary source in bringing business, education and government leaders together at the State and community level to form meaningful and sustained work force development programs.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kansas for opening discussion on the important role that business brings to the table. With strong private sector input, efforts to turn primary responsibility for education programs to the State and local levels will hold much promise.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I appreciate the comments from the Senate majority leader on this important issue and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the chamber of commerce with an accompanying statement.

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

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC, October 5, 1995.

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:
The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, representing 215,000 businesses, 3,000 state and local chambers of commerce, 1,200 trade and professional associations, and 73 American

Chambers of Commerce abroad, urges your support for the Workforce Development Act (S. 143), which is scheduled for floor consideration on October 10.

The Workforce Development Act, sponsored by Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS), contains many provisions that the Chamber supports. S. 143 would consolidate and decentralize roughly 100 federal education and training programs into a simpler, integrated block grant system for states. The bill also would enable small businesses and local chambers of commerce to compete with the public sector in the delivery of education and training services; recognize the important role of business in the design and implementation of the new system; and promote the effective use of technology and the development of labor-market information to orient education and training services.

In addition to these provisions, the Chamber is encouraged that the Workforce Development Act maintains the important goal of preparing students and workers for skills needed in the modern workplace. S. 143 aims to achieve this goal by adopting many new approaches to workforce development. Examples include promoting the use of vouchers rather than funding streams for institutions and programs; establishing user-friendly, one-stop delivery centers where individuals and employers can share and obtain relevant job information; opening the door to new measures of accountability rather than relying on the old measure of bureaucratic processes; and encouraging the creation of effective business-education partnerships.

Many, if not most, of these provisions are found in the Chamber's policy statement on restructuring the federal training and employment system. A copy of this statement is attached, for your review.

For American business, the knowledge and skills of employees are the critical factors for economic success and international competitiveness. The Workforce Development Act embodies language that can help achieve this end by creating a world-class workforce development system that is responsive to today's skill needs. Again, we urge your support for S. 143, and your opposition to any weakening amendments. Doing so will dramatically enhance the possibility of enacting meaningful workforce development legislation during the 104th Congress.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,
Senior Vice President,
Membership Policy Group.

STATEMENT ON RESTRUCTURING THE FEDERAL
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SYSTEM

The U.S. Chamber recognizes that America's training and employment system is inadequate to meet the demands of rapidly evolving technologies and intensifying global competition. The current system is fragmented and duplicative, and often fails to provide workers and employers with the fast and effective training and placement services they need. Equally compelling is the fact that growing numbers of workers are becoming permanently displaced through structural changes in government policy and corporate restructuring, as opposed to cyclical changes in the economy. These weaknesses in the existing work-to-work transition system need to be resolved.

The U.S. Chamber, therefore, supports restructuring the federal training and employment system to make it more responsive to the needs of dislocated workers and skill requirements of employers. To be effective, it is essential that the new system reflect the following principles:

The business community must be centrally involved in all phases of the restructured system's design, development, operation, and evaluation.

The new system must not impose any new federal mandates or regulatory burdens upon employers. It must not be financed through the creation of a new tax or an increase in any current tax on business.

The new system should assist workers in pursuing job search and placement assistance, career advancement, and a career change. Services must be delivered as promptly and effectively as possible to help employers make quicker and less costly connections with prospective employees. Training services must reflect the local and regional skill needs of employers.

Information regarding career and training services should be offered competitively at the local level. Service providers may include representatives of the private sector. The creation and governance of the streamlined system must be business led. Attempts should be made to factor in the education, employment and training programs of all federal agencies.

There must be sufficient state and local flexibility incorporated into the design and implementation of the new re-employment system. Provisions to maintain accountability and standards of quality at the state and local level should be a part of the national restructuring plan.

The current labor market information system must be strengthened and enhanced. Voluntary occupational skills standards should be integrated into this system, so dislocated workers can know exactly what types of skills they will need for certain occupations.

In addition to strengthening state and local flexibility, the private sector should be encouraged to compete for the delivery of education, employment and training services. One way to help spur local competition and encourage public sector programs to operate more efficiently is to put financial resources directly in the hands of individuals to pursue private or public sector postsecondary education and training. The overall goal should be to improve the learning and achievement of individuals and help them to succeed in the workplace of the 21st century.

Block grants are considered a viable mechanism for diminishing control from the federal government and increasing state and local flexibility. State and local workforce development plans emerging from the block grants must maintain the goal of preparing students and workers for skills needed in a high performance workplace. Appropriate performance and skill standards and accountability measures should be incorporated into state and local programs that emanate from the block grant system.

Mr. SIMON. Is it not your understanding that nonresidential programs for at-risk youth described under section 161(b) (2) and (3) of the bill, could be provided by local, community-based organizations?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes, of course. The States could elect to provide these services through such organizations or other organizations in the private sector.

AMENDMENT NO. 2896

(Purpose: To make amendments with respect to museums and libraries)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator JEFFORDS and myself and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 2896.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the House of Representatives recently approved the Careers Act which contains extensive provisions regarding library services. This is the companion bill to the legislation we are now considering and the bill the House will bring to conference, Senate bill 143.

I am of the mind we should have library services provisions formally on the table when we go to conference with the House. Thus, the amendment now being offered would include the Institute of Museum and Library Services reauthorization as part of S. 143.

Those provisions stress the importance of both museums and libraries to literacy, economic development and most importantly, the work force development, all of which are relevant and important to the bill now under consideration.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment is or should be considered non-controversial, and I urge its approval.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator PELL, and myself which would incorporate the Institute of Museum and Library Services as part of S. 143, the Workforce Development Act of 1995.

Libraries have been key players in developing literacy programs and it only makes sense to include the Institute for Museum and Library Services [IMLS] as part of this bill today. The problem of illiteracy is of great concern to me and I believe that we should not pass up this opportunity today to recognize the power and purpose that libraries have in dealing with this problem and finding solutions to it. Libraries have made a positive impact in communities throughout the Nation and have been instrumental in enhancing educational and lifelong learning opportunities. Because of its focus on literacy as well as workforce and economic development, I believe that ensuring that the IMLS is part of the S. 143 is an action which will benefit individuals in all of our States. The Pell/Jeffords amendment today represents a holistic and winning approach to lifelong learning.

Mr. President, I am especially pleased that the Artifacts Indemnity Act has been included as part of this amendment. The Indemnity Program, created in 1975, has been an extraordinarily successful program. I believe that there has been only one claim for a very modest amount of money since it first began 20 years ago. Over the

years, I have had many opportunities to speak with museum directors who have shared with me their thoughts on the importance of this program along with frustrations regarding the difficulty they have had in getting insurance for their exhibitions to travel throughout the United States, or for bringing some of the great U.S. exhibitions to their region. In response to those conversations, an extension of the indemnity program for domestic exhibitions has been included. We have also moved administration of this program to the Institute of Museums and Library Services, which I believe is a sensible and logical change that will only enhance the program's successes.

So again, I would like to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for offering his assistance in crafting this amendment and look forward to its adoption.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I do not believe there is an objection on either side of the aisle regarding this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is right. We appreciate the Senator bringing this to the attention of the Members. We hope it will be included.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I urge the adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2896) 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2897

(Purpose: To make technical amendments)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] proposes an amendment numbered 2897.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. 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 line 19, strike lines 5 through 14 and insert the following:

(35) WELFARE RECIPIENT.—The term "welfare recipient" means an individual who receives welfare assistance.

On page 50, strike lines 7 through 12 and insert the following:

viduals to participate in the statewide system; and

(N) followup services for participants who are placed in unsubsidized employment.

On page 65, lines 5 and 6, strike "section 103(a)(1)" and insert "this subtitle for workforce employment activities".

On page 69, line 10, strike "and" and insert a comma.

On page 69, line 14, strike "and" and insert "or".

On page 70, line 7, strike "and" and insert "or".

On page 70, line 14, strike "and" and insert "or".

On page 70, line 19, strike "and" and insert "or".

On page 70, line 20, strike "to" and insert "for".

On page 71, line 12, strike "and" and insert "or".

On page 71, line 21, strike "and" and insert "or".

On page 96, strike line 6 and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) NEGOTIATION AND AGREEMENT.—After a Governor submits

On page 96, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(B) WORKFORCE EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out activities under this section, a local partnership or local workforce development board described in subsection (b) may make recommendations with respect to the allocation of funds for, or administration of, workforce education activities in the State involved, but such allocation and administration shall be carried out in accordance with sections 111 through 117 and section 119.

On page 108, strike lines 10 through 12 and insert the following:

(A) welfare recipients;

In subparagraph (B)(ii) of the matter inserted on page 114, after line 14, strike "reduce" and insert "reduce by 10 percent".

In subparagraph (C)(iii) of the matter inserted on page 114, after line 14, strike "strategic plan of the State referred to in section 104(b)(2)" and insert "integrated State plan of the State referred to in section 104(b)(5)".

After subparagraph (D) of the matter inserted on page 114, after line 14, insert the following:

(E) DEFINITION.—As used in this paragraph, the term "portion of the allotment"—

(i) used with respect to workforce employment activities, means the funds made available under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 103(a) for workforce employment activities (less any portion of such funds made available under section 6 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49e)); and

(ii) used with respect to workforce education activities, means the funds made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 103(a) for workforce education activities.

On page 175, line 25, strike "; and" and insert a semicolon.

On page 176, line 2, insert "and" after the semicolon.

On page 176, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(E) career development planning and decisionmaking;

On page 176, line 11, strike the period and insert ", including training of counselors, teachers, and other persons to use the products of the nationwide integrated labor market and occupational information system to improve career decisionmaking."

On page 184, lines 18 through 20, strike ", which models" and all that follows through "didactic methods".

On page 222, line 10, strike "from" and insert "for".

On page 239, line 19, strike "of" and insert "of the".

On page 248, line 23, strike "98-524" and insert "98-524".

On page 250, line 11, strike "and" and insert "and inserting".

On page 255, line 25, add a period at the end.

On page 290, line 14, strike "to" and insert "to the".

On page 290, line 17, strike "(a) IN GENERAL.—"

Beginning on page 290, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 291, line 5.

On page 292, strike lines 9 through 12 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(a) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 49b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

On page 293, strike lines 2 through 13 and insert the following:

tion."

On page 294, lines 9 through 14, strike "subsection (b)" and all that follows through "(2)" and insert "subsection (b)(2)".

On page 296, line 12, strike "to" and insert "to the".

On page 304, line 6, strike "members" and insert "member's".

On page 309, lines 20 and 21, strike "technologies" and insert "technologies".

On page 311, line 7, strike "purchases" and insert "purchased".

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, this is an amendment that bears technical and conforming amendments that I believe has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we urge the acceptance of this amendment and appreciate the working out of the technical issues which have been included in this proposal.

We urge the Senate to accept it. The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2897) was agreed to.

THE REPEAL OF THE MCKINNEY ACT PROVISIONS FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Mr. DOMENICI. I would first like to thank Senator KASSEBAUM for her excellent work on this long-awaited legislation to improve the delivery of America's work force training and education programs. This is a mammoth task well done, and I look forward to final passage this morning. Let me say, however, that I have a serious concern about homeless children that I would like to clarify with the Senator.

The legislation before us in its present form repeals the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act provisions for the Homeless Children and Youth Program. I believe this is an oversight and I agree with the chairman's intent to repeal the McKinney Act job training provisions to include them in this much improved legislation for those purposes. Unfortunately, the repeal language includes a repeal of the program for homeless children. This critical program helps homeless children to enroll in and attend school.

Before the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, almost half of all school aged homeless children were not in school at any given time. The very poor attendance was caused in large part by school policies that did not take into account the unique problems of homeless families.

Residency requirements, for example, often prevented homeless families from enrolling their children in school because by definition a homeless family did not have an address that could be used to prove residence in a district. Furthermore, because a number of

shelters only allowed people to stay for 30 days at a time, homeless families were often forced to move from shelter to shelter.

If these shelters were zoned for different schools, as is often the case, the children were forced to transfer as frequently as the families moved. This is a most difficult hurdle for any family, and more so for homeless families. Frequent school changes impede rather than promote the education of homeless children. Transfer of records between schools slowed the process even more, often keeping children out of school for weeks at a time.

To address this problem, we created the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program in the McKinney Act. This program for homeless children requires States and local governments to ease the types of barriers I have described and to improve the support mechanisms for homeless children in schools. This program also provides money to States to identify homeless students, ease transfers and placements, and provide tutoring and school supplies.

I am proud to say that this program has made a difference. Since 1987, school attendance by homeless children nationally has risen from 50 percent to 82 percent and continues to increase each year. These improvements occur despite the fact that the number of homeless children continues to rise with the number of homeless families, as reported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

For homeless children, education will be their best chance to break the cycle of poverty. This McKinney Act program ensures that homeless children will have access to that chance. Now is not the time to repeal this program.

I understand, Senator KASSEBAUM, that you have indicated your support for the continuation of the McKinney Act Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program. Since the technical language of S. 143 repeals this program along with job training for homeless adults, I also understand that it is your intention to revisit this matter in conference.

I hope the Senator can reassure me that it is not her intent to repeal the McKinney Act program for homeless children, and that she will work in conference to assure that the final bill contains explicit protections for homeless children so that the progress we have made in helping homeless children continues.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes, I support the McKinney Act program for homeless children, and I appreciate the effort of the Senator from New Mexico in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I assure the Senator and the Senate that I will work in conference to protect this program for homeless children by accepting language to ensure its continuation. I thank the Senator on behalf of homeless children and their families. They

know the full benefits of this McKinney Act program for school placement and support and should have every assurance of its continuation.

NOTE

Due to a printing error, a statement by Senator HARKIN on page S14840 of the RECORD of October 10, 1995, appears incorrectly. The permanent RECORD will be corrected to reflect the following correct statement.

SUPPORT OF THE PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Disability Policy, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the applicability of S. 143, the Work Force Development Act, to individuals with disabilities.

I would like to compliment Senator KASSEBAUM, the sponsor of the legislation and chair of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, and Senator FRIST, the chair of the Subcommittee on Disability Policy, for including specific provisions in S. 143 that will enhance our Nation's ability to address the employment-related needs of individuals with disabilities, including individuals with significant disabilities. I am particularly pleased that these provisions were developed on a bipartisan basis and enjoy the broad-based support of the disability community.

On January 10, 1995, the Labor Committee heard testimony from Tony Young, on behalf of the employment and training task force of the Consortium for Citizens With Disabilities. CCD urged the Senate to recognize the positive advances made in the 1992 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and to take a two-pronged approach to addressing the needs of individuals with disabilities in our jobs consolidation legislation. I am pleased that the Senate bill adopted this two-pronged approach.

Under prong one, S. 143 guarantees individuals with disabilities meaningful and effective access to the core services and optional services that are made available to nondisabled individuals in generic work force employment activities and to work force education activities described in the legislation, consistent with nondiscrimination provisions set out in section 106(f)(7) of the legislation, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act.

The commitment to ensuring meaningful and effective access to generic services for individuals with disabilities is critical. Advocates for individuals with disabilities have often expressed concern that many current generic job training programs such as JTPA have not met the needs of individuals with disabilities. Ensuring access to generic services is critical for many people with disabilities who can benefit from such services.

The promise of access to generic services is also illustrated through

other provisions in S. 143. The purposes of the bill—(section 2(b))—include creating coherent, integrated statewide work force development systems designed to develop more fully the academic, occupational, and literacy skills of all segments of the population and ensuring that all segments of the work force will obtain the skills necessary to earn wages sufficient to maintain the highest quality of living in the world. The content of the State plan set out in section 104(c) of S. 143 must include information describing how the State will identify the current and future work force development needs of all segments of the population of the State. The term all is intended to include individuals with disabilities.

The accountability provisions in S. 143—(section 121(c)(4))—specify that States must develop quantifiable benchmarks to measure progress toward meeting State goals for specified populations, including at a minimum, individuals with disabilities.

Under S. 143, State vocational rehabilitation agencies must be involved in the planning and implementation of the generic system. For example, under section 104(d) of S. 143, the part of the State plan related to the strategic plan must describe how the State agency officials responsible for vocational rehabilitation collaborated in the development of the strategic plan. Under section 105(a) of S. 143, the work force development boards must include a representative from the State agency responsible for vocational rehabilitation and under section 118 of S. 143, local work force development boards must include one or more individuals with disabilities or their representatives.

Under prong two the current program of one-stop shopping for persons with disabilities, particularly those with severe disabilities, established under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended most recently in 1992, is retained, strengthened, and made an integral component of the statewide work force development system.

The current vocational rehabilitation system has helped millions of individuals with disabilities over the past 75 years to achieve employment. Since the 1992 amendments, the number of individuals assisted in achieving employment each year has increased steadily. In fiscal year 1994, 203,035 individuals achieved employment, up 5.8 percent from fiscal year 1992, the year just prior to the passage of the amendments. Data for the first three quarters of fiscal year 1995 show a 8.4 percent increase in the number of individuals achieving employment as compared to the first three quarters for fiscal year 1994.

In fiscal year 1993, 85.7 percent of the individuals achieving employment through vocational rehabilitation were either competitively employed or self-employed. Seventy-seven percent of individuals who achieved employment as a result of the vocational rehabilitation program report that their own in-

come is the primary source of support rather than depending on entitlement or family members.

The percent of persons with earned income of any kind increased from 21 percent at application to 90 percent at closure. The gain in the average hourly wage rate from application to the achievement of an employment outcome was \$4.36 per person. Of the individuals achieving employment in fiscal year 1993, their mean weekly earnings at the time of their application to the program was \$32.20, compared to \$204.10 at closure, an average weekly increase of \$164.90.

In 1993, the General Accounting Office [GAO] found that an individual who completed a vocational rehabilitation program was significantly more likely than an individual who did not complete the program of working for wages 5 years after exiting the program. In addition, the GAO found that individuals who achieved an employment outcome demonstrated four times the gain in wages compared to the other groups studied.

I am also pleased to share with my colleagues the positive impact that vocational rehabilitation is having in my home State of Iowa. During fiscal year 1993-94, 5,717 Iowans with disabilities were rehabilitated through the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services [DVRS]. At referral to DVRS, 33 percent have weekly earnings; at closure the rate went to 98 percent. Average weekly earnings rose from \$49.94 at referral to \$229.45 at closure. In addition, the Iowa Department for the Blind provided 765 blind persons with vocational rehabilitation services. At closure the average weekly income was \$352.00. Seventy-three percent of those rehabilitated found work in the competitive labor market, including work in occupations such as psychologist, tax accountant, teacher, food service, and radio repair.

Mr. President, as I explained previously in my remarks, under S. 143, title I of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended most recently in 1992, is not repealed; rather it is retained, strengthened, and made an integral component of the statewide work force development system.

For example, the findings and purposes section of title I of the Rehabilitation Act are amended to make it clear that programs of vocational rehabilitation are intended to be an integral component of a State's work force development system. Further, the amendments clarify that linkages between the vocational rehabilitation program established under title I of the Rehabilitation Act and other components of the statewide work force development system are critical to ensure effective and meaningful participation by individuals with disabilities in work force development activities.

Section 14 and section 106 of title I of the Rehabilitation Act pertaining to