

**SEC. 502. FUNDING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENTS AT MENWITH HILL AND BAD AIBLING STATIONS.**

Section 506(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-93; 109 Stat. 974) is amended by striking out "for fiscal years 1996 and 1997" and inserting in lieu thereof "for fiscal years 1998 and 1999".

**SEC. 503. MISUSE OF NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE NAME, INITIALS, OR SEAL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"§426. Unauthorized use of National Reconnaissance Office name, initials, or seal**

"(a) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Except with the joint written permission of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence, no person may knowingly use, in connection with any merchandise, retail product, impersonation, solicitation, or commercial activity, in a manner reasonably calculated to convey the impression that such use is approved, endorsed, or authorized by the Secretary or the Director, any of the following:

"(1) The words 'National Reconnaissance Office' or the initials 'NRO'.

"(2) The seal of the National Reconnaissance Office.

"(3) Any colorable imitation of such words, initials, or seal.

"(b) INJUNCTION.—(1) Whenever it appears to the Attorney General that any person is engaged or is about to engage in an act or practice which constitutes or will constitute conduct prohibited by subsection (a), the Attorney General may initiate a civil proceeding in a district court of the United States to enjoin such act or practice.

"(2) Such court shall proceed as soon as practicable to the hearing and determination of such action and may, at any time before final determination, enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or take such other action as is warranted, to prevent injury to the United States or to any person or class of persons for whose protection the action is brought."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of that subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

"426. Unauthorized use of National Reconnaissance Office name, initials, or seal."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOSS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 858, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 1775 as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1775) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to S. 858 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of the Senate bill, and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GOSS, YOUNG of Florida, LEWIS of California, SHUSTER, MCCOLLUM, CASTLE, BOEHLERT, BASS, GIBBONS, DICKS, DIXON, SKAGGS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. SKELTON and Mr. BISHOP.

From the Committee on National Security, for consideration of defense tactical intelligence and related activities:

Messrs. SPENCE, STUMP, and DELUMS.

There was no objection.

**CARL D. PERKINS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997**

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 187

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution. The proposed rule is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The resolution waives points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI relating to the 3-day availability of the report.

After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Furthermore, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the name of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides the Chair may accord priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, under the proposed rule, each Member has an opportunity to have their concerns addressed, debated, and ultimately voted up or down by this body. House Resolution 187 was reported out of the Committee on Rules by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 187, which is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

This act is named for the long-time chairman of the Education and Labor Committee who was a champion of educational opportunity for all Americans but especially for those who would not attend college but needed skills in order to find a meaningful place in America's work force.

The continued availability of secondary and postsecondary vocational educational opportunities in concert with high economic goals is critical to ensuring that this Nation is equipped with a work force that can be competitive and productive in today's global economy.

I am concerned, however, that the bill reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce does not direct the funding toward those secondary school districts most in need of funding for their vocation and technical education programs. I am also concerned the reported bill eliminates the act's original emphasis on ensuring that women, minorities, the economically disadvantaged, and the disabled have access to quality vocational and technical programs.

It is especially unfortunate that the committee bill eliminates the set-asides currently in the act which were created to ensure that there would be programs to serve displaced homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women to help them enter into employment that has traditionally not been open to women. In today's working environment it is critical all students be offered the opportunity created by these programs.

However, since the Committee on Rules has recommended an open rule, I am hopeful that the House will adopt amendments which can address these concerns. These programs represent long-term investments in the health of the economy of the United States, and it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to shortchange opportunities for those who would benefit the most.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 187 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1853.

□ 1039

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, with Mr. EWING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of

1997. The legislation assists the 75 percent of the American people who do not complete a 4-year college degree. Our youth should receive a high-quality education whether they are bound for college, the military, further training or directly into the work force.

Before I go further, I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee and the staff for their support in the development of this important piece of legislation. In particular I would like to recognize the hard work of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], Chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families. It was through his diligent commitment to a strong vocational-technical education program and many long hours of negotiations which have brought us here today.

I would also like to recognize another Pennsylvanian, Mr. PETERSON, who has also given an enormous amount of time in crafting this legislation. Mr. PETERSON represents an area of Pennsylvania in which vocational-technical education is critical, and we appreciate his help and expertise in the area.

I want to thank the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], who worked very closely with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] to develop a bipartisan effort, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member of the full committee for the bipartisan effort put into this piece of legislation.

The legislation enjoys a broad coalition of support, and I hope we will pick up more support as we go through this process and then through conference with the Senate.

For far too long we paid little attention to the 75 percent of youth who do not go on and complete some 4-year college degree. Our youth should receive a high-quality education no matter what they plan to do in the future.

In today's vocational-technical education programs, students need a very high-quality education for today's world. These students need strong academics and relevant skills in order to thrive in today's economy.

In H.R. 1853, we have three overarching goals: strengthening academics; broadening the opportunities for vocational-technical education students; and sending more money to the classroom.

The bill, first of all, sends 90 percent of the money down to the local level. Under current law only 75 percent gets there.

Second, we alter the way the funds are distributed to ensure they are more equitably distributed. We are trying to make sure limited Federal dollars for vocational-technical education follow vocational-technical education students fairly and equitably.

The legislation strengthens the academic component of vocational-technical education programs, and this is so important because in 1950, 60 percent of all the jobs that were available were

jobs that were unskilled. But by the time we got to 1990, that figure dropped to 35 percent. And by the year 2000 it is projected that only 15 percent of all jobs available will be for unskilled people. That is why this legislation is so important at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached, I believe, a bipartisan agreement, which is what our committee generally does when it comes to education, nutrition and child care issues. I do want to point out that there is no one that is a stronger advocate for programs that help, for instance, displaced homemakers than the person speaking and I have fought for them since I came to the Congress. And because of that, I want to make sure we understand that we have taken care of these concerns. We do not need any amendments to take care of displaced homemakers or other special populations. We have made very clear what we expect from this legislation.

As my colleagues will notice, we ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks, established under section 114, and are prepared for secondary education, further learning and high-skill and high-wage careers. Then there is a financial audit that follows to make very, very sure that the vocational-technical education programs adhere to the requirements of the act, including those related to special populations.

We also make it very clear that each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs, including special populations. The report submitted by the State, in accordance with subparagraph A, shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women participating in vocational-technical education programs have met the vocational-technical education benchmarks established by the State.

We also say that the funds provided under this act may support programs at the local level for displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, and individuals in nontraditional occupations that lead to high-skilled, high-wage end careers.

□ 1045

We also indicate that local funds can be used for programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women. In all of those sections, we point out the need to serve special populations.

I hope that we can pass this legislation today with an overwhelming vote and send a message to the Senate that we are ready to do business with the other body.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Each year the Perkins Act helps over 10 million vocational students receive high-quality education, to receive jobs and skill training and to receive support services. That is our country's flagship vocational education program. We have worked with our Republican colleagues for several months to resolve differences concerning reauthorization of this act and have reached a fair compromise in the way States distribute vocational education funds to the local educational agencies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, for resolving these difficult issues.

The bill as reported by the committee would have resulted in a significant reduction in funding for existing vocational education programs in urban and rural areas. The bipartisan agreement reached on the formula that will be offered later by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] preserves formula allocations for existing vocational education programs for the first 3 years, and it provides for the gradual implementation of a formula based 60 percent on poverty and 40 percent on population.

Although some of us would have preferred maintaining the existing Perkins Act formula for all 5 years of reauthorization, this, however, is a fair, good faith compromise that will ensure the continuation of all local programs.

Mr. Chairman, the bill also strengthens the integration of academics and vocational education to ensure that vocational education programs are academically challenging.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill needs additional improvement with regard to women, especially for displaced homemakers and those entering non-traditional employment. Later this morning, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will offer amendments which are designed to achieve gender equity in vocational education, and despite what was said, it is needed, Mr. Chairman.

I hope that our colleagues will support this amendment and support the reauthorization bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the subcommittee chairman, who was so instrumental in bringing the legislation to the floor.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, for yielding me the time.

I want to say good morning to the Speaker and my colleagues and tell them that I am glad to stand before them today in very strong support of the very important Federal education statute, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

This bill reforms and reauthorizes, in my view, one of the most important

Federal education statutes. It provides support for vocational and technical education programs, which are extremely important for meeting the needs, as I think the chairman has already mentioned, of the 75 percent of our young people who are not college bound, or who, if they go to college, will not complete college with a 4-year degree.

I worry a little bit that, particularly at this point in time, when we find ourselves debating a number of tax incentives, to make the third and fourth years of education more affordable, more accessible to young people, that we might look past the fact, again, that most of our young people are not college bound, or, if they go to college, they will not complete college with a 4-year degree.

Because we do have, I think, a very legitimate interest and a real Federal role in helping to prepare those young people for the work force. That is, I believe, in our national defense interest as a country. And, of course, we always have an interest at the Federal level in attempting to help to prepare and educate our young people to sustain our democracy.

So I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of our committee for their contributions to this legislation. I want to thank, in particular, of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, for his strong leadership in the area of vocational and technical education over the years, not just at the Federal level, but also in support of some very well-established vocational institutions in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and in his congressional district.

Speaking of Pennsylvania, I want to thank a new member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] for his help on this legislation. He was a cosponsor of H.R. 1853 and has worked with us very diligently to help ensure passage of the bill.

This bill is very much bipartisan in nature. And for that, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, my very good friend, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee which I chair.

We have tried to generate a broad base of support for this legislation and a bill that both sides of the aisle can support and that, hopefully, can be signed into law by the President. It is absolutely critical, my colleagues, that our young people receive a high-quality education, whether they are bound for college, whether they are going to enter the military, which is still the largest training institution in the world, or whether they are going to go directly into the work force.

Three themes resonate throughout this bill. You might call these three themes the ABC's of vocational-technical education: Strengthening academics, broadening opportunities, and sending more money to the classroom.

The first and most important goal, of course, is strengthening academics. And what we have tried to do in this legislation is combine strong academics with expanded vocational and technical education opportunities for young people.

The second theme, of course, is broadening opportunities for young people after high school. We heard testimony at a field hearing just across the Potomac River in northern Virginia at Thomas Jefferson High School in Fairfax County, VA, that there are currently 18,000 jobs, and these are high-wage, high-skill jobs, that are currently unfilled in northern Virginia because employers and business owners cannot find the job applicants to fill those positions.

We do not have an education system that prepares enough of our young people to be technologically capable for the work force and to have, if you will, the work force literacy skills, the entry skills that they will need to go out there and compete and succeed in the work force.

The average salary for those unfilled positions in northern Virginia, we heard, is over \$45,000. That is the starting annual salary for those positions on average. If we are going to ensure that America meets the next century as a world leader, we have to focus on making sure that our citizens have the technological skills to compete in an ever-more global economy. If the global economy today is the size of a beach ball, the global economy of the 21st century, the brave new world just around the corner, is going to be the size of a golf ball. What we are trying to do here is bring the Perkins vocational-technical education statute into the 21st century.

The last thing that I want to mention is that we are in this bill driving more money down to the classroom. My colleagues are going to see that theme, that effort, repeated in every major Federal education bill that we bring to the House floor in this session of Congress. We want to get more money down to the local level, into the classroom, and not into the hands of someone who does not know that child's name. That is our goal.

In this bill we send 90 percent of the funds to the local level. If we are going to see real change in vocational-technical education, it is not going to come from the Federal level, it is going to come from the local level, from teachers in the classroom making a difference. Change is going to come from schools like the new technology high school in Napa County, CA, in my district, which is preparing students to enter a high technology career or to go on to college.

We have worked very closely, as I mentioned earlier, with Members on the other side of the aisle trying to form a bipartisan agreement on this bill. We have made well over 60 changes to this legislation to date to accommodate the request of House Democratic

Members, members of the committee, 60 changes since the date of introducing the bill to passage of the bill by the committee.

In fact, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the ranking member of the subcommittee, wrote me a letter on June 4 outlining several concerns he had with the discussion draft of the legislation, the bill that I had introduced; and I can now say that we have met the concerns of all the areas he addressed, including the substate formula.

The chairman explained the compromise that we have worked out on the formula. However, I wanted to point out for the record that we developed a substate formula in this bill which more equitably distributes funding throughout the States and more appropriately distributes money for students in vocational and technical education programs.

This formula does not take money away from cities or poor areas. And under our bill, I believe that almost all school districts will gain. H.R. 1853 is a good bill. It is a fair bill. It is a bill that is going to do a better job in preparing our young people for the educational and employment opportunities of the 21st century, and I urge its passage.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member of the full committee for yielding me time.

I am pleased to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], my ranking member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairmen of the full committee and subcommittee, in bringing this bill before the House today.

H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997 have been the subject of many hours of discussion between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], with the aim of producing a bipartisan bill we can all support.

While not being absolutely perfect, this legislation has gained my support and I believe should gain the support of my colleagues due to the changes that have been made and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Upon the expiration of general debate, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, will present us with the manager's amendment to this bill, which deals with one of the most fundamental concerns the committee Democrats had during the markup.

That was the secondary substate formula. Instead of the reported bill's provision, which deemphasized poverty and allowed the States to withhold dollars which should go out by formula, the manager's amendment would incor-

porate a bipartisan compromise which affects the funding stream for existing vocational education programs.

This new formula gradually incorporates a slightly less targeted distribution method over a 5-year period. At the end of the five-year period, funds going down to the secondary school districts will go out based on a formula of 60 percent poverty, 40 percent population.

Unfortunately, the one issue that clouds a fuller bipartisan embrace of this legislation is its termination of programs ensuring gender equity. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member, mentioned a minute ago, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] will offer an amendment to rectify this situation.

I strongly urge careful consideration of this amendment. I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for the work on this bill.

Dealing with the more difficult issues which this reauthorization presents took many hours of both Members' time and staff time. However, as we have done on other bills which we have passed out of the House during this Congress out of our committee, we put our partisan differences aside and reached an agreement that we could all support.

I urge the Members on my side to support this bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], a very distinguished member of the subcommittee and the chairman.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak in favor of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments. As a businessman who had to hire many people through my business lifetime, the most frustrating thing that occurs is when a person requests to fill out an application for work but they do not have time and they ask to be able to take that application home with them. One knows then they cannot read or write, which one we do not know. But they still want a job.

Primary and secondary education did not provide what is necessary. That person is trapped in that never-never land of joblessness and unemployability. Job training is their only way out. Giving them some help through vocational and technical training gives them a chance.

Please vote for H.R. 1853.

□ 1100

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge passage of this legislation. While bringing bi-

partisan support for this bill has not been easy, it has come about, and I believe that is both significant and important.

There are several provisions of this bill that are commendable. The "such sums" authorizations, for instance, gives us room to seek a significant increase in funding for vocational education.

The separate authorization for tech prep is a noteworthy accomplishment. This is a highly successful and popular program. It has done well in appropriations and should certainly grow in the years ahead.

The provisions of the reserve for Indian programs are good, and I am especially encouraged that we have made bureau funded secondary schools eligible to receive funds under the within State allocation of the basic State grant.

We also permit private schoolteachers to participate in professional development programs in both Goals 2000 and the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, and I am especially glad that we permit the States and localities to do so in this legislation.

The formula regarding the within State allocation of funds has been improved and refined through this reauthorization process. While I certainly support the changes that have been made, I continue to believe that the formula can be further improved and targeted.

In another area, I regret very much that we have weakened current law with respect to sex equity. That is something I have been pushing for my 21 years here in the Congress, and I think that the role of the sex equity coordinator has been very important and I will be supporting the Mink-Morella amendment when that is offered.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill, even though I believe there are several areas where it can be improved. I intend to support the floor amendments and will continue to work in the conference for improvements.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the full committee.

In section 103(c)(1) of the legislation now under consideration, secondary school programs in schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs will no longer be eligible to receive assistance under the reserve of funds for Indian programs. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KILDEE. I understand, however, that the provision in question is included in this legislation in order to make it clear that the bureau funded schools with secondary vocational programs will be considered a local education agency eligible for funding

under the within State allocation of funds under the basic State grant.

Mr. GOODLING. That is also correct. In accordance with provisions of section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, bureau funded schools are local educational agencies. Thus they would qualify for funding under the basic State grant. Bureau funded schools will receive vocational education funding assistance from the within State allocation of funds and will qualify for such assistance in the same manner as would any other local education agency in the State.

Mr. KILDEE. The purpose of the language in section 103(c)(1), therefore, is to make bureau funded schools eligible for funding under the within State allocation of funds. Making such schools ineligible for funding under section 103(c)(1) removes any question of the source of funding, as well as any question of whether or not such schools are eligible to receive funding from more than one source. The intent of our language is to make clear that funding for bureau funded schools operating secondary programs will come as a result of the eligibility of those schools to receive assistance under section 202 of this legislation, which amends part B of title II of current law.

Mr. GOODLING. That too is correct. I would point out, however, that bureau funded schools that have operated adult education programs would remain eligible to receive funding under section 103(c)(1) pertaining to the reserve of funds for Indian programs. The provision making bureau funded schools ineligible to receive section 103(c)(1) funding applies only to secondary school programs at such schools.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that specific clarification, and I thank the gentleman for joining with me in this colloquy.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is much needed. I want to observe, too, with the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and certainly the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the subcommittee chairman, that we have an excellent example here, maybe exhibit A, of how well we can work together on a bipartisan basis and better serve or genuinely serve the needs of the people. I think this is an excellent example of how we can move forward without partisan bickering.

I also want to say that this particular subject is very near and dear to me. I have always been devoted to vocational education, but I must say in the modern global economy and the accel-

eration of technology, this legislation is more important than ever. We can no longer ignore those students whose talents are wasted because they never go to college. It is not only a waste for them but it is a waste for the needs of our economy.

Excellent example—exhibit A of how well we can work on a bipartisan basis to better serve the genuine needs of the people. The modern acceleration of technology and increasing competition in the global economy require us to rethink our approach to education. We can no longer ignore \* \* \* and therefore waste the talents of the vast numbers of students who never go to college. There exists a yawning gap between those students who are prepared and unprepared to enter our high-skills workplace.

As a result, our economy suffers. If we are to meet our work force demands we must have effective technology schools, such as Sussex Tech in Sussex County, NJ. Bergen technical school, Passaic and Warren County schools.

I have a particular longstanding interest in improving the relevance of vocational education. This legislation does this.

We need to continue to improve the national school-to-work system—a system that would emphasize technological developments.

This legislation makes several beneficial changes to vocational education. First of all, this bill eliminates set-asides which have prohibited a particular State's ability to adjust to its own special populations. With this change, a State can assess and address its own needs.

We need desperately to continue to improve the national school-to-work system, and this legislation does that in a very real way. It makes several beneficial changes to the vocational bill. It certainly eliminates set-asides which have prohibited a particular State's ability in the past to adjust to its own special populations. I think this represents progress. With this change, a State can assess and address its own needs.

The legislation also emphasizes sending funds to the local level. With the passage of this legislation, 90 percent of the funds will be headed to the local level to provide programs to prepare our youth for the technological age.

This legislation makes an important change to assist rural and suburban areas in the lowering of the minimum grant amount for local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. This change is helpful because it will allow more schools to apply for grants, since they will be more likely to become eligible.

The legislation also emphasizes sending funds to the local level. With the passage of this legislation, 90 percent of the funds will be headed to the local level to provide programs to prepare our youth for the technological age. It makes important changes to assist rural and suburban areas as well as the urban areas, to get the needed minimum grant for local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. This is a great improvement over the past.

This legislation also includes a provision which requires States to establish their own State benchmarks to measure their progress.

The States are to annually submit a report to the Secretary on how they are performing on their State benchmarks. I am a strong believer in benchmarks since they help provide oversight and they help determine the effectiveness of various programs.

This legislation will help us achieve the goal of providing our youth a higher level of technology training. This will provide greater access to a system that would allow these students to build a high-quality, high-value high-wage career.

School to work—relevant education for personal fulfillment and meet economic needs.

Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by simply saying that school-to-work is relevant education, not only for personal fulfillment of the students involved but also to meet our vast economic needs in the new brave world in which we are operating.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON], who has been very active in helping us put this legislation together.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking members, for working together to put together a bill that I think will make a positive difference in vocational education in America.

I would also like to commend the staff, Becky Voslow, Sally Lovejoy, and Alex Nock, who worked tirelessly together. We all know, when doing compromises, who really does a lot of the hard work. I want to commend them for all their efforts.

I believe if this country is going to compete, if we are going to continue to be a manufacturing leader in the world, and I do not think we will be a strong country if we do not, we have to improve our ability to deliver vocational and technical education. I think this bill moves us in the right direction. It does not solve all the problems. I toured a plant in Blossburg, PA, in my district this week that is doing something very interesting. That plant employs about 1,000 people in one of the most rural parts of Pennsylvania and is growing fast. They have brought to Pennsylvania a Japanese technology, refined it; these things used to be made for Japanese cars, these parts, in Japan. They are now being manufactured in Pennsylvania. But that plant is high technology. There has been a huge investment made there. The workers there need skills and a good academic base. That is important in this country.

I recently also toured a plant in State College. If one buys a Japanese TV, there is a very good chance the picture tube came from State College, PA, because they are really becoming a dominant player in that market. Again, huge investment of capital and

very high tech jobs. They are not strong backs and strong arms that are needed but technical knowhow.

This bill moves more funds to the classroom, 15 percent more. I think that makes a big difference. We need to get the money in the classroom. Many of our arguments have been the Federal rules that we want to put down on the States. I come from State government. State government bureaucracies do not need us to tell them all the fine details of educating our youngsters. It is important that we allow them to be free. Because what we have when we have a lot of Federal rules, we have a Federal bureaucracy, and if we go into most State departments of education, the majority of the people working there are dealing with implementing the Federal rules. So we have all of this money wasted at the Federal level and at the State level that should be going to the classroom.

The other issue that we struggled over was the rural set-aside. I was disappointed in the great opposition for that because rural America is way behind urban America in vocational education. If this country is going to remain strong, rural America needs to have equity. We need to be able to train the young people. Many parts of rural America do not have vocational education. All we wanted to do was to have a 10-percent set-aside that allowed States to meet that need if they wanted to.

We were not against money for urban. Urban has always been the big winner when we look at the formula. We were disappointed but we do accept the compromise of five and give. But I would like to say to my urban friends, in the future, rural America, if we are not going to be an imposition on the welfare rolls, we have to be able to train our workers, and vocational education is one of the ways we need to do that.

I want to thank all of those that compromised. There may have been a little more compromise than I would have liked, but I am willing to accept it today and move this bill forward.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, while I commend and congratulate all of those who have hammered out this agreement, I have some concerns about it. There seems to be a theme that resonates throughout this Congress, and that theme is to take from the poor and give to the wealthy, well-to-do and the rich. It is the very theme that divides rather than unites. It is the theme that shatters millions of Americans' hope and faith in the American system. It seems to me that some portions of this compromise continues that theme. This compromise, while better than the original proposed formula, moves away

from the emphasis on poverty to an emphasis on population in fiscal years 2001 and 2002. Under the current distribution formula for funds for school districts, the emphasis is 70 percent on poverty and 30 percent on population. I believe that this is a fair formula.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, I have thousands and thousands of disadvantaged, underprivileged individuals who need to catch up, individuals who need special attention. I do not believe that as we shift away from an emphasis on need to an across-the-board program, that this is in the best interests of rural America, nor is it in the best interests of inner-city urban America.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I want to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for their excellent work and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle that serve on this committee. My colleagues may have heard me applauding a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Pennsylvania made his remarks, because I regret the fact that the chairman reached, I think, the right conclusion in the face of opposition to cut the rural set-aside from 10 to 5 percent. I think that was inappropriate pressure from the other side of the aisle. I think they should not be anti-rural in their actions. Nevertheless, this bill has many important features that are positive.

H.R. 1853, for example, most importantly alters the amount of dollars spent at the local level. Under the current law, only 75 percent of Federal dollars currently are required to flow to the local school districts. This bill, of course, in a very important change, requires 90 percent of those dollars to go to the local level. Any true changes in vocational technical education must come from the local level, from teachers who are in the classroom, to make a difference.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that this legislation contains two important components to assist rural communities and schools. Not as much as I had hoped but a big and important change, especially in the longer term. One provision, of course, encourages the States and permits them to set aside a portion of the funds flowing to the local level to target rural or non-metropolitan areas. This provision provides States with discretion in the equitable distribution of funds throughout the State. An additional provision lowers the minimum grants for secondary and postsecondary programs, enabling more schools to qualify.

□ 1115

Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very important change, it is long needed,

and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] very much for his diligent work on this.

Mr. Chairman, 75 percent of American youth do not complete a 4-year college degree. This bill appropriately changes the way funds are distributed from the Federal Government to the States by targeting the funds more directly to the youth and young adults up to age 24 which are served by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. This legislation broadens opportunities after high school for vocational-technical education students by ensuring that they receive a high-quality education which will allow them to continue on to college or further education, the military, training or directly into the work force.

In addition, H.R. 1853 most importantly alters the amount of dollars sent to the local level. Under current law, only 75 percent of Federal dollars currently are required to flow to the local school districts. This bill requires 90 percent of the dollars to go to the local level. Any true change in vocational-technical education must come from the local level—from teachers who are in the classroom making a difference. The increased funding that H.R. 1853 sends to the local level in this Member's home State of Nebraska will result in a \$52,000 increase for the Lincoln Public School System, a \$3,000 increase for the York Public Schools, an increase of \$1,600 for the Wahoo Public Schools, \$700 more for the Homer Community Schools, a \$2,200 increase for Nebraska City Public Schools, and \$8,000 more in funding for the Norfolk Public Schools, just to name a few.

This Member is also pleased that H.R. 1853 contains two important components to assist rural schools. One provision enables States to set aside a portion of the funds flowing to the local level to target rural areas. This provision provides States with discretion in the equitable distribution of funds throughout the State. An additional provision lowers the minimum grant for secondary and postsecondary programs, enabling more small schools to qualify.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. This is an important reform bill, and it deserves to be supported.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], a very important member of the committee.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for yielding this time to me, and I do congratulate Chairman GOODLING and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] and the staff of this committee, which is rapidly becoming the committee that seems to work out very difficult legislation and bring it to the floor with a minimum amount of opposition and really do something to improve education in America, and I do rise in very strong support of this legislation.

We have to remember that about 75 percent of our Nation's youth does not receive a 4-year college degree, and in order to ensure that that percentage of our population is going to thrive in today's economy, in my judgment it is

imperative they receive a quality high school education, meaning relevant skills and strong academics, whether they are bound for college, the military, further training, or go directly into the work force.

In the past, vocational-technical education policy encouraged the development of specific occupational programs in areas such as trade and industry, business, and home economics. It targeted students with special needs such as displaced homemakers and single mothers, and today we realize mandating specific uses of dollars at the federal level does not necessarily add up to a quality vocational education.

It is time for Federal policy to give more discretion to States and local districts, which are and always have been the true laboratories of reform.

I just like to share my experiences in Delaware, which has an outstanding vocational education program. In fact, one of our State's three vocational-technical high schools, Sussex Technical High School in Georgetown, DE, was honored as a U.S. Department of Education blue ribbon school of excellence. This occurred after the school went through a paradigm shift similar to the paradigm shift we are seeing in the legislation we are considering today. It transformed itself from a center serving part-time students into a full-time technical high school offering a rigorous integrated program of academic and vocational studies to kids who actually choose to attend. In 1988, students from this school scored at the bottom of the heap on standardized tests, and enrollment had declined 35 percent in 10 years. After a massive restructuring effort in 1988, Sussex Tech became a full-time comprehensive high school with a challenging program of study organized around relevant career clusters. The result has been a dramatic improvement in SAT scores and in the number of students taking the SAT, a dropout rate of less than 2 percent, soaring enrollment in college prep level math courses and a 100-percent increase in percentage of students enrolling in postsecondary education.

The bill we consider today encompasses the main principles of this paradigm shift which I was able to witness in my own State. It strengthens the academics of vocational-technical education students, broadens the opportunities of vocational-technical education students and sends more dollars to the local level for vocational-technical education programs, and I encourage each and every one of us to support this very outstanding piece of legislation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in strong support of this legislation and in praise of the leaders of the committee and the fine staff.

The educational needs of our youth indeed have changed since 1917, which

was when the Federal Government first began to support vocational education. Today, still, vocational-technical education programs fill a very critical need.

As my colleague from Delaware indicated, the programs prepare 75 percent of American youths who do not complete a 4-year degree for jobs requiring advanced training and knowledge. The programs demand a strong background in math and science, as they should, and students have to be prepared for the technical and competitive jobs that exist today.

I know this because I have frequently visited with students and teachers and wonderful facilities throughout my district who use and support these programs, and they strongly support it. The bill before us today builds on that success. It encourages stronger academics, greater opportunities for use after high school and targets more dollars to the classroom. In fact, 90 percent of the Federal dollars will be sent to the local level under this bill, and that is how it should be.

Finally, I am also pleased that the bill preserves the strength of the very popular tech prep program. In southwest Michigan this program has quickly become an integral part of students' learning experience.

Our businesses today are rightly demanding a better prepared work force. This bill helps in a major way, and I urge all members to support H.R. 1853.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY], an important new member of our committee.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1853, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and his staff for their hard work. This legislation reforms and repeals a number of burdensome and arcane provisions, including set-asides for criminal offenders and unfunded mandates on local and State governments.

More importantly, H.R. 1853 sends more money directly to the local level, a 15-percent increase over current law. It reduces the amount of money that a State can hold for administrative purposes from 5 to 2 percent and ensures that Federal dollars are being used to support programs and not to sustain bureaucracies.

Another important provision of H.R. 1853 that is especially important for rural districts like mine in Tennessee protects the right of home schoolers to educate their children at home. Further, this legislation prohibits vocational-technical education programs from requiring individuals to choose or pursue a specific career path or measure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that will help educate some of our Nation's children who need it the most and preserve the right of every child in

a vocational-technical education program to receive a well-rounded education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I do that just to again thank the staff who worked so hard:

Becky Voslow, Mary Clagett, Vic Klatt, Sally Lovejoy; staff Republican members Mark Davis, Trent Barton with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]; Bob Moran with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON]; Democratic committee staff Alex Nock, June Harris, Mark Zuckerman, David Evans; Congressional Research Service for all the thousands of formula runs that they made trying to get one that would fit one of our colleagues on committee from New Jersey; it was very difficult to do; and Rick Appling and Wayne Riddle.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997. Seventy-five percent of American youth do not complete a 4-year college degree. Vocational-technical education programs ensure that the necessary training and a high quality education is available to those individuals. Our society is increasingly reliant on workers who have technological skills and advanced training, making the support of these programs critical to our economy.

I am especially pleased that this legislation ensures that States, localities, and parents have maximum control over decisions affecting these programs and students—and makes certain that 90 percent of each State allocation goes to local districts.

By helping young people to acquire these necessary skills, we are improving the opportunities available for our youth and helping our businesses to compete in the technologically advanced, global economy.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the chairman and members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their work with bringing the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act to the House floor today. I am pleased that H.R. 1853 includes language which enables Oregon to continue its integrated K-14 education and training system.

Oregon has a unique set of regional partnerships composed of secondary and postsecondary schools. Oregon's consortium structure increases student achievement and promotes high skill standards by making better professional technical programs available in a cost-effective manner to remote and sparsely populated areas.

Oregon's innovative programs continue to do an outstanding job preparing our students for the education and working challenges of the 21st century. It is my hope that other States will take a look at Oregon's regional consortiums, and consider this model to improve the teaching and learning of all our students.

I thank the chairman and members of the committee for including this important language for Oregon in H.R. 1853.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this important legislation to reauthorize the Carl Perkins Act. These programs are making great strides in improving technical education in my State of Oregon and across this Nation.

Most of my colleagues need no reminder that the high-tech industry has become one of the most important forces behind our surging economy, and has produced millions of new manufacturing and information-technology jobs in this decade. In fact, the electronics and information technology industry employed more than 4 million American workers in 1995, and the average wage of a high-tech worker is nearly 60-percent higher than that of the average private sector worker. However, I am repeatedly told by high-tech companies in my State that we're still not educating enough workers with adequate science, math and engineering training to fill those jobs.

The Carl Perkins Act educates over 10,000 students each year through a variety of vocational education programs that have been shown to be highly successful in helping to prepare students for high-tech careers. In my State, the number of Professional Technical students is increasing by 9 percent annually and should reach 35 percent by the year 2000.

I am pleased that we have reached a reasonable compromise on the funding formulas and have partially restored the size of the minimum grants to local education agencies. While I do not believe that we should alter these formulas, it is beneficial that we have been able to reach a consensus and hopefully reauthorize spending on these vital programs. I commend and congratulate the distinguished chairman, the subcommittee chairman and the ranking members for their hard work in doing this.

I would like to mention my satisfaction with one measure in this bill that would allow secondary and postsecondary schools to join in consortia to allow professional technical education to be delivered in a continuum from grades 9 through 14.

Under a waiver granted by the Secretary of Education, Oregon has already developed 10 such regional consortia that serve half of the eligible students. These consortia are common sense and cost-effective means of improving vocational education. In establishing the consortia, we have not only increased the number of students involved in the programs, but have improved professional technical education by engaging the entire community, including local businesses, to provide continuous quality improvement.

I am pleased that we have been able to address this bill, and continue providing these important programs to advance the technical educations of so many students across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Act Amendments of 1997. This important legislation reauthorizes and revises the current vocational education statute.

H.R. 1853 focuses on strengthening the academics of vocational training for those among our Nation's youth who do not earn a 4-year college degree. In doing so, it ensures the overall quality of vocational education and provides special populations with access to high quality vocational education.

As the Nation moves individuals from the welfare rolls to the work force, and as the Nation enters the 21st century, it is essential that welfare recipients and other disadvantaged Americans have access to the education and

vocational training they need to effectively compete in the new job market.

Vocational programs are critical. As such, they broaden career opportunities for the 75 percent of high school students who do not earn college degrees. They also equip many of our Nation's disadvantaged and disabled populations to compete for high paying jobs, build careers, and raise the standard of living for their families.

In 1994 the U.S. Census Bureau reported that individuals with an associates degree earned an average of \$2,000 more per year than those with only a high school diploma. According to the Department of Labor, the number of low-skilled jobs is expected to decline from 47 percent of the work force in 1993 to 27 percent in the year 2000—and it is expected that nearly half of all jobs in the 21st century will require some post-secondary education.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments. It is vitally important that the Nation's new work force receive effective education and vocational training. Support of this legislation is one means of ensuring its accessibility.

Vote "yes" for H.R. 1818.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

#### H.R. 1853

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997".*

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO ACT.

*(a) SHORT TITLE OF ACT.—Section 1(a) of the Act is amended by striking "(a) SHORT TITLE.—" and further by striking "Vocational and Applied Technology" and inserting "Vocational-Technical".*

*(b) REFERENCES TO ACT.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a title, chapter, part, subpart, section, subsection, or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a title, chapter, part, subpart, section, subsection, or other provision of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technology Education Act as amended in subsection (a).*

#### SEC. 3. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

*Section 1(b) is repealed.*

#### SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

*Section 2 of the Act is amended to read as follows:*

#### "SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

*"It is the purpose of this Act to develop more fully the academic, occupational, and technical skills of individuals participating in vocational-technical education programs. This purpose will be achieved through concentrating resources on improving vocational-technical education programs leading to academic and technical skill competencies needed to work in a technologically advanced society."*

#### SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

*Section 3 of the Act is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a) by striking "\$1,600,000,000" and all that follows and inserting "\$1,300,000,000, for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of titles I and II.";*

*(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:*

*"(b) TITLE I.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a)—*

*"(1) 1.5 percent shall be reserved to carry out section 103, relating to Indian and Native Hawaiians programs; and*

*"(2) 0.2 percent shall be reserved to carry out section 101A, relating to the territories.";* and

*(3) by striking subsections (c) through (f).*

#### TITLE I—VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

#### SEC. 101. ALLOTMENT.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I is amended by striking the matter preceding the text of section 101 and inserting the following:*

*"TITLE I—VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES  
"PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION"  
"SEC. 101. ALLOTMENT:"*

*(b) ALLOTMENT.—*

*(1) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 101(a) are amended to read as follows:*

*"(a) SPECIFIC POPULATIONS.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—In each fiscal year, from amounts made available under section 3(a), the Secretary shall reserve—*

*"(A) 1.5 percent to carry out section 103, of which—*

*"(i) 1.25 percent shall be available to carry out section 103(c); and*

*"(ii) 0.25 percent shall be available to carry out section 103(i); and*

*"(B) 0.2 percent for the purpose of carrying out section 101A.*

*"(2) REMAINDER OF FUNDS.—From the remainder of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—*

*"(A) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 percent of the sums being allotted as the product of the population aged 15 to 19 inclusive, in the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; and*

*"(B) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 percent of the sums being allotted as the product of the population aged 20 to 24, inclusive, in the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States."*

*(2) Paragraph (3) of section 101(a) is amended—*

*(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (C);*

*(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (D) as (A) and (B), respectively;*

*(C) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated, by striking clause (i), and inserting the following:*

*"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B) and clause (ii), no State shall receive less than 1/2 of 1 percent of the amount available for each such program for each fiscal year under this subsection.";* and

*(D) in subparagraph (A)(ii), as redesignated, by striking "or part A, B, C, D, or E of title III".*

*(3) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:*

*"(c) ALLOTMENT RATIO.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—The allotment ratio for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of—*

*"(A) 0.50; and*

*"(B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands), except that—*

“(i) the allotment ratio in no case shall be more than 0.55 or less than 0.40; and

“(ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 0.55.

“(2) ALLOTMENT RATIOS.—The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Secretary for each fiscal year between October 1 and December 31 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the appropriate per capita incomes for the 3 most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data are available.

“(3) DEFINITION.—The term ‘per capita income’ means, with respect to a fiscal year, the total personal income in the calendar year ending in such year, divided by the population of the area concerned in such year.

“(4) POPULATION DETERMINATION.—For the purposes of this section, population shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the latest estimates available to the Department.”.

#### SEC. 101A. THE TERRITORIES.

Section 101A of the Act is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) RESTRICTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau shall not receive any funds under this part for any fiscal year that begins after September 30, 2001.”.

#### SEC. 102. WITHIN STATE ALLOTMENTS.

Section 102 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “at least” and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting “an amount equal to not less than 90 percent of the allotment shall be available for basic programs under part B of title II;”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, by striking “8.5” and inserting “8” and further by adding after the semicolon “and”;

(E) in paragraph (3), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “5” and inserting “2”;

(ii) by striking “of which—” and all that follows through “and” at the end and inserting the following:

“which may be used for the costs of—

“(A) developing the State application;

“(B) reviewing local applications;

“(C) monitoring and evaluating program effectiveness; and

“(D) assuring compliance with all applicable Federal laws.”; and

(F) by striking paragraph (5);

(2) in subsection (b) by striking “(a)(4)” and inserting “(a)(3)”;

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) RURAL RESERVE.—A State may reserve not more than 10 percent of the allotment made under section 102(a)(1) to use for grants to rural areas.

“(d) INCENTIVE AWARDS.—A State may reserve not more than 5 percent of the allotment made under section 102(a)(1) to make awards—

“(1) to a local eligible recipient that meets or exceeds the State benchmarks described in section 114;

“(2) to a local eligible recipient that meets or exceeds the average State graduation rate; or

“(3) to assist a local eligible recipient that has significantly failed to meet the State benchmarks described in section 114, or has a graduation rate that is significantly below the average State graduation rate.”

#### SEC. 103. INDIAN AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN PROGRAMS.

Section 103 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

##### “SEC. 103. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAM.

“(a) INDIAN POLICY.—All programs assisted under this section shall be administered in a

manner consistent with the principles of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) and the government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribal governments.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

“(1) ALASKA NATIVE.—The term ‘Alaska Native’ means a Native as such term is defined in section 3(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602(b)).

“(2) BUREAU FUNDED.—The term ‘Bureau funded school’ means—

“(A) a Bureau school;

“(B) a contract school; or

“(C) a school for which assistance is provided under the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988.

“(3) INDIAN, INDIAN TRIBE, AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The terms ‘Indian’, ‘Indian tribe’, and ‘tribal organization’ have the meanings given such terms in subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively, of section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

“(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

“(5) NATIVE HAWAIIAN AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN ORGANIZATION.—The terms ‘Native Hawaiian’ and ‘Native Hawaiian organization’ have the meanings given such terms in paragraphs (1) and (3), respectively, of section 9212 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7912).

“(6) TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGE.—The term ‘tribally controlled community college’ has the meaning given such term in section 2(a)(4) of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801(a)(4)).

“(7) TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institution’ means an institution of higher education that—

“(A) is formally controlled, or has been formally sanctioned or chartered, by the governing body of an Indian tribe or Indian tribes;

“(B) offers a technical degree or certificate granting program;

“(C) is governed by a board of directors or trustees, a majority of whom are Indians;

“(D) demonstrates adherence to stated goals, a philosophy, or a plan of operation, that fosters individual Indian economic and self-sufficiency opportunity, including programs that are appropriate to stated tribal goals of developing individual entrepreneurship and self-sustaining economic infrastructures on reservations;

“(E) has been in operation for at least 3 years;

“(F) holds accreditation with or is a candidate for accreditation by a nationally recognized accrediting authority for postsecondary vocational-technical education; and

“(G) enrolls the full-time equivalent of not less than 100 students, of whom a majority are Indians.

“(c) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts reserved under section 101(a)(1)(A)(i), the Secretary shall make grants to Indian tribes, tribal organizations and Alaska Native entities to carry out the authorized programs described in subsection (d), except that such terms shall not include secondary school programs in Bureau funded schools.

“(2) SPECIAL AUTHORITY RELATING TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS OPERATED OR SUPPORTED BY THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.—An Indian tribe, a tribal organization, or an Alaska Native entity, that receives funds through a grant made or contract entered into under paragraph (1) may use the funds to provide assistance to a secondary school operated or supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to enable such school to carry out vocational-technical education programs.

“(d) AUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.—Funds made available under this section shall be used to

carry out vocational-technical education programs consistent with the purposes of this Act.

“(e) GRANT APPLICATION.—In order to receive a grant under this section an entity described in subsection (c) shall submit an application to the Secretary and shall include an assurance that such entity shall comply with the requirements of this Act.

“(f) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary, in making grants under subsection (c), shall give special consideration to—

“(1) grants which involve, coordinate with, or encourage tribal economic development plans; and

“(2) applications from tribally controlled community colleges which—

“(A) are accredited or are candidates for accreditation by a nationally recognized accreditation organization as an institution of postsecondary vocational-technical education; or

“(B) operate vocational-technical education programs that are accredited or are candidates for accreditation by a nationally recognized accreditation organization and issue certificates for completion of vocational-technical education programs.

“(g) CONSOLIDATION OF FUNDS.—Each entity receiving assistance under this section may consolidate such assistance with assistance received from related programs in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3401 et seq.).

“(h) NONDUPLICATIVE AND NONEXCLUSIVE SERVICES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to limit the eligibility of any entity described in subsection (c) to participate in any activity offered by a State or local entity under this title; or

“(2) to preclude or discourage any agreement, between any entity described in subsection (c) and any State or local entity, to facilitate the provision of services by such entity or to the population served by such entity.

“(i) NATIVE HAWAIIAN PROGRAMS.—From the funds reserved pursuant to section 101(a)(1)(A)(ii), the Secretary is directed to enter into contracts with organizations primarily serving and representing Native Hawaiian Programs which are recognized by the Governor of the State of Hawaii to plan, conduct, and administer programs, or portions thereof, which are authorized by and consistent with the provisions of this section for the benefit of Native Hawaiian Programs.”.

#### SEC. 104. TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Part A of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SEC. 104. TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, make grants pursuant to this section to tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institutions to provide basic support for the education and training of Indian students.

“(b) USE OF GRANTS.—Amounts made available pursuant to this section shall be used for vocational-technical education programs.

“(c) ELIGIBLE GRANT RECIPIENTS.—To be eligible for assistance under this section a tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution shall—

“(1) be governed by a board of directors or trustees, a majority of whom are Indians;

“(2) have been in operation for at least 3 years;

“(3) hold accreditation with or be a candidate for accreditation by a nationally recognized accrediting authority for postsecondary vocational-technical education; and

“(4) enroll the full-time equivalent of not less than 100 students, of whom a majority are Indians.

“(d) APPLICATIONS.—Any tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution that desires to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary in such manner and form as the Secretary may require.

“(e) OTHER PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as specifically provided in this Act, eligibility for assistance under this section shall not preclude any tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution from receiving Federal financial assistance under any program authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965 or any other applicable program for the benefit of institutions of higher education or vocational-technical education.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of any grant for which tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institutions are eligible under this subpart shall not be altered because of funds allocated to any such institution from funds appropriated under the Act of November 2, 1921.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACT DENIAL.—No tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution for which an Indian tribe has designated a portion of the funds appropriated for the tribe from funds appropriated under the Act of November 2, 1921, may be denied a contract for such portion under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (except as provided in that Act), or denied appropriate contract support to administer such portion of the appropriated funds.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

“(1) INDIAN.—The terms ‘Indian’ and ‘Indian tribe’ have the meanings given such terms in section 2 of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978.

“(2) TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘tribally controlled postsecondary vocational-technical institution’ means an institution of higher education which is formally controlled, or has been formally sanctioned or chartered by the governing body of an Indian tribe or tribes which offers technical degrees or certificate granting programs.

“(3) INDIAN STUDENT COUNT.—The term ‘Indian student count’ means a number equal to the total number of Indian students enrolled in each tribally controlled vocational-technical institution, determined as follows:

“(A) REGISTRATIONS.—The registrations of Indian students as in effect on October 1 of each year.

“(B) SUMMER TERM.—Credits or clock hours toward a certificate earned in classes offered during a summer term shall be counted toward the computation of the Indian student count in the succeeding fall term.

“(C) ADMISSION CRITERIA.—Credits or clock hours toward a certificate earned in classes during a summer term shall be counted toward the computation of the Indian student count if the institution at which the student is in attendance has established criteria for the admission of such student on the basis of the student’s ability to benefit from the education or training offered. The institution shall be presumed to have established such criteria if the admission procedures for such studies include counseling or testing that measures the student’s aptitude to successfully complete the course in which the student has enrolled. No credit earned by such student for purposes of obtaining a high school degree or its equivalent shall be counted toward the computation of the Indian student count.

“(D) DETERMINATION OF HOURS.—Indian students earning credits in any continuing education program of a tribally controlled vocational-technical institution shall be included in determining the sum of all credit or clock hours.

“(E) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—Credits or clock hours earned in a continuing education program shall be converted to the basis that is

in accordance with the institution’s system for providing credit for participation in such programs.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this section.”.

## **PART B—STATE ORGANIZATIONAL AND PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **SEC. 111. STATE ADMINISTRATION.**

Section 111 of this Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “pursuant to section 113(b)(8), section 116, and section 117”;

(2) by striking subsection (a)(1)(B);

(3) in subsection (a)(1)(C), by striking “consultation with” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of subsection (a)(1)(C) and inserting “consultation with the Governor and appropriate agencies, groups, and individuals, including business, industry and representatives of employees involved in the planning, administration, evaluation, and coordination of programs funded under this Act;”; and

(4) by striking subsections (b) through (g) and inserting the following:

“(b) LIST OF PROGRAMS ASSISTED.—The State board shall make available to each Private Industry Council established under section 102 of the Job Training Partnership Act within the State a listing of all programs assisted under this Act.”.

### **SEC. 112. STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.**

Section 112 of the Act is repealed.

### **SEC. 113. STATE APPLICATION.**

Section 113 of the Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating such section as section 112;

(2) by striking “plan” in the section heading and inserting “application”;

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “(A)” and further by striking all that follows after “Secretary” and inserting “an application in such manner and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require but which, at a minimum, shall be for a 5-year period.”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (B);

(C) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) The State board shall conduct public hearings in the State, after appropriate and sufficient notice, for the purpose of affording all segments of the public and interested organizations and groups an opportunity to present their views and make recommendations regarding the State application. A summary of such recommendations and the State board’s response shall be included with the State application.”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (3); and

(4) by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

“(b) CONTENTS.—Each State application shall—

“(1) describe the vocational-technical education programs that will be carried out with funds received by the State under this Act, including a description of—

“(A) the secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education programs to be carried out at the State level pursuant to section 201, including programs that will be carried out by the State to develop, improve, and expand access to quality, state-of-the-art technology in vocational-technical education programs;

“(B) the criteria that will be used by the State in approving applications of eligible recipients of funds under this Act; and

“(C) how such programs will prepare vocational-technical education students for opportunities in postsecondary education or entry into high skill, high wage jobs;

“(2) describe how the State will actively involve parents, teachers, local businesses (including small- and medium-sized businesses) and representatives of employees in the planning, development, and implementation of such vocational-technical education programs;

“(3) describe how funds received by the State through the allotment made under section 102 will be allocated among secondary school vocational-technical education, or postsecondary and adult vocational-technical education, or both, including the rationale for such allotment;

“(4) describe how the State will—

“(A) improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs which includes strengthening the academic component of vocational-technical education programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education to ensure learning in the core academic subjects and provide students with strong experience and understanding of all aspects of the industry; and

“(B) ensure that students who participate in such vocational-technical education programs are taught to the same challenging academic proficiencies as are provided for all other students;

“(5) describe how the State will annually evaluate the effectiveness of such vocational-technical education programs and describe how the State is coordinating such programs to ensure nonduplication with other existing Federal programs;

“(6) identify the benchmarks that the State will use to measure the progress of the State, including a description of how such benchmarks will ensure continuous improvement for vocational-technical students in meeting such benchmarks;

“(7) describe how the State will—

“(A) provide vocational-technical education programs that lead to high skill, high wage careers for members of special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women; and

“(B) ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks established under section 114 and are prepared for postsecondary education, further learning, and high skill, high wage careers;

“(8) provide a financial audit of funds received under this Act; and

“(9) provide assurances that none of the funds expended under this Act will be used to acquire equipment (including computer software) in any instance in which such acquisition results in a direct financial benefit to any organization representing the interests of the purchasing entity or its employees or any affiliate of such an organization.

“(c) AMENDMENTS.—The State board may submit amendments to the State application, as necessary, during the 5-year period. Such amendments shall be submitted in accordance with section 113(c).”.

### **SEC. 114. SUBMISSION OF STATE APPLICATION.**

Section 114 of the Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating such section as section 113;

(2) by striking “state plan approval” in the section heading and inserting “submission of state application”;

(3) by striking subsections (a) and (b); and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(a) APPLICATION.—Each State application shall be submitted to the Secretary by not later than May 1 preceding the beginning of the first fiscal year for which a State application is to be in effect.

“(b) CONSULTATION.—The State board shall develop the portion of each State application relating to the amount and uses of any funds proposed to be reserved for adult vocational-technical education, postsecondary vocational-technical education, tech-prep education, and secondary vocational-technical education after

consultation with the State agency responsible for supervision of community colleges, technical institutes, or other 2-year postsecondary institutions primarily engaged in providing postsecondary vocational-technical education, and the State agency responsible for secondary education. If a State agency finds that a portion of the final State application is objectionable, such agency shall file such objections with the State board. The State board shall respond to any objections of such agency in submitting such application to the Secretary.

“(c) APPLICATION SUBMISSION.—A State application submitted to the Secretary under this section shall be approved by the Secretary unless the Secretary makes a written determination, within 90 days after receiving the application, that the application is in violation of the provisions of this Act.”

#### SEC. 115. ACCOUNTABILITY.

Part B of title I is amended by inserting after section 113, as redesignated, the following:

##### “SEC. 114. ACCOUNTABILITY.

“(a) BENCHMARKS.—To be eligible to receive an allotment under section 102, a State shall develop and identify in the State application submitted under section 113 proposed rigorous and quantifiable benchmarks to measure the statewide progress of the State, which shall include, at a minimum, measures, of—

“(1) attainment of challenging State academic proficiencies;

“(2) attainment of secondary school diplomas or general equivalency diplomas; and

“(3) placement in, retention in, and completion of, postsecondary education or advanced training, or placement and retention in military service, or employment.

“(b) PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND SANCTIONS.—

“(1) STATE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—If a State fails to meet its State benchmarks as described in the report submitted under subsection (c), the State shall develop and implement a program improvement plan in consultation with appropriate agencies, individuals, and organizations for the first program year succeeding the program year in which the State failed to meet its benchmarks in order to avoid a sanction as provided under paragraph (3).

“(2) LOCAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—If an eligible recipient fails to meet its State benchmarks, the eligible recipient shall develop a program improvement plan with appropriate agencies, individuals, and organizations for the succeeding program year.

“(3) SANCTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State fails to meet the State benchmarks required under subsection (a), and has not implemented an improvement plan as described in paragraph (1), has not demonstrated improvement in meeting its benchmarks, or has failed to meet its benchmarks for 2 or more consecutive years, the Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, or withhold from the State all, or a portion of, the State's allotment under this Act. The Secretary may waive the sanction due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances such as a natural disaster or a precipitous and unforeseen decline in the financial resources of the State.

“(B) FUNDS RESULTING FROM REDUCED ALLOTMENTS.—The amount of funds retained by the Secretary as a result of a reduction in an allotment made under subparagraph (A) shall be redistributed to other States in accordance with section 101.

“(C) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) INFORMATION.—Each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs. In preparing the report, the State may include information on such additional vocational-technical education benchmarks as the State may establish.

“(B) SPECIAL POPULATIONS.—The report submitted by the State in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women participating in vocational-technical education programs have met the vocational-technical education benchmarks established by the State.

“(2) INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall make the information contained in such reports available to the general public through publication and other appropriate methods which may include electronic communication.

“(3) BENCHMARK PERFORMANCE.—Each local recipient shall make available to the general public information regarding how the local recipient is performing in regard to the State benchmarks.”

#### SEC. 116. PROGRAM EVALUATION.

Sections 115, 116, 117, and 118 of the Act are repealed.

### TITLE II—BASIC STATE GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

#### SEC. 201. STATE PROGRAMS.

(a) HEADING.—The heading for title II is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE II—BASIC STATE GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION”.

(b) PROGRAMS.—Section 201 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “102(a)(3)” and inserting “102(a)(2)”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) REQUIRED USES OF FUNDS.—The programs described in subsection (a) shall include—

“(1) an assessment of the vocational-technical education programs carried out with funds under this Act that includes an assessment of how the needs of special populations are being met and how such programs will ensure that the benchmarks established under section 114 are being met;

“(2) developing, improving, or expanding the use of technology in vocational-technical education which may include—

“(A) training of vocational-technical education personnel to use State-of-the-art technology, which may include distance learning;

“(B) providing vocational-technical education students with the academic and technical skills that lead to entry into the high technology and telecommunications field; or

“(C) encouraging schools to work with high tech industries to offer voluntary internships and mentoring programs;

“(3) professional development programs, including—

“(A) inservice and preservice training in state-of-the-art vocational-technical education programs and techniques; and

“(B) support of education programs for teachers of vocational-technical education in public schools and other public school personnel who are involved in the direct delivery of educational services to vocational education students to ensure that such teachers stay current with the needs, expectations, and methods of industry; and

“(4) support for vocational-technical education programs that improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening the academic component of such vocational-technical education programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education to ensure learning in the core academic subjects.”;

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) PERMISSIBLE USES OF FUNDS.—The programs under subsection (a) may include—

“(1) technical support for eligible recipients;

“(2) support for tech-prep programs;

“(3) support for programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women,

and individuals in nontraditional occupations that lead to high skill, high wage careers;

“(4) support for cooperative education;

“(5) support for vocational student organizations;

“(6) support for public charter schools operating secondary vocational-technical education programs;

“(7) support for vocational-technical education programs that offer experience in, and understanding of, all aspects of the industry for which students are preparing to enter;

“(8) support for family and consumer sciences programs; and

“(9) support for corrections vocational-technical education.”; and

(4) by adding after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) RESTRICTION ON USES OF FUNDS.—A State that receives funds under section 102(a)(2) may not use any of such funds to pay administrative costs.”.

#### SEC. 202. SECONDARY, POSTSECONDARY, AND ADULT VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Part B of title II of the Act is amended to read as follows:

“PART B—SECONDARY, POSTSECONDARY, AND ADULT VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

##### “Subpart 1—Within-State Allocation

“SEC. 221. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in this section and section 223, each State shall distribute the funds received under this Act and available in fiscal year 1998 for secondary school vocational-technical education to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

“(1) From 70 percent of such funds, each local educational agency shall be allocated an amount that bears the same relationship to such 70 percent as the amount such local educational agency was allocated under section 1124 or such section's predecessor authority of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the preceding fiscal year bears to the total amount received under such section by local educational agencies in the State in such year.

“(2) From 20 percent of such funds, each local educational agency shall be allocated an amount that bears the same relationship to such 20 percent as the number of students with disabilities who have individualized education programs under section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act who are served by such local educational agency in the preceding fiscal year bears to the total number of such students served by local educational agencies in the State in such year.

“(3) From 10 percent of such funds, each local educational agency shall be allocated an amount that bears the same relationship to such 10 percent as the number of students enrolled in schools and adults enrolled in training programs under the jurisdiction of such local educational agency in the preceding fiscal year bears to the number of students enrolled in schools and adults enrolled in training programs under the jurisdiction of all local educational agencies in the State in such year.

“(b) ALLOCATION FOR SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—In fiscal year 1999, and the succeeding 3 fiscal years, each State shall distribute the funds available in any such fiscal year for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

“(1) POPULATION.—50 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

“(2) INCOME.—50 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

“(c) WAIVER FOR MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary may waive the application of subsection (b) in the case of any State that submits to the Secretary an application for such a waiver that—

“(1) demonstrates that the formula described in subsection (b) does not result in a distribution of funds to local educational agencies within the State that have the greatest economic need and that an alternative formula would result in such a distribution; and

“(2) includes a proposal for such an alternative formula.

“(d) MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no local educational agency shall be eligible for a grant under this part unless the amount allocated to such agency under subsections (a) and (b) is not less than \$7,500. A local educational agency may enter into a consortium with other local educational agencies for purposes of meeting the minimum allocation requirement of this paragraph.

“(2) WAIVER.—The State shall waive the application of paragraph (1) in any case in which the local educational agency—

“(A)(i) is located in a rural, sparsely populated area, or

“(ii) is a public charter school operating secondary vocational-technical education programs; and

“(B) demonstrates that the agency is unable to enter into a consortium for purposes of providing services under this part.

“(3) REDISTRIBUTION.—Any amounts that are not allocated by reason of paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) shall be redistributed to local educational agencies that meet the requirements of paragraph (1) or (2) in accordance with the provisions of this section.

“(e) LIMITED JURISDICTION AGENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In applying the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d), no State receiving assistance under this Act shall allocate funds to a local educational agency that serves only elementary schools, but shall distribute such funds to the local educational agency or regional educational agency that provides secondary school services to secondary school students in the same attendance area.

“(2) SECONDARY SCHOOL JURISDICTION.—The amount to be allocated under paragraph (1) to a local educational agency that has jurisdiction only over secondary schools shall be determined based on the number of students that were enrolled in such secondary schools in the previous year from the elementary schools involved.

“(f) ALLOCATIONS TO AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall distribute funds available for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to the appropriate area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency in any case in which the area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency and the local educational agency concerned—

“(A) have formed or will form a consortium for the purpose of receiving funds under this section; or

“(B) have entered into or will enter into a cooperative arrangement for such purpose.

“(2) ALLOCATION BASIS.—If an area vocational-technical education school or educational

service agency meets the requirements of paragraph (1), then the amount that would otherwise be distributed to the local educational agency shall be allocated to the area vocational-technical education school, the educational service agency, and the local educational agency based on each school's or entity's relative share of students who are attending vocational-technical education programs (based, if practicable, on the average enrollment for the prior 3 years).

“(3) APPEALS PROCEDURE.—The State board shall establish an appeals procedure for resolution of any dispute arising between a local educational agency and an area vocational-technical education school or an educational service agency with respect to the allocation procedures described in this section, including the decision of a local educational agency to leave a consortium or terminate a cooperative arrangement.

“(g) CONSORTIUM REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) ALLIANCE.—Any local educational agency receiving an allocation that is not sufficient to conduct a program which meets the requirements of section 225 is encouraged to—

“(A) form a consortium or enter into a cooperative agreement with an area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency offering programs that meet the requirements of section 225;

“(B) transfer such allocation to the area vocational-technical education school or educational service agency; and

“(C) be of sufficient size, scope, and quality as to be effective.

“(2) FUNDS TO CONSORTIUM.—Funds allocated to a consortium formed to meet the requirements of this paragraph shall be used only for purposes and programs that are mutually beneficial to all members of the consortium and can be used only for programs authorized under this Act. Such funds may not be reallocated to individual members of the consortium for purposes or programs benefiting only one member of the consortium.

“(h) DATA.—The Secretary shall collect information from States regarding the specific dollar allocations made available by the State for vocational-technical education programs under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) and how these allocations are distributed to local educational agencies, area vocational-technical education schools, educational services agencies, and eligible institutions within the State in accordance with this section.

**“SEC. 222. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR POST-SECONDARY AND ADULT VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.**

“(a) ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) and section 223, each State shall distribute funds available in any fiscal year for postsecondary and adult vocational-technical education programs to eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions within the State.

“(2) FORMULA.—Each eligible institution or consortium of eligible institutions shall receive an amount that bears the same relationship to the amount of funds available under such section as the number of individuals who are Pell Grant recipients or recipients of assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and are enrolled in programs meeting the requirements of section 225 offered by such institution or consortium in the preceding fiscal year bears to the number of such recipients enrolled in such programs within the State for such year.

“(3) CONSORTIUM REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In order for a consortium of eligible institutions described in paragraph (2) to receive assistance pursuant to such paragraph, such consortium shall operate joint projects that—

“(i) provide services to all postsecondary institutions participating in the consortium; and

“(ii) are of sufficient size, scope, and quality as to be effective.

“(B) FUNDS TO CONSORTIUM.—Funds allocated to a consortium formed to meet the requirements of this section shall be used only for purposes and programs that are mutually beneficial to all members of the consortium and can be used only for programs authorized under this Act. Such funds may not be reallocated to individual members of the consortium for purposes or programs benefiting only one member of the consortium.

“(b) WAIVER FOR MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary may waive the application of subsection (a) in the case of any State that submits to the Secretary of Education an application for such a waiver that—

“(1) demonstrates that the formula described in subsection (a) does not result in a distribution of funds to the institutions or consortia within the State that have the highest numbers of economically disadvantaged individuals and that an alternative formula would result in such a distribution; and

“(2) includes a proposal for such an alternative formula.

“(c) MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No funds provided to any institution or consortium under this section shall be for an amount that is less than \$20,000.

“(2) REDISTRIBUTION.—Any amounts that are not distributed by reason of paragraph (1) shall be redistributed to eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions in accordance with the provisions of this section.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘eligible institution’ means an institution of higher education as such term is defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, a local educational agency serving adults, or an area vocational education school serving adults that offers or will offer a program that meets the requirements of section 225 and seeks to receive assistance under this part; and

“(2) the term ‘Pell Grant’ means a recipient of financial aid under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

**“SEC. 223. SPECIAL RULES FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION.**

“(a) SPECIAL RULE FOR MINIMAL ALLOCATION.—

“(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 221 and 222 and in order to make a more equitable distribution of funds for programs serving the areas of greatest economic need, for any program year for which a minimal amount is made available by a State for distribution under section 221 or 222, such State may distribute such minimal amount for such year—

“(A) on a competitive basis; or

“(B) through any alternative method determined by the State.

“(2) MINIMAL AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘minimal amount’ means not more than 15 percent of the total amount made available for distribution under this part.

“(b) REDISTRIBUTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In any academic year that a local educational agency or eligible institution does not expend all of the amounts it is allocated for such year under section 221 or 222, such recipient shall return any unexpended amounts to the State to be reallocated under section 221 or 222, as appropriate.

“(2) REDISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS RETURNED LATE IN AN ACADEMIC YEAR.—In any academic year in which amounts are returned to the State under section 221 or 222 and the State is unable to reallocate such amounts according to such sections in time for such amounts to be expended in such academic year, the State shall retain such amounts for distribution in combination with amounts provided under this title for the following academic year.

“(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 221 or 222 shall be construed—

“(1) to prohibit a local educational agency (or a consortium thereof) that receives assistance

under section 221, from working with an eligible recipient (or consortium thereof) that receives assistance under section 222, to carry out secondary school vocational-technical education programs in accordance with this title;

“(2) to prohibit an eligible recipient (or consortium thereof) that receives assistance under section 222, from working with a local educational agency (or consortium thereof) that receives assistance under section 221, to carry out postsecondary and adult vocational-technical education programs in accordance with this title; or

“(3) to require a charter school that is a local educational agency to jointly establish its eligibility unless the charter school is explicitly permitted to do so under the State’s charter school statute.

“(d) **CONSISTENT APPLICATION.**—For purposes of this section, the State board shall provide funds to charter schools that offer vocational-technical education programs that are public schools of the local educational agency in the same manner as it provides those funds to other schools of the local educational agency. Such program within a charter school shall be of sufficient size, scope, and quality as to be effective.

**“SEC. 224. LOCAL APPLICATION FOR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.**

“(a) **APPLICATION REQUIRED.**—Any eligible recipient desiring financial assistance under this part shall, in accordance with requirements established by the State board, submit an application to the State board. Such application shall cover the same period of time as the period of time applicable to the State application submitted under section 112.

“(b) **CONTENTS.**—The State board shall determine requirements for local applications, except that each application shall—

“(1) describe how the vocational-technical education programs required under section 225(b) will be carried out with funds received under this part;

“(2) describe how students participating in vocational-technical education programs carried out with funds under this Act will reach the State benchmarks as established under section 114;

“(3) describe how the eligible recipient will—

“(A) improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening the academic component of such programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education programs through a coherent sequence of courses to ensure learning in the core academic subjects; and

“(B) ensure that students who participate in such vocational-technical education programs are taught to the same challenging academic proficiencies as are provided for all other students;

“(4) describe how parents, students, teachers, business and representatives of employees are involved in the development and implementation of vocational-technical education programs assisted under this Act; and

“(5) provide assurances that the eligible recipient will provide a vocational-technical education program that is of such size, scope, and quality as to bring about improvement in the quality of vocational-technical education programs.

**“SEC. 225. LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.**

“(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—Each eligible recipient that receives a grant under this part shall use such funds to improve vocational-technical education programs.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS FOR USES OF FUNDS.**—Funds made available under this part shall be used to provide vocational-technical education programs that—

“(1) strengthen the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening

the academic component of such programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education programs through a coherent sequence of courses to ensure learning in the core academic subjects;

“(2) develop, improve, or expand the use of technology in vocational-technical education which may include—

“(A) training of vocational-technical education personnel to use State-of-the-art technology, which may include distance learning;

“(B) providing vocational-technical education students with the academic and technical skills that lead to entry into the high technology and telecommunications field; or

“(C) encouraging schools to work with high tech industries to offer voluntary internships and mentoring programs;

“(3) provide professional development programs, including—

“(A) inservice training in state-of-the-art vocational-technical education programs and techniques; and

“(B) support of education programs for teachers of vocational-technical education in public schools and other public school personnel who are involved in the direct delivery of educational services to vocational education students, to ensure that such teachers stay current with the needs, expectations, and methods of industry;

“(4) support vocational-technical education programs that improve the academic and technical skills of students participating in vocational-technical education programs by strengthening the academic component of such vocational-technical education programs through the integration of academics with vocational-technical education to ensure learning in the core academic subjects; and

“(5) provide an assessment of the vocational-technical education programs carried out with funds under this Act, including an assessment of how the needs of special populations are being met, and how such programs will ensure that the benchmarks established under section 114 are being met.

“(c) **PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—The vocational-technical education programs described in subsection (b) may be used for—

“(1) establishing agreements between secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education programs in order to provide postsecondary education and training opportunities for students participating in such vocational-technical programs, such as tech-prep programs;

“(2) involving parents, business, and representatives of employees in the design and implementation of vocational-technical education programs authorized under this Act;

“(3) providing career guidance and counseling;

“(4) providing work related experience, such as internships, cooperative education, school-based enterprises, entrepreneurship, and job shadowing that are related to vocational-technical education programs;

“(5) programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women;

“(6) local education and business partnerships;

“(7) vocational student organizations;

“(8) mentoring and support services;

“(9) leasing, purchasing, or upgrading of equipment; and

“(10) establishing effective programs and procedures to enable vocational-technical education program participants and their parents to participate directly in decisions that influence the programs, including providing information and assistance for informed effective participation.

“(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Each eligible recipient receiving funds under this part shall not use more than 2 percent of the funds for administrative costs associated with the administration of the grant.”.

**SEC. 203. REPEAL OF PART C.**

Part C of title II is repealed.

**TITLE III—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

**SEC. 301. EVALUATION; RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS AND DISSEMINATION.**

(a) **HEADING.**—The heading for title III is amended to read as follows:

**“TITLE III—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT”.**

(b) **PART A.**—Part A of title III is amended to read as follows:

**“PART A—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT  
“SEC. 301. EVALUATION; RESEARCH; DEMONSTRATIONS; AND DISSEMINATION.**

“(a) **SINGLE PLAN.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop a single plan for evaluation and assessment, research, demonstrations, and dissemination with regard to the vocational-technical education programs assisted under this Act.

“(2) **PLAN.**—Such plan shall—

“(A) identify the vocational-technical education programs the Secretary will carry out under this section;

“(B) describe how the Secretary will evaluate such vocational-technical education programs in accordance with subsection (b); and

“(C) include such other information as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(b) **EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From amounts made available under subsection (g), the Secretary shall provide for the conduct of an independent evaluation and assessment of vocational-technical education programs under this Act through studies and analyses conducted independently through grants and contracts awarded on a competitive basis.

“(2) **CONTENTS.**—Such evaluation and assessment of vocational-technical education programs shall include descriptions of—

“(A) the extent to which State, local, and tribal entities have developed, implemented, or improved State and local vocational-technical education programs;

“(B) the degree to which the expenditures at the Federal, State, local, and tribal levels address improvement in vocational-technical education programs;

“(C) the extent to which vocational-technical education programs succeed in preparing individuals participating in such programs for entry into postsecondary education, further learning, or high skill, high wage careers; and

“(D) the effect of State benchmarks, performance measures, and other measures of accountability on the delivery of vocational-technical education programs.

“(c) **INFORMATION COLLECTION AND REPORT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may collect and disseminate information from States regarding State efforts to meet State benchmarks described in section 114.

“(2) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall gather any information collected pursuant to paragraph (1) and submit a report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate.

“(d) **RESEARCH.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to an institution of higher education, a public or private organization or agency, or a consortium of such institutions, organizations, or agencies to establish a national research center or centers—

“(A) to carry out research for the purpose of developing, improving, and identifying the most successful methods for successfully addressing the education, employment, and training needs of participants in vocational-technical education programs;

“(B) to carry out research to increase the effectiveness and improve the implementation of vocational-technical education programs, including conducting research and development and studies providing longitudinal information or formative evaluation with respect to vocational-technical education programs;

“(C) to carry out such other programs as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to achieve the purposes of this Act.

“(2) SUMMARY.—The Secretary shall provide an annual report summarizing the evaluations and assessments described in subsection (b), and the research conducted pursuant to this subsection, and the findings of such evaluations and assessments, and research, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate.

“(e) DEMONSTRATIONS AND DISSEMINATION.—

“(1) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out demonstration vocational-technical education programs, to replicate model vocational-technical education programs, to disseminate best practices information, and to provide technical assistance upon request of a State, for the purposes of developing, improving, and identifying the most successful methods and techniques for providing vocational-technical education programs assisted under this Act.

“(2) DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a demonstration partnership project involving a 4-year, accredited postsecondary institution, in cooperation with local public education organizations, volunteer groups, and private sector business participants to provide program support, and facilities for education, training, tutoring, counseling, employment preparation, specific skills training in emerging and established professions, retraining of military medical personnel, retraining of individuals displaced by corporate or military restructuring, migrant workers, and other individuals who otherwise would not have access to such services, through multi-site, multi-State distance learning technologies.

“(B) PROGRAM.—Such program may be carried out directly or through grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or through the national center or centers.

“(f) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to carry out this part.”.

#### SEC. 302. TECH-PREP EDUCATION.

Part B of title III is amended to read as follows:

##### “PART C—TECH-PREP EDUCATION

#### “SEC. 321. TECH-PREP EDUCATION.

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The State board, in accordance with the provisions of this part, shall award grants to consortia on a competitive basis or on the basis of a formula determined by the State board, for tech-prep education programs.

“(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Each grant recipient shall use amounts provided under the grant to develop and operate a 4-year tech-prep education program.

“(c) CONTENTS OF PROGRAM.—Any such program shall—

“(1) be carried out under an articulation agreement between the participants in the consortium;

“(2) consist of the 2 or 4 years of secondary school preceding graduation and 2 years of higher education, or an apprenticeship program of at least 2 years following secondary instruction, with a common core of required proficiency in mathematics, science, communications, and technologies designed to lead to an associate degree or postsecondary certificate in a specific career field;

“(3) include the development of tech-prep education program components appropriate to the needs of the consortium participants;

“(4) include in-service training for teachers that—

“(A) is designed to train vocational-technical teachers to effectively implement tech-prep education programs;

“(B) provides for joint training for teachers in the tech-prep consortium; and

“(C) may provide such training in weekend, evening, and summer sessions, institutes, or workshops;

“(5) include training programs for counselors designed to enable counselors to more effectively—

“(A) provide information to students regarding tech-prep education programs;

“(B) support student progress in completing such programs; and

“(C) provide information on related employment opportunities;

“(6) provide equal access to the full range of technical preparation programs to individuals who are members of special populations, including the development of tech-prep education program services appropriate to the needs of such individuals; and

“(7) provide for preparatory services that assist participants in such programs.

“(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Each such program may—

“(1) provide for the acquisition of tech-prep education program equipment; and

“(2) acquire technical assistance from State or local entities that have successfully designed, established and operated tech-prep programs.

#### “SEC. 322. APPLICATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each consortium that desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application to the State board, as appropriate, at such time and in such manner as the State board shall prescribe.

“(b) PLAN.—Each application submitted under this section shall contain a 5-year plan for the development and implementation of programs under this part.

“(c) APPROVAL.—The State board shall approve applications based on their potential to create an effective tech-prep education program as provided for in this section.

“(d) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The State board, as appropriate, shall give special consideration to applications which—

“(1) provide for effective employment placement activities or transfer of students to 4-year baccalaureate degree programs;

“(2) are developed in consultation with business, industry, institutions of higher education, and representatives of employees;

“(3) address effectively the issues of dropout prevention and reentry and the needs of special populations.

#### “SEC. 323. REPORT.

“Each State that receives a grant under this part shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on the effectiveness of their Tech-Prep programs, including how competitive grants were awarded within the State.

#### “SEC. 324. ALLOTMENT.

“The Secretary shall allot funds under this part in each fiscal year in the same manner as funds are allotted under section 101(a)(2).

#### “SEC. 325. AUTHORIZATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available under section 3(a), 10 percent shall be used to carry out this part for fiscal year 1998 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

“(b) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—No State shall receive a grant of less than \$200,000 under this part in any fiscal year.”.

#### SEC. 303. VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION DATA SYSTEMS.

Part C of title IV is amended—

(1) by striking the part heading and inserting the following:

##### “PART B—VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION INFORMATION”;

(2) by redesignating sections 421 through 424 as sections 311 through 314, respectively.

(3) by amending subsection (e) of section 312, as redesignated under paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(e) There are authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this part.”;

(4) in section 313(a)(1), as redesignated in paragraph (2), by striking “421” and inserting “311”; and

(5) by adding at the end of such part the following new section:

#### “SEC. 315. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

“There are authorized to be appropriated for this part such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1998 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.”.

#### SEC. 304. REPEALS.

(a) TITLE III.—Part C of title III of the Act, as the Act was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, is repealed.

(b) TITLE IV.—The heading for title IV and parts A, B, E, and F of such title of the Act are repealed.

#### TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### SEC. 401. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Title V of the Act is amended to read as follows:

#### “TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### “PART A—FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

#### “SEC. 401. PAYMENTS.

“The Secretary shall pay from its allotment under section 101 to each State for any fiscal year for which the State has a State application submitted in accordance with section 113 (including any amendment to such application) the Federal share of the costs of carrying out the State application.

#### “SEC. 402. FISCAL REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds received under this Act shall be used to supplement, not supplant, the amount of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for vocational-technical education programs.

“(b) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—

“(1) DETERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no payments shall be made under this title for any program year to a State for vocational-technical education programs unless the Secretary of Education determines that the fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of such State for vocational-technical programs for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, equaled or exceeded such effort or expenditures for vocational-technical education programs, for the second program year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

“(B) COMPUTATION.—In computing the fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Education shall exclude capital expenditures, special one-time project costs, similar windfalls, and the cost of pilot programs.

“(C) DECREASE IN FEDERAL SUPPORT.—If the amount made available for vocational-technical education programs under this Act for a fiscal year is less than the amount made available for vocational-technical education programs under this Act for the preceding fiscal year, then the fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of a State required by subparagraph (B) for such preceding fiscal year shall be decreased by the same percentage as the percentage decrease in the amount so made available.

“(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirements of paragraph (1) (with respect to not more than 5 percent of expenditures required for the preceding fiscal year by any State) for 1 program year only, after making a

determination that such waiver would be equitable due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances affecting the ability of the State to meet such requirements, such as a natural disaster or an unforeseen and precipitous decline in financial resources. No level of funding permitted under such a waiver may be used as the basis for computing the fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures required under this paragraph for years subsequent to the year covered by such waiver. The fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the subsequent years shall be computed on the basis of the level of funding that would, but for such waiver, have been required.

**"SEC. 403. AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.**

"Any authority to make payments or to enter into contracts under this Act shall be available only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance appropriation Acts.

**"SEC. 404. NATIONAL AND STATE FUNDING.**

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit, allow, encourage, or authorize any Federal control over any aspect of any private, religious, or home school, whether or not a home school is treated as a private school or home school under State law. This section shall not be construed to bar private, religious, or home schools from participation in programs or services under the Act.

**"SEC. 405. FREEDOM TO CHOOSE.**

"None of the funds made available under this Act shall be used to—

"(1) require any individual to choose or pursue a specific career path or major;

"(2) compel any individual to enter into a specific course of study which requires as a condition or completion, attainment of federally-funded or endorsed industry recognized skills or standards; or

"(3) require any individuals to meet or obtain federally-funded or endorsed industry recognized skills, certificates, or standards.

**"SEC. 406. LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS.**

"None of the funds received under this Act may be used to provide vocational-technical education programs to students prior to the seventh grade, except that equipment and facilities purchased with funds under this Act may be used by such students.

**"SEC. 407. FEDERAL LAWS GUARANTEEING CIVIL RIGHTS.**

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to be inconsistent with applicable Federal laws guaranteeing civil rights.

**"SEC. 408. AUTHORIZATION OF SECRETARY.**

"For the purposes of increasing and expanding the use of technology in vocational-technical education instruction, including the training of vocational-technical education personnel as provided in title II, the Secretary is authorized to receive funds collected by the Federal Government from fees for the use of property, rights-of-way, and easements under the control of Federal departments and agencies for the placement of telecommunications services that are dependent, in whole or in part, upon the utilization of general spectrum rights for the transmission or reception of such services.

**"PART B—STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS**

**"SEC. 411. JOINT FUNDING.**

"(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Funds made available to States under this Act may be used to provide additional funds under an applicable program if—

"(1) such program otherwise meets the requirements of this Act and the requirements of the applicable program;

"(2) such program serves the same individuals that are served under this Act;

"(3) such program provides services in a coordinated manner with services provided under this Act; and

"(4) such funds would be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds provided from non-Federal sources.

"(b) APPLICABLE PROGRAM.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'applicable program'

means any program under any of the following provisions of law:

"(1) Section 123, title II, and title III of the Job Training Partnership Act.

"(2) The Wagner-Peyser Act.

"(c) USE OF FUNDS AS MATCHING FUNDS.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'additional funds' does not include the use of funds as matching funds.

**"SEC. 412. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO INDUCE OUT-OF-STATE RELOCATION OF BUSINESSES.**

"No funds provided under this Act shall be used for the purpose of directly providing incentives or inducements to an employer to relocate a business enterprise from one State to another State if such relocation would result in a reduction in the number of jobs available in the State where the business enterprise is located before such incentives or inducements are offered.

**"SEC. 413. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**

"For each fiscal year for which a State receives assistance under this Act, the State shall provide from non-Federal sources for costs the State incurs for administration of programs under this Act an amount that is not less than the amount provided by the State from non-Federal sources for such costs for the preceding fiscal year.

**"SEC. 414. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL REGULATIONS.**

"The Secretary may issue regulations under this Act only to the extent necessary to administer and ensure compliance with the specific requirements of this Act.

**"SEC. 415. STUDENT ASSISTANCE AND OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.**

"(a) ATTENDANCE COSTS NOT TREATED AS INCOME OR RESOURCES.—The portion of any student financial assistance received under this Act that is made available for attendance costs described in subsection (b) shall not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for assistance under any other program funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

"(b) ATTENDANCE COSTS.—The attendance costs described in this subsection are—

"(1) tuition and fees normally assessed a student carrying the same academic workload as determined by the institution, and including costs for rental or purchase of any equipment, materials, or supplies required of all students in the same course of study; and

"(2) an allowance for books, supplies, transportation, dependent care, and miscellaneous personal expenses for a student attending the institution on at least a half-time basis, as determined by the institution.

"(c) COSTS OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION SERVICES.—Funds made available under title II may be used to pay for the costs of vocational-technical education services required in an individualized education plan developed pursuant to section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and services necessary to meet the requirements of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 with respect to ensuring equal access to vocational-technical education.

**"PART C—DEFINITIONS**

**"SEC. 421. DEFINITIONS.**

"Except as otherwise specified in this Act, as used in this Act:

"(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The term 'administration' means programs of a State necessary for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this Act, including supervision, but does not include curriculum development programs, personnel development, or research programs.

"(2) ALL ASPECTS OF THE INDUSTRY.—The term 'all aspects of the industry' means strong experience in, and comprehensive understanding of, the industry that individuals are preparing to enter.

"(3) AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.—The term 'area vocational-technical education school' means—

"(A) a specialized secondary school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational-technical education to individuals who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market;

"(B) the department of a secondary school exclusively or principally used for providing vocational-technical education in not fewer than five different occupational fields to individuals who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market;

"(C) a technical institute or vocational-technical education school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational-technical education to individuals who have completed or left secondary school and who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market, if the institute or school admits as regular students both individuals who have completed secondary school and individuals who have left secondary school; or

"(D) the department or division of a junior college, or community college, that operates under the policies of the State board and that provides vocational-technical education in not fewer than five different occupational fields leading to immediate employment but not necessarily leading to a baccalaureate degree, if the department or division admits as regular students both individuals who have completed secondary school and individuals who have left secondary school.

"(4) COOPERATIVE EDUCATION.—The term 'cooperative education' means a method of instruction of education for individuals who, through written cooperative arrangements between a school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related instruction, by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, which alternation shall be planned and supervised by the school and employer so that each contributes to the education and employability of the individual, and may include an arrangement in which work periods and school attendance may be on alternate half days, full days, weeks, or other periods of time in fulfilling the cooperative program.

"(5) DISPLACED HOMEMAKER.—The term 'displaced homemaker' means an individual who—

"(A) has worked primarily without remuneration to care for a home and family, and for that reason has diminished marketable skills; or

"(B) is a parent whose youngest dependent child will become ineligible to receive assistance under title I of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 not later than 2 years after the date of which the parent applies for assistance under this title.

"(6) EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCY.—The term 'educational service agency' means a regional public multiservice agency authorized by State statute to develop and manage a service or program and provide the service or program to a local educational agency.

"(7) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term 'eligible recipient' means a local educational agency, an area vocational-technical education school, an educational service agency, an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a))), and a consortium of such entities.

"(8) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'local educational agency' has the meaning given such term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

"(9) OUTLYING AREA.—The term 'outlying area' means the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau.

"(10) REPRESENTATIVES OF EMPLOYEES.—The term 'representatives of employees' means—

“(A) individuals who have been elected by organizations, associations, or a network of similar institutions to represent the economic interests of employees at a significant segment of workplaces; or

“(B) individuals from organizations, associations, or a network of similar institutions, with expertise to represent, or experience representing, the interests of employees with respect to vocational-technical education.

“(11) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term ‘secondary school’ has the meaning given the term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

“(12) SPECIAL POPULATIONS.—The term ‘special populations’ means individuals with disabilities, economically disadvantaged individuals, individuals of limited English proficiency, and individuals participating in nontraditional training and employment.

“(13) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Education.

“(14) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

“(15) TECH-PREP PROGRAM.—The term ‘tech-prep program’ means a program of study that—

“(A) combines at least 2 years of secondary education (as determined under State law) and 2 years of postsecondary education in a non-duplicative sequential course of study;

“(B) strengthens the applied academic component of vocational-technical education through the integration of academic and vocational-technical instruction;

“(C) provides technical preparation in an area such as engineering technology, applied science, a mechanical, industrial, or practical art or trade, agriculture, a health occupation, business, or applied economics;

“(D) builds student competence in mathematics, science, and communications through applied academics in a coherent sequence of courses; and

“(E) leads to an associate degree or a certificate in a specific career field and to high skill, high wage employment or further education.

“(16) VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION.—The term ‘vocational-technical education’ means organized educational programs that—

“(A) offer a sequence of courses that provide individuals with the academic knowledge and skills the individuals need to prepare for further education and careers in current or emerging employment sectors; and

“(B) include competency-based applied learning that contributes to the academic knowledge, higher-order reasoning and problem-solving skills, work attitudes, general employability skills, and occupation-specific skills, of an individual.

“(17) VOCATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘vocational student organization’ means an organization, for individuals enrolled in programs of vocational-technical education programs, that engages in programs as an integral part of the instructional component of such programs, which organization may have State and national units.”.

**SEC. 402. REPEAL OF SMITH-HUGHES VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT.**

The Act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929; 20 U.S.C. 11) (commonly known as the “Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act”) is repealed.

**SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Except as otherwise provided, the repeals and amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair will accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has had printed in the

designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GOODLING:

Page 3, after line 18, insert the following:

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) NATIONAL PROGRAMS.—None of the funds made available under this section for programs authorized under titles I, II, and part C of title III, shall be used for any program authorized under part A of title III.

Page 3, line 19, strike “(3)” and insert “(4)” and strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

Page 9, strike lines 12 through 14, and insert the following:

“(c) RURAL AND URBAN RESERVE.—A State may reserve not more than 5 percent of the allotment made under section 102(a)(1) to use for grants to rural areas and not more than 5 percent of such allotment to use for grants to urban areas.”.

Beginning on page 9, strike lines 15 and all that follows through page 10, line 2.

Page 10, after line 2, insert the following:

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘rural area’ means an area that is not in a metropolitan statistical area;

“(2) the term ‘urban area’ means an area that serves a central city in a metropolitan statistical area; and

“(3) the terms ‘central city’ and ‘metropolitan statistical area’ have the same meanings given such terms in section 10952 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.”.

Page 16, after line 10, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subsections accordingly):

“(c) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for grants under this section are not sufficient to pay in full the total amount which approved applicants are eligible to receive under this section for such fiscal year, the Secretary shall first allocate to each such applicant which received funds under this part for the preceding fiscal year an amount equal to 100 percent of the product of the per capita payment for the preceding fiscal year and such applicant’s Indian student count for the current program year, plus an amount equal to the actual cost of any increase to the per capita figure resulting from inflationary increases to necessary costs beyond the institution’s control.

“(2) PER CAPITA DETERMINATION.—For the purposes of paragraph (1), the per capita payment for any fiscal year shall be determined by dividing the amount available for grants to tribally controlled postsecondary vocational technical institutions under this part for such program year by the sum of the Indian student counts of such institutions for such program year. The Secretary shall, on the basis of the most accurate data available from the institutions, compute the Indian student count for any fiscal year for which such count was not used for the purpose of making allocations under this section.

Page 22, strike line 13, and insert the following:

(D) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) The State board shall, for secondary vocational-technical education programs, establish effective activities and procedures, by which parents, students, teachers, and area residents concerned will be able to participate in State and local decisions that influence programs under this Act, and ensure that such individuals are given access to the information needed to use such procedures.”.

Page 23, line 5, strike “and”.

Page 23, line 9, strike the semicolon and insert “in current and emerging occupations; and”.

Page 23, after line 9, insert the following:

“(D) how funds will be used to improve or develop new vocational-technical education courses.”.

Page 23, line 13, strike “and”.

Page 23, line 14, before “of” insert “, and evaluation”.

Page 24, line 1, strike “component” and insert “and vocational components”.

Page 24, line 5, after “academic” insert “and vocational”.

Page 24, line 14, after “describe”, insert “, to the extent practicable.”.

Page 25, strike lines 8 and 9 and insert the following:

“(8) describe what steps the State shall take to involve representatives of local school boards in the development of the State’s benchmarks;

“(9) provide a financial audit of funds received under this Act which may be included as part of an audit of other Federal or State programs; and”.

Page 25, line 10, strike “(9)” and insert “(10)”.

Page 27, strike line 11 and insert the following:

“(a) BENCHMARKS.—

“(1) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive an allot-”.

Page 27, strike lines 17 through 24 and insert the following:

“(A) attainment of challenging State academic and vocational proficiencies;

“(B) attainment of secondary school diplomas or general equivalency diplomas; and

“(C) placement in, retention in, and completion of, postsecondary education or advanced training, or placement and retention in military service, or employment.

“(2) EXISTING BENCHMARKS.—If a State has developed State performance indicators or benchmarks for skills according to challenging academic or vocational proficiencies consistent with this Act, the State may use such performance indicators or benchmarks in measuring the progress of vocational-technical education students.”.

Page 30, line 3, strike “have met” and insert “have performed in meeting”.

Page 32, line 10, before the semicolon insert “, effective teaching skills based on research, and effective practices to improve parental and community involvement”.

Page 32, line 22 and page 33, line 2, after “academic” insert “and vocational”.

Page 33, line 8, strike “support for” and insert “establishing agreements between secondary and postsecondary vocational-technical education programs in order to provide postsecondary education and training opportunities for students participating in such vocational-technical education programs, such as”.

Page 33, line 23, strike “and”.

Page 33, line 25, strike the period and all that follows and insert a semicolon.

Page 33, after line 25, insert the following:

“(10) support for education and business partnerships; and

“(11) support to improve or develop new vocational-technical education courses.”; and

Page 34, strike line 7 and insert “**TIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.**”.

Page 36, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 37, line 2, and insert the following:

“(b) SPECIAL DISTRIBUTION RULES FOR SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—

“(1) FISCAL YEARS 1999 AND 2000.—In fiscal years 1999 and 2000, each State shall distribute the funds available under this Act in such fiscal years for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

“(A) LESSER OR EQUAL AMOUNTS.—Each State shall distribute all funds allocated by the State for each such fiscal year for secondary school vocational-technical education programs in amounts less than or equal to the total amount of funds distributed pursuant to section 231(a) of this Act as such section was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997 for such programs in fiscal year 1997 as follows:

“(i) 30 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

“(ii) 70 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

“(B) GREATER AMOUNTS.—Each State shall distribute all funds allocated by the State for each such fiscal year for secondary school vocational-technical education programs in amounts greater than the total amount of funds distributed pursuant to section 231(a) of this Act as such section was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997 for such programs in fiscal year 1997 as follows:

“(i) 40 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

“(ii) 60 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—Each State shall distribute funds allocated under this Act in fiscal year 2001 for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

“(A) 35 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

“(B) 65 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

“(3) FISCAL YEAR 2002.—Each State shall distribute funds allocated under this Act in fiscal year 2002 for secondary school vocational-technical education programs to local educational agencies within the State as follows:

“(A) 40 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 to 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency for the preceding fiscal year compared to the total number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all local educational agencies in the State for such preceding year.

“(B) 60 percent shall be allocated to such agencies in proportion to the number of individuals aged 15 through 19, inclusive, who reside in the school district served by such agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the fiscal year for which the determination is made compared to the number of such individuals in all the local educational agencies in the State.

Page 37, strike lines 7 through 11, and insert the following:

“(1) demonstrates that a proposed alternative formula more effectively targets funds on the basis of poverty (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) to local educational agencies within the State than the formula described in subsection (b);”

Page 37, line 20, strike “\$7,500” and insert “\$10,000”.

Page 41, line 5, insert “and” after the semicolon.

Page 41, line 9, strike “be” and insert “operate programs that are”.

Page 44, line 12, strike “\$20,000” and insert “\$35,000”.

Page 47, line 8, strike “that” and insert “which provides vocational-technical education programs and”.

Page 47, line 17, after “Such” insert “vocational-technical education”.

Page 48, line 18, strike “component” and insert “and vocational components”.

Page 48, line 22, after “academic” insert “and vocational”.

Page 49, line 5, strike “and implementation” and insert “, implementation, and evaluation”.

Page 49, line 6, before the semicolon insert “, and how these individuals are effectively informed about, and assisted in understanding, the requirements of this Act.”.

Page 49, line 18, strike “provide” and insert “support”.

Page 49, beginning on line 22, strike “components” and insert “and vocational components”.

Page 50, line 2, after “academic” insert “and vocational”.

Page 50, line 20, before the semicolon insert “, effective teaching skills based on research, and effective practices to improve parental and community involvement”.

Page 50, line 25, strike “vocational” and insert “vocational-technical”.

Page 51, beginning on line 18, strike “The” and all that follows through “subsection (b)” on line 19, and insert “Funds made available under this part”.

Page 52, line 4, strike “and implementation” and insert “, implementation, and evaluation”.

Page 52, line 7, after “and” insert “academic”.

Page 52, line 18, strike “and”.

Page 52, line 24, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 52, after line 24, insert the following:

“(11) teacher preparation programs which assist individuals who are interested in becoming vocational-technical education instructors, including individuals with experience in business and industry;

“(12) improving or developing new vocational-technical education courses; and

“(13) support for family and consumer sciences programs.

Page 55, line 1, after “expenditures” insert “of funds provided under this Act”.

Page 55, strike line 14 and insert the following:

“(C) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION AND REPORT.—”.

Page 56, line 19, after the semicolon insert “and”.

Page 56, after line 19 insert the following:

“(C) to carry out research that can be used to improve teaching and learning in the vocational-technical education classroom;”

Page 56, line 20, strike “(C)” and insert “(D)” and strike “programs” and insert “research”.

Page 59, line 10, strike “4-year” and insert “4 or 6-year”.

Page 62, line 22, strike “\$200,000” and insert “\$250,000”.

Page 64, line 2, strike “Part C” and insert “Parts C, D, E, F, G, and H”.

Page 64, line 4, strike “is” and insert “are”.

Page 65, lines 5 and 14, strike “program” and insert “fiscal”.

Page 65, line 21, strike “similar windfalls,”.

Page 67, line 18, before the semicolon insert “or to participate in any vocational-technical education program”.

Page 67, line 20, strike “or” and insert “of”.

Page 67, line 22, strike “or” after the semicolon.

Page 67, line 24, after “or” insert “federally”.

Page 67, line 25, strike the period and insert “, unless the participant has selected and is participating in a program or course of study that requires, as a condition of completion, attainment of an industry-recognized skill or standard; or”.

Page 67, after line 25, insert the following:

“(4) to require any individual to obtain a federally funded or endorsed certificate of mastery.”.

Page 68, after line 21, insert the following: **“SEC. 409. PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SCHOOL PERSONNEL.**

“A State or local educational agency which uses funds under this Act for inservice and preservice vocational-technical education professional development programs for vocational-technical education teachers, administrators, and other personnel may,

upon request, permit the participation in such programs of vocational-technical education teachers, administrators, and other personnel in nonprofit private schools offering vocational-technical education programs located in the geographical area served by such agency."

Page 70, line 6, strike "For" and insert "(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), for".

Page 70, after line 11, insert the following: "(b) EXCEPTION.—If the amount made available for administration of programs under this Act for a fiscal year is less than the amount made available for administration of programs under this Act for the preceding fiscal year, the amount the State is required to provide from non-Federal sources for costs the State incurs for administration of programs under this Act shall be the same percentage as the amount made available for administration of programs under this Act.

Page 73, after line 21, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

"(4) CAREER GUIDANCE AND ACADEMIC COUNSELING.—The term 'career guidance and academic counseling' means providing individuals with information access on career awareness and planning for their occupational and academic future which shall involve career options, financial aid, and postsecondary options.

Page 74, line 2, after "related" insert "vocational-technical education".

Page 77, beginning on line 13, strike "through applied academics" and insert "(including through applied academics)".

Page 78, line 2, strike "employment sectors" and insert "occupations which require other than a baccalaureate or an advanced degree".

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, a manager's amendment, that would modify the within State secondary funding formula to distribute funds in 1998 by the current law formula, in 1999 and 2000 by a formula based 70 percent on poverty, 30 percent on population with a hold harmless at the 1997 funding level. Any additional funds above the 1997 level will be distributed by a formula based 60 percent on poverty, 40 percent on population. In the year 2001 all funds are allocated by a formula based 65 percent on poverty, 35 percent on population. And in the year 2002 all funds are allocated by a formula based on 60 percent poverty, 40 percent population.

The amendment will raise the minimum grant amount from \$7,500 to \$10,000 for secondary programs, and from \$20,000 to \$35,000 for postsecondary programs. It would modify the 10-percent rural reserve and would strike the 5 percent for incentive grant awards. The amendment would further modify the secondary alternative formula language to allow funds to be targeted to areas of greater poverty. The Chairman's amendment would raise the small State minimum grant award for technology prep to \$250,000 and would insert language prohibiting the use of funds authorized for State grants to be used for national programs. Part C through H of title III are repealed. Language is added to increase the involvement of parents in vocational-technical education programs. Language asking States to describe how they will

involve local school boards in the development of the State's benchmarks is included and the amendment would add language allowing nonprofit private schools who have secondary vocational-technical education programs, to be able to participate in vocational-technical education professional development activities. Finally, the amendment would make other modifying and technical changes to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment, the manager's amendment, because it does allow States to reserve 5 percent of their Federal funds to help rural areas improve vocational education, and unlike our urban Members, rural residents often do not have the option of hopping on a subway or a bus to get to their needed services. Sometimes we have to drive many, many miles to even to get the most basic of services.

Many of Nebraska's rural communities are grappling with some pretty dramatic State education funding changes. At risk of course is vocational education, which provides opportunities for young people to get the job skills and learn about the technologies in the business world.

In my State we have a very unique problem. We have a labor shortage. Our unemployment rate today is about 2.3 percent. Many businesses have wanted to expand or locate in my State only to find that we do not have enough skilled people for them to employ. That is why targeting vocational funds to rural areas might very well help attract and retain existing businesses.

So, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and the staff for all of the hard work that has gone into this legislation. I would encourage my colleagues to support the Goodling amendment as well as the bill.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I rise to discuss a provision of the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and a cornerstone of this amendment is the changes that it will make to the secondary substate former provisions which have been agreed upon in a bipartisan fashion, and the formula which is included in the reported bill strongly deemphasizes, in my estimation, poverty and allows the States to reserve up to 15 percent of local moneys for an undefined purpose and subsequently was completely unacceptable to us on our side of the aisle.

In contrast, the manager of the amendment will gradually institute a formula over a 5-year period which is slightly less targeted toward poverty than in current law but still is adequate. In doing this, the formula provi-

sions will protect current funding streams to ensure that school districts, whether represented by a Democrat or a Republican, will continue to operate quality vocational education programs.

□ 1130

In addition, the amendment would ensure that States who wish to waive the provision of this formula would have to develop one that better targets poverty to gain the approval of the Secretary of Education. Coupled with this alternative formula provision is the ability of States to target both rural and urban areas through grants and increase minimum grant amounts for both secondary and postsecondary recipients.

While many, including myself, would have wanted to maintain the formula in current law, I believe both sides view this as a compromise which we could all support. We on this side support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to my colleagues that we worked very diligently to arrive at this bipartisan compromise. This bipartisan compromise, as included in the manager's amendment, really is the result of weeks and weeks of very intensive negotiations. It came about as a result of literally a last-minute, 11th-hour proposal made by our Democratic colleagues yesterday.

However, I want to point out that what we have done here effectively is to meet halfway. Current law sends money down to local school districts for secondary programs on a formula that is based roughly on 30-percent population and 70-percent poverty. The 70 percent poverty factor is a proxy for the current title I variable and the 30-percent population factor is a proxy for the 20-percent IDEA and 10-percent population factors in current law.

In our committee bill we proposed splitting the funds for secondary programs on a 50/50 poverty-population formula. What the Chairman has proposed, and which has met with agreement on the other side of the aisle, is a new substate formula based 40 percent on population and 60 percent on poverty. This will be gradually phased in over the life of the bill.

However, what I want to stress to my colleagues and this is really critical in view of some of the amendments that may be coming up later today on this legislation, that any additional funds above the 1997 level would be distributed, beginning in fiscal year 1999, on a new formula which is based 60 percent on poverty, 40 percent on population.

So, that is to say, that to the extent we can have additional moneys going down to the local level and to the extent we can secure any additional appropriations for Perkins vocational-technical education programs, beginning in 1999 those moneys will go down to the local school district by a formula that is based 60 percent poverty—40 percent population.

If any amendment comes up later today that would effectively reduce the amount of money—reduce from the 90 percent of the funds that are going locally—then that amendment would have the effect of basically upsetting this very delicate agreement that we have arrived at in a bipartisan fashion with respect to the sub-State formula.

In the Chairman's manager's amendment, we have come up with an agreement that allows 10 percent of the funds to be targeted to rural and urban areas—a maximum of 5 percent for rural areas and 5 percent for urban areas. But we should not overlook the concerns we heard from some of our witnesses regarding suburban areas.

We all recognize the problems of urban cities, and I daresay that those urban school districts are fairly well represented on the Democratic side of the aisle. They have some very forceful and articulate advocates on our Committee. Suburban schools have many of the same problems that urban school districts face today, very similar problems in fact: drugs, gangs, youth violence. Those problems are being found, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] pointed out, in rural areas and, as I am stressing now, in suburban areas as well as urban areas.

I mentioned in my opening remarks that we held a field hearing across the Potomac River in northern Virginia Fairfax County, VA is a county that most Members are familiar with because of its proximity to Washington, DC. I want to stress that whereas in 1990, 8.7 percent of the children in Fairfax County schools were considered living in poverty, today, in 1997, that number has risen to 18.3 percent—an average annual increase of 15 percent.

One other point I want to make and that concerns reducing the minimum grant amount. I am very glad that we were able, again, to arrive at a bipartisan agreement with our Democrat colleagues on this issue. We heard during our hearings that there is a need to try to spread this money more equitably around the country. A lot of the Perkins dollars simply are not getting into certain areas and communities of the country.

By lowering the minimum grant amount in current law from \$15,000 to \$10,000 for secondary programs, one effectively cutting the minimum grant amount by one-third. We are driving more money to more school districts at the local level, using those Federal taxpayer dollars to leverage State and local dollars that are going into public education specifically for vocational-technical education programs.

Again, I am pleased that our Democratic colleagues were able to arrive at an agreement with us on this particular issue, and I urge support of the manager's amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before us, and in support of the amendment before us, but also in support of moving this bill from the House floor and our body to conference, where we hope it can even undergo further improvements.

I rise in support of this legislation for a number of reasons. One is because so many people today do not go on to graduate from a 4-year college or university and need this help through this particular legislation; second, because in a global economy where more and more businesses are doing their business overseas, where more and more of our workers are needing lifetime skills and not just learning between 18 and 22, we need to make sure that programs like this are targeted to the most vulnerable in our society and targeted for a lifetime of learning, not just for a particular couple of years or time period.

Those are very, very important reasons why we need the legislation. The world is changing. We need to target the help to help our businesses compete, to help our young people learn new skills, and to help them learn these skills for a lifetime.

I also think we have had a number of improvements in this bill through the subcommittee process and the full committee process and now with the administration amendments. We have maintained the tech prep program which is very critical for the State of Indiana and helps prepare some of our youngest, most talented and most vulnerable people to get the necessary skills in Indiana to stay in Indiana and contribute to the business, to the work force, to the plant, and ultimately, to the economy.

Second, we have been able to strengthen provisions addressing professional development in this bill so we continue to work with the teachers that need to enhance their abilities to teach young people in different ways as to the changing world and the changing machines and computers they are working with. That is a very key ingredient in this bill.

Third, we are training the personnel to use technology and long-distance learning capabilities more and more through the language in this bill. We have heard from testimony throughout the last couple of months that long-distance learning and E rate and a host of other things are going to be very, very important, not only to train young people but for equity in learning, to make sure that some of the schools that are in inner-city areas that cannot afford the long-distance learning machines and technology also get access to that technology.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, we need to do more there, more through enforcing the E rate that was recently passed by the FCC. We need to do more in terms of technology and getting this technology into schools that cannot afford it. We need to do more in terms of the fairness and the equity. But this is

a beginning in this bill. I support that, and hopefully we can do more in conference.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I think one of my biggest concerns about this legislation is the funding mechanism. I want to make sure that we have the funding formula more and more oriented toward making sure that the most vulnerable people in our society, those that need this assistance and education the most, those people that are trying to get off welfare, that they get the skills for a good education and training to stay off those welfare rolls. We need a funding formula that drives this assistance in education and training to those people. Instead of making it population-based, we need to drive it more toward the poverty rate and those that need it.

We are starting to do that. I hope we do even more of that in the conference coming up with the Senate. It is similar to disaster assistance. If we had a disaster assistance bill on the floor that was supposed to go to those people in North Dakota that just experienced a disaster, but we said no, we are not going to base this on the disaster or the flooding, we are going to base it on the population so people in California and Florida will get it just as people in North Dakota will get it, that would not make a whole lot of sense.

So let us try to drive this formula, the funding formula, in conference more and more toward those in poverty, those that need it; those schools that really need the resources to address those people to get the education and training, both for their dignity, for their futures and their family's futures, but also to help fix the welfare problem that we have in this society today, too.

We are making great strides. We need to continue to be fair and equitable. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and continue to improve it in conference.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to strike the requisite number of words, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment, and overall stand to support the vocational education bill which is so important as part of our Federal education system. This act provides our students with the tools to be prepared for a trade or career directly following high school.

As has been indicated, every student is not going on to college. The intention of these programs is to teach young people a trade while allowing students to be academically prepared for postsecondary education. Giving our students viable options for the future is very critical for the economic and social development of our Nation.

It is for that reason that I am pleased that the concern that I raised during the committee markup regarding reserves for only rural districts has been addressed. I appreciate the subcommittee chair for allowing the position that I had that the bill before the House today includes a 5-percent reserve for

both urban and rural areas who display need.

The additional pool of funds will allow students in regions of our country, where a college education is unfortunately just not economically an option, to have vocational education programs best suited for their future.

I would also like to offer my sincere strong support for the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment to provide a hold harmless for programs serving displaced homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women, and programs that promote gender equity.

Opponents of this provision claim that States can offer these programs at the present time if they decide to do so. However, prior to when the Perkins Act required the States to have gender equity programs, only 1 percent, let me state it again, only 1 percent of State grants went to displaced homemakers and supportive services. The history of this provision proves that these programs will not be funded if the Mink amendment is not included in this bill. So I urge Members of the House to support this very important amendment.

Sadly, this will leave members of our population who are struggling to support families and to stay off of welfare, as we talk of from welfare to work, this will not give the opportunity to women to be trained in specific fields. It will also leave young women in high schools across the country with little encouragement to participate in vocational education programs that increase the chance of them attaining a job with a future when they graduate.

As we attempt to move this country from welfare to work, I find it strange that job training programs such as the Perkins Act would ignore the female population that constitutes a large majority of people who are currently relying on public assistance who will have to move to work.

□ 1145

Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the House on both sides to fully support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment and vote for its passage.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I would like to share my strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out two things. We are hearing a lot about where the money should go. Keep in mind now, we are talking about 75 percent of the population that has been pretty well ignored because they do not receive a 4-year college degree. We have to make sure that that 75 percent is ready to enter the high tech jobs that are out there, if we are going to remain competitive.

I would also like to point out that with the formula contained in the bill,

the nine largest cities in the country, receive anywhere from a 12.7-percent to 17.2-percent increase. But we are talking about 75 percent of our population that we really have to deal with and deal with promptly if we are going to remain competitive in this United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

Page 21, line 4, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 21, line 6, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 21, line 10, strike the periods and end quotation marks and insert a semicolon.

Page 21, after line 10, insert the following:

(5) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "section 221" and inserting "paragraph (3) of section 201(c); and

(ii) by striking "section 222" and inserting "paragraph (4) of section 201(c)"; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (J).

Page 33, after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

"(4) sex equity programs,".

Page 34, after line 5, insert the following:

"(e) HOLD HARMLESS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of the part or section 102(a), to carry out programs described in paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (c), each eligible recipient shall reserve from funds allocated under section 102(a)(1), an amount that is not less than the amount such eligible recipient received in fiscal year 1997 for carrying out programs under sections 221 and 222 of this Act as such sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act Amendments of 1997.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise today together with my colleagues the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD] to offer this amendment which seeks to preserve existing programs serving the needs of girls and women in our vocational educational system.

The bill in its current form represents a major setback for girls and women in our educational system. It eliminates important provisions of current law which target programs for displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women, and programs to ensure gender equity and train women for nontraditional careers. It eliminates the equity coordinator now required in every State to assist vocational edu-

cation programs in meeting the needs of girls and women in these special categories, and eliminates a 10.5 percent set-aside which is required under current law.

The amendment we offer today does not fully restore these provisions but assures that it will continue to receive the support at the current level. It maintains a vocational education equity coordinator and provides a hold-harmless for the displaced homemaker, single parent and gender equity programs at the fiscal year 1997 level. We have heard in the manager's amendment how the expectation is that there will be increased funding because of the bipartisan support for this program, and the formula is based upon the assumption that the funding will increase to the year 2002.

Under our amendment we do not have a 10 percent set-aside. All we are asking is that the current funding which has been allocated to these four programs be maintained at the level that is being experienced in the local communities.

Over 13 years ago Congress made sure that the special needs of women and girls were attended to by this set-aside, and numerous analyses have been made about the effectiveness of this program. GAO and other sources have reported that this is a program that has provided that assistance which was absent prior to this set-aside. There is evidence to indicate that only 1 percent of the program recipients were women in these categories.

So I hope that my amendment will be agreed to. It is especially urgent because of the changes that were made in the welfare program. We are now putting emphasis on work and on work training. The only education program in the bill that was passed last year which meets the criteria of work activity is vocational training. Vocational training is recognized by all persons as the one means by which people who are not able to find a job, get a job, improve themselves, get into a situation where they can actually sustain their families with their income.

So it is extremely important, at this stage of correlating the existing law to the new changes under welfare, that we not abandon the support that has been given to displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women and others in this category. They need that continued support.

We are restructuring this program. We are creating new ways in which to orient the funding of the program. It seems to me that in this period of transition it is critical that we hold harmless a program of this sort. Otherwise it will get lost.

Notwithstanding what the majority Members, including the Chair of the full committee, have said, suggesting that the bill before us is adequate, I would like to point out that the bill does not in any way make sure that single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, or individuals

seeking nontraditional employment can be served. Although the State application must include a description of how the State will serve these categories of people, the application is only a planning document. There is no enforcement mechanism that would sanction the States if they did not actually do what they said in their application.

The State leadership activities only allow a State to provide support for these programs; that they may choose to spend all of their money on required activities and absolutely none on the programs for displaced homemakers, single pregnant women, and sick single parents.

The accountability provisions which have been referred to do not include a benchmark for measuring services to this group of disadvantaged persons. A State can report that only one single displaced homemaker was served and would meet the requirements of the benchmarks.

I ask the House to consider the progress that we have made in addressing the special needs of these individuals in probably the most disadvantaged group in our society and in view of the fact that the welfare bill, which we voted and made into law, singles out the single parents on welfare and says that the policy of this country is that all of these individuals should work, work off their welfare or work into a job situation; in order to work into a job situation, have specifically said that the work requirement could be met by the work activity definition of vocational education.

That being the case, this Congress and this House in particular has recognized the significance of vocational education. Women, after all, constitute half the population. They should have special attention. In view of what we did in the welfare bill, it seems to me to abandon them now, offer them no protection of at least sustaining the efforts that have been put in place, would be a dramatic reversal of the emphasis that we have put on serving this population.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and continue the programs that are in existence.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must stand in opposition to this amendment for my dear colleague from Hawaii. We so often agree on some of these gender issues, but on this, as I did in the committee markup, I must oppose the amendment.

I agree with the direction of this legislation and that is to move away from any type of set-aside and, therefore, cannot support the amendment.

This amendment, in my assessment, would severely limit the authority given to the States which is one of the prime reforms of this legislation; that is, the authority given to the States, to local school districts and post-second-

ary institutions that under this bill would determine their own priorities for reform and for funding.

I think there are benefits, enormous benefits to putting more decisionmaking at the local level, as long, and I must stress this to my colleagues that do not understand this legislation or have not read it yet, as long as we have the backup and enforcement mechanisms that are required. I believe the legislation does this.

To address the concerns that special populations would not be accommodated under this legislation, for any of our colleagues who question that, I have to refer them to page 29 where there is an explicit statement about special populations. This statement refers to how the State has to take certain actions in accordance with this legislation. Those actions include all kinds of populations and specifically displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women.

Further, the legislation does include the necessary enforcement mechanisms and penalties, as I read it. If the State application fails to show how the State will ensure that the special populations meet or exceed State benchmarks, then the Secretary of Education would disapprove the application. Further, if the State fails to meet its own benchmarks, then the Secretary and the Department of Education can intervene to bring the State up to a minimum adequate level of performance. That is explicit in the legislation.

In addition, the Secretary and the department could also sanction the State by withholding all or part of the State grant. So I am really not quite sure where the author of this amendment, how the author of the amendment is able to say that there are no enforcement mechanisms.

I am more than reasonably assured that we are protecting the special populations and at the same time gaining the benefits from the knowledge, the direct knowledge of those at the local level who best know how to target these programs. That is one of the essential reforms of this bill. To adopt this amendment would deny that and reinstate set-asides.

I do not believe that we need set-asides or quotas. We need equity, we need outreach, and we need non-discrimination. The Secretary and the Department of Education have the explicit authority in this legislation to maintain those principles.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise on behalf of our bipartisan amendment to H.R. 1853, the sex equity amendment. Our amendment will preserve programs that eliminate sex bias in vocational education and job training programs. This assistance is vital to displaced homemakers, single parents, and to pregnant women attempting to enter the work force.

Let us face it, young women are being tracked into vocational edu-

cation that leads to low wage, traditionally female occupations. I remember when I was graduating from high school and I went to see my counselor. With a straight A average, I was told to go to the local community college. I said I wanted to be a doctor. My counselor said, "Why don't you become a nurse?"

Sadly, 10 years later my younger sister went to the same counselor at the same high school, and she also had practically a straight A average, and she was told the same thing: "Stay close to home. Go to school for a 2-year degree that will get you a job that will let you start working right away."

We need to stop this. The current 10.5 percent set-aside in Perkins dollars is designated to reverse this detrimental trend. More importantly, these specialized programs move displaced homemakers and single parents from welfare to work, something most of us agree needs to be done.

This amendment will preserve the specialized job training programs by requiring local entities to maintain current funding for the next fiscal year. Each State will also be required to maintain its sex equity coordinator, and that is very important because it allows somebody to talk to young women about good-paying jobs and following a program that will allow them to be good breadwinners.

□ 1200

This approach will ensure that these programs are maintained by providing States and local entities maximum flexibility in meeting the vocational education needs of women.

Since we are all interested in reducing the number of women and families on welfare, our primary goal should be to increase the employability and the earning potential of women, especially women with children. The programs that we have now do this. They succeed in promoting self-sufficiency for women.

So let us not take a step back but, instead, let us work toward maintaining and advancing these programs.

I am especially concerned that programs to help young single mothers will remain intact. My district in Orange County has the highest incidence of teen pregnancy. When a young lady makes a good decision to keep a child but wonders how she will support it, it is important that we have programs in place to assist teen mothers to graduate from high school with the ability to find and maintain employment that is essential to getting these families out of that welfare and low-poverty cycle.

If we are to break that cycle, that dependency that haunts teenage mothers, then we must help these young women to graduate from high school with the skills necessary to gain good, meaningful, long-term employment.

Funding sex equity and single parent programs now is an investment in our young people. Small grants combined

with local community efforts can help to make a tremendous impact on programs for young women. Please vote for our amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, during my tenure in the House, I have always supported programs that would ensure that women have access to nontraditional jobs. For women who are seeking job training services, the bottom line is a livable wage. Nontraditional jobs pay better, they offer greater benefits. For displaced homemakers and single parents, nontraditional jobs can be a pathway to economic self-sufficiency and family stability.

I also believe that, we know the old adage, if it ain't broke don't fix it, we have a situation that is not broken, that appears to be working, that this bill will help to enhance, so let us not change it. It is because of my interest in the self-sufficiency of women that I have joined with my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] to offer this amendment to preserve programs for displaced homemakers, single parents and pregnant women.

The amendment does not add any cost to the bill nor does it seek to restore the current law set-aside at the State level for these programs. It merely requires that localities currently funding such programs continue to do so at the same level as fiscal year 1997.

The amendment also restores the vocational education equity coordinator required in each State to oversee and evaluate equity programs for displaced homemakers and single parents in vocational education, which is current law.

It is essential that we preserve these programs, I believe, to ensure that women and girls have access to higher wage, higher skilled jobs that traditionally are reserved for men.

Programs and services to displaced homemakers and single parents have received very high marks. A national assessment of past program participants found a majority rated the program that they attended as excellent or very good. Three out of four customers who participated in other government programs, such as the welfare system, the Job Training Partnership Act or Job Corps rated the displaced homemaker or single parent programs as much better or better. Nearly all of the participants agreed that they would recommend the program to a friend.

In Pennsylvania, participants enrolled in the displaced homemaker programs terminated or reduced their need for public assistance, resulting in savings to the State of nearly \$2 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the members of the com-

mittee, the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY]. I want to also commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

All of this committee have done an excellent job on this particular bill. I know they have put a lot of hard work into it, and this is a bill that directs funds for vocational education programs into the local level.

I also appreciate the efforts of the chairman and the committee to protect programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, and pregnant women. However, history, as well as anecdotal information, collected by the National Coalition for Women and Girls on Education, makes it clear that without reserves States will not continue these services.

Before designated funds were in place, States and localities spent only 0.2 percent of their vocational funding on specialized programming for women and girls. Unless language is written with more specific wording, programs for this special population may not continue. I think they will not continue in many instances.

Some displaced homemaker programs have already been put on notice by State directors of vocational and technical education that, if Congress eliminates the reserves, they will not be funded. This is an ominous warning about States' commitment to equity without firm Federal guidelines.

Our amendment ensures that these successful programs will continue. It would also provide States with the flexibility they need to meet the needs of the girls and women in their vocational education and job training programs.

Mr. Chairman, women comprise close to half of the civilian work force. By the year 2000, more women than men will be entering the work force. The failure to incorporate women into all areas of the work force penalizes not only women but the entire American economy.

U.S. productivity and competitiveness in the international marketplace will depend more and more upon industry's ability to encourage, incorporate, and nurture the skills and knowledge, energy, and creativity of women workers.

Our amendment is not an option, it is a necessity, so I urge a "yes" vote on this important amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Some years ago, when we were reauthorizing vocational education, we found, when we got almost to the end of the markup, that we had set-asides totaling 120 percent. Obviously, funding for programs can only total 100 percent but we had included set-asides for 120 percent, which meant that so many programs were created that were so small, that no one really could do much of anything with the money they were getting. So we had to go back to

the drawing board, and fortunately we were able to eliminate an awful lot of those set-asides.

Now, today, we are back, and what we would do with this amendment is make sure that there is less money for local school districts to do exactly what these Members want to do. In the formula under our bill we force this money down to the local level, 90 percent of it, for local priorities.

Now, let me tell my colleagues what the amendment does, on the other hand. Let us say a State gets only \$4 million. Only \$4 million. Well, the first \$60,000 goes off the top for a sex equity coordinator. Then that person has to have five, six, maybe eight other people that have to help that sex equity coordinator. Another \$60,000, \$100,000, \$200,000 goes off the top and never gets down to the local level to help the people we are trying to help. I again point out, we are talking about 75 percent of our population, including displaced homemakers, who we need to serve in this legislation.

Now, it was mentioned that this amendment would be better than the job training services provided to displaced homemakers under the Job Training Partnership Act. This is no any longer true. As a matter of fact, we have approximately \$1.5 billion in the job training bill that we passed in May through which displaced homemakers may receive assistance. We have defined displaced homemakers as dislocated workers under that legislation and increased the emphasis for serving this population under that bill. We have also expanded services for displaced homemakers in our reconciliation bill under its welfare-to-work provisions with another \$3 billion.

We have to understand there is 75 percent of our population that has not been served well; that must be served if we are going to remain a competitive nation. And if we do not remain a competitive nation, then there is no use to talk about education or training because there will be no jobs out there.

In my district we have many jobs available for those who have skills. There are very few jobs for unskilled laborers any longer, and in the year 2000 there will be less. So we have to deal with this 75 percent. We cannot require a little set-aside here and a little set-aside there.

As I mentioned, if we do it the way we now have it in the manager's amendment, we are forcing 90 percent of the money down to the local level.

Now, I ask who, more than I, have led the fight over the years to make sure that we are serving the needs of displaced homemakers? Not any woman that I know, as a matter of fact, and that is why this legislation is filled with references requiring services for special populations.

We start out on page 24 and we say describe how the State will ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks established under section 114 and are prepared for post-secondary education, future learning,

high skill, high wage careers. Then we have an auditor that comes in and makes darn sure that, as a matter of fact, the State is doing what they said to the Secretary they are going to do.

We go on then and indicate that each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks. And, under that, special population, the report submitted by the State in accordance with the subparagraph, shall include a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers—we even spell them out—are served under our legislation.

And then we go to the local level, and we say “support for programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women and individuals in nontraditional occupations that lead to high skill, high wage careers.” And again, we mention the local level on page 52 and say, “programs for single parents, displaced homemakers and single pregnant women.”

We have spelled it out over, and over, and over, again that the State will serve special populations, displaced homemakers, single pregnant women and single parents, probably far better than they have been served in the past. If the State does not, then the State will be in serious trouble as far as their State allocation is concerned.

So I would hope that we do not start this business now of having set-asides until we weaken everything so there is not enough money to do anything well and no flexibility for local governments and States to serve those in most need.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, assuming over 50 percent of the 75 percent of individuals not going to college are women, if we really want to reduce the number of families on welfare, we should thank our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] for offering this amendment.

I am personally very proud to support girls and women in vocational education, and I am proud of the co-authorship of this amendment with my colleague from Hawaii, and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD].

Clearly, this amendment proves that the real welfare reform for families, those who are on welfare, will get off the rolls if we take care of women and their children. This amendment prevents families not only from being on welfare and helping them get off of welfare, it prevents them from going on welfare in the first place.

The Mink amendment is real welfare reform. It does that because it pre-

serves vocational education programs that give women the skills they need to get jobs that pay a livable wage. Also, it provides women with the ability to support themselves and their families. These programs train displaced homemakers, single parents and single pregnant women for nontraditional careers, such as blue collar jobs, jobs that men usually hold, jobs that pay better than the traditional jobs women often take.

The data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. Chairman, shows that young women who graduate from high school and go right into the job market earn less, 25 percent less, than their male counterparts. The reason for this? Again, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it is that these young women are overrepresented in low-paying occupations.

The Mink amendment does not require any local community to start any new program to train women for nontraditional jobs, it just maintains and holds harmless what is in place today.

□ 1215

It simply says if we already have a program for displaced homemakers for single parents or for single pregnant women, we can and should continue the program.

We know these programs work. The Department of Labor in Florida showed that over 70 percent of the women who participated in their programs in 1992 and 1993 doubled their income after completing the program. A study of the participants in Oregon's program showed that the graduates had expanded employment opportunities, increased salaries, and reduced dependence on public assistance.

In 1992, less than 7 percent of all working women were employed in nontraditional occupations. Yet those women earned 20 to 30 percent more than women in more traditional jobs if they were in the nontraditional occupations.

The Morella-Woolsey-Sanchez-Millender-McDonald sex equity amendment is good welfare prevention and good welfare reform, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, as a former director of gender equity programs for the Los Angeles Unified School District, I would like to correct something that the previous speaker spoke on with reference to women, single parents, displaced homemakers, teen pregnancy programs.

As the director of those programs, I know from the absolute experience that we provided the majority of the money to those programs to help the women, the young women who were

pregnant, parents as well as displaced homemakers in these programs. The majority of the money did go down to the local level to help them, and we want to just make sure the RECORD reflects this statement and correction of that statement, because I do know the value and necessity for providing quality vocational programs for single parents and displaced homemakers.

I also know the need for equity coordinators to oversee, coordinate, and evaluate equity initiatives in vocational education. I had four equity coordinators working under me, and I do know that they made evaluations of the program on an annual basis.

Under current law, a 10.5-percent set-aside is required at the State level for these programs. Our amendment would not restore the set-aside but simply require that localities currently funding such programs continue to provide funding for these programs at the same level as the fiscal year 1997. Our amendment would also restore the requirement that a vocational education equity coordinator exist in every State.

The Vocational Education Reauthorization Act that Congress has deemed essential in helping women escape domestic violence and become self-sufficient for the past 13 years has indeed been a model program and one that is sorely needed. I do not see nor understand why we would not want to maintain a program at the current level that has proven to be one of the most successful programs in this country.

The 1996 GAO study “Employment Training: Successful Projects Share Common Strategy” reported that the single parent/displaced homemaker program funded through the Florida program is one of the most successful training programs. Most of the 1,300 single parent/displaced homemaker program participants and program coordinators follow the Florida model.

In Oregon, during the same year, the long-term success rate of these single and displaced homemaker programs was remarkably high. The employment rate soared from 28 percent to 71 percent, and the median wage rate increased from \$6 per hour to \$7.45 per hour. In addition, Mr. Chairman, the dependence on AFDC of the program participants fell from 29 percent to 15 percent.

Studies all over the country, from Arizona to Georgia, demonstrate the vast improvement in increased salaries for women participants, a higher rate of employment of women in nontraditional jobs, and more women living independently from welfare assistance. And these numbers do not even mention the vast ways in which the vocational education has improved the self-esteem of these women and enhanced the lives of their families.

The single and displaced homemaker programs are exceeding the goals they were designed to meet. This is not the time for us to close down these programs. If anything, we should be expanding these programs to ensure that

we reach even more women in need of a quality education program, especially in light of the welfare reform bill that was passed by the majority in this House.

But that is not what this amendment does. The Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey-Millender-McDonald amendment requires that local recipients of vocational education funds spend at least as much as they spent in fiscal year 1997 on programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women and programs which promote gender equity.

We need this amendment to ensure that the doors to education and employment opportunities remain open for single and displaced women. This amendment will maintain the gender equity coordinator position and continue to create opportunities for women that they should have. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, I would like to urge the majority to withdraw its opposition to this amendment. This is a very conservative amendment seeking to hold onto the status quo. We are only asking that you continue to do what we were doing before.

The chairman before talked about the high-technology world that we are into already and how it is critically necessary that we be able to train people for this high-technology world. Here is a whole pool of people out there who can qualify, that we are ignoring in the traditional approach to vocational education, and too many people at the State and local level are still trapped in the traditional approach. They will not look at the pool of females who are available for some of these areas.

It has been mentioned that we ought to open up blue collar jobs to women, and that is good and well, but we do not need to go that far. We have a massive number of jobs being opened every day in the world of the Internet and the world of computer repair and computer maintenance, technicians, mechanics. We have a revolution going on in our school system that we are not fully aware of, that will require large numbers of new kinds of personnel.

I have an article that was in the New York Times today about teachers being trained, we need to spend more money to train teachers, and another article about training teachers how to make use of educational technology, computers, and telecommunications apparatus that may be available in the future. We have a \$2.2 billion universal fund that is going to allow for discounts to go to schools so that more schools can get telecommunications services and be

wired for the Internet. We have a whole category of people out there that this bill really did not take into full consideration.

I appreciate the fact that the subcommittee chairman did incorporate language that would recognize the fact that we have a telecommunications and technology revolution underway. We should be doing more to recognize that in this legislation. It really did not do that.

And certainly in opposing this bill, which seeks to keep open a new channel that has been opened already, to allow us to take full advantage of the great pool of people out there who are being ignored for these various technician and mechanical applications of high technology that are being opened, and we are going to ignore it if we do not do that.

We do not have much monitoring of anything in education anymore. If my colleagues have been out there, they know that nothing is being monitored and enforced. If my colleagues take a step backwards and do not keep this provision in there, it will be a sign to the traditionalists and to the sexists to continue doing things the way they were doing them before we had this provision put into law. So we need to keep going forward and understand where we are in this revolution.

I was visiting a Citibank processing center several years ago, where they process their paperwork and bills and so forth, a massive center of people doing high-technology computerized processing, and I noticed most of the people in there were women. They pointed out the fact that women, particularly those who did not have college educations, who are intelligent but do not have a college education, were the best employees for that kind of repetitive job which required a high degree of focus and accuracy. They did not want college-educated women because they got bored, their minds wandered.

There is a certainly category, the kind of people we are talking about here, who could fill those jobs if they were given the opportunity, but if we do not open up the vista, if we do not have the people in charge of vocational and technical education.

I want to emphasize that vocational education does not mean what it used to mean. We are not talking about automobile mechanics, we are not talking about plasterers, we are not talking about various kinds of people only. We are talking about the full range of jobs that are opening up in our society, which is a high-technology society which requires people who are good technicians, good mechanics, and they have good pay in these areas also.

My son is employed in the computer area, and the industry is training people at improvising all along to meet its needs. The jobs pay very well, and women can do those jobs as well as men. But even in this new area, most of the people that are there are men be-

cause there is a mind-set that starts with vocational education and career guidance in the schools that we have to break.

The Mink amendment breaks that mind-set. The Mink amendment wants to continue what we started before to break that mind-set. We want the traditionalists to understand that the Federal Government is not taking a back seat. We see things from the national and international level that local people do not see. They deserve to have our vision projected. The mandates are really often ways to open up their minds to see new vistas.

We see a global economy. We see the great need. We know that there 80,000 jobs out there already not being filled, related in some way to computers and telecommunication and technology. We should provide more leadership by maintaining what we have already. Let us vote positive for the Mink amendment.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will not take the whole 5 minutes because I do not want to be redundant. I simply want to recall an adage that is worth its weight in gold, and that is, Come and let us reason together.

We have had a lot of dialog in terms of welfare reform. Yet, to oppose the amendment of the honorable gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] would in fact eliminate a set-aside and provide a setback for the most vulnerable and fragile segment of our society that we seek to assist in the amendment of the gentlewoman.

I would simply say, very briefly, that we need to envision welfare reform as providing an opportunity for people to become self-sufficient by providing them an apparatus to develop the right kind of vocational education and skills to enable them to move out into the world of work.

This is not a spendthrift kind of amendment. It is an investment in the most fragile infrastructure of our society. I would encourage unanimous support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands [Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN].

(Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. CARSON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]. I want to commend and associate myself with her remarks and those of the other sponsors of the amendment, my esteemed colleagues, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD], and others who have spoken for this amendment.

The amendment offered by my colleagues is needed to preserve the important existing programs which serve

the needs of girls and women in our vocational system. It seeks to retain a minimum level of support for programs for girls and women in this system, to retain an equity coordinator, and to eliminate sex bias in vocational education as well as in access to programs and training which would eventually lead to better-paying jobs for women.

□ 1230

Some have argued that this kind of investment is already covered in the bill. But, Mr. Chairman, it has been demonstrated that wherever these programs were not specifically federally mandated, they were dropped.

At no prior time in this country's history has it been more important for us to make sure that our women, who make up the vast majority of single households, are still locked out of the vast majority of jobs, have been locked into lower salaries and who have been given no other choice but to turn to AFDC, now TANF, to enable them to raise their children, be given every opportunity to learn a nontraditional trade, to develop a better-paying skill and thus move into the job market with hope for a better future not only for themselves but for their children.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to support the education of our young women, to support job opportunities for single parents and for mothers to be, and to therefore restore hope for these women and for their children.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. This is a good amendment. This amendment is fundamentally about equal rights and equal access. Simply put, this amendment ensures that displaced homemakers, single mothers, pregnant women, and others traditionally underserved by vocational education will have access to vocational education and job training.

Vocational education has become a cornerstone of our democracy. Vocational education provides millions of American citizens with the opportunity to become independent. Vocational education provides individuals with real skills so that they can succeed in today's workplace. In fact, thousands of women in my district have benefited from these vocational programs. For example, the Chicago Women In Trade's [CWIT] Organization located in my district is now in its 10th year and is supported by sex-equity funds. CWIT has been successful in training over 450 women, many single parents, and helping them move from low-income jobs to high wage careers.

These vocational programs for women have been funded since 1984, and have been very successful. These programs have helped women find real jobs. When women find meaningful jobs that is good for America. It helps to lower the welfare roles, and enables women and families to escape domestic violence. More importantly, it empowers women and gives them real independence.

I urge my colleagues not to go backward, to draconian methods of denying women the opportunity to vocational opportunities. Rather let's move forward and restore gender equity to vocational programs.

Let's support this amendment as it is good for America.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment as well as the legislation overall. I feel that although it is not a perfect piece of legislation, we can move this on to conference. The Senate has some different provisions in it, but as a new member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am proud to see the cooperation and bipartisan effort that went into crafting this deal, even though there were a lot of 11th-hour maneuverings which got us to this point.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for the hard work they put into it, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] on this legislation, but I do feel that there is still some more work that needs to be done and improved in this piece of legislation.

We have heard a couple of comments today about the substate formula and the minimum local grants and the effect that is going to have on a lot of needy students. I feel that the change of the formula, especially in the final couple of years, will undermine the key Federal role in assisting the neediest rural students in western Wisconsin, the district that I represent. I think this formula change sends a bad message to them. But also the formula change, combined with reducing the minimum grant from \$15,000 to \$10,000, would dilute the effectiveness of Federal funds. Again, this provision could endanger many of the consortia in my district in western Wisconsin where we have an effective system that allows local school districts to pool their vocational education funds.

I am also concerned that the legislation severely cuts the funding for State-level activities. Vocational education institutions in western Wisconsin rely on State agencies to maintain a detailed performance of accountability and to supply them with analyzed statewide information on student success and program performance for their local planning. Performing these tasks at the system level is the most effective way to assist the local improvement.

But I find the elimination of the special job training and just to hold harmless on already existing gender equity programs to be the most disturbing aspect of this legislation here today. The barriers that continue for women in those nontraditional fields remain a troubling national problem. This will only be compounded now with the full implementation of welfare reform across the country. By reducing support for women seeking to gain access to high-skilled training for high-wage careers, this bill once again overlooks

the needs of a disadvantaged population. We must retain a minimum level of support for programs for girls and women in vocational education. I think this amendment goes a long way at addressing this need.

That is why I strongly urge my colleagues here today to give welfare reform a chance and to support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mrs. TAUSCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this important amendment that maintains current funding levels for programs that benefit girls and women and promote gender equity in our vocational education system. These vital programs train women for higher wage jobs so they can become self-sufficient and stay off welfare. They also promote high-skill, high-technology training in nontraditional fields for girls and women. These programs address the special needs of vocational training for displaced homemakers, single moms and single pregnant women.

As the mother of a 6-year-old daughter, I want her to have the same career opportunities that will be available to my 6-year-old nephew. We must not forget our daughters, nieces, and granddaughters and the legacy we pass on to them.

This amendment makes sense and these programs deserve our support. Please vote to maintain the funding for these important programs which offer a way up the ladder for women determined to improve their lives and that give our young girls the chance to feel the thrill of professional achievement and personal success.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support all the previous speakers and all that they have said as it relates to this fine piece of legislation. I want to first commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman, as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], our ranking member, for all their hard work over the years to work on and retain the Perkins Act which has helped several million women across this country.

I am a former teacher in the public school system in the Detroit public schools. I taught business classes and vocational classes. I saw the peak as young women and men gained the skill necessary to compete in America's job market. I know the importance of vocational education and the skills that it requires and offers to young people to move and matriculate as they become parents.

Most of my colleagues know that this is the 25th year of title 9. Title 9 was

instituted in 1972 and this year we celebrate the 25th anniversary of title 9. In title 9's experience, millions of women and men, particularly women, have shared across this country in higher education experiences as a result of the title 9 experiences, and many of them in their vocational education training.

As has been already said, vocational education has increased employment opportunities. Vocational education has also increased wage earning for millions of Americans. It has reduced AFDC caseloads across America and has had millions of dollars in savings. This is not a time to cut back. We must mandate States that they continue in their support of vocational education training.

I come from the State of Michigan. I served in that legislature for several years. I served on the education committee there and know of the commitment after the enactment of the vocational education ruling, after the Perkins Act mandated the 10 percent, that many children were able, through the mandate from the Federal Government, to participate in vocational education programs to prepare them for the world of work.

I commend the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the other sponsors for bringing this amendment forward. We have got to keep the commitment to the States. The 10 percent is just a minuscule amount. I wish we could increase that amount, but to eliminate it totally is unfortunate. This amendment asks that we retain the level of funding for 1997 and beyond, that that level of funding not decrease.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we support the Mink amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KILPATRICK. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to turn tail and run after 13 years of bipartisan support for special attention to the most vulnerable women in America on vocational education opportunities. That is not only because we are in the throes now finally of welfare reform, but because vocational training is where women have been most short-changed and where there has been the most discrimination.

Vocational training has been a major element in discrimination against women in the workplace. It is only fair to specially target some of our funds toward these most vulnerable of women, displaced homemakers, single parents, single pregnant women. These are the women most in need. These are the women most likely to be trapped into discriminatory job opportunities. These are the women most likely to be overlooked.

This amendment assures that there will be special outreach to these

women, and if there is not special outreach, then for many of them it simply will not happen.

We will not need the sanctions if we get the outreach. We will not get the outreach without this amendment. In many ways I regard this amendment as akin to a nondiscrimination provision. Where we have had the breakthroughs for women is in professional jobs like law and medicine and accounting and business. In jobs where women can make as much or more money as a welder or machinist is where we need to put our attention and where we need to do the most outreach.

The call on vocational training funds will be enormous. These funds are going to go to the most enlightened and the most educated. Those are not the women covered by this amendment.

The remedy for poverty, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. It is a job. But it is not every job. As those seeking to get off welfare now understand, it is not most jobs for which most of the most vulnerable women have the training. I approach this in many ways as a nondiscrimination provision. Government money has been used to reinforce existing job patterns. What we do with this amendment is to use government money to get us out of those patterns. Remember, this amendment ought to be seen as the counterpart to the horrendous budget cuts that these women themselves have received, 97 percent of the people on AFDC are women and children. They have \$53 billion in cuts; 85 percent of the people on Medicaid are women and children. They have \$72 billion in cuts. And it goes on and on that way.

The way to make sure that these cuts do not harm these single mothers, these displaced homemakers, and these single pregnant women is to give them the best opportunities for jobs. For them, the best opportunities are in vocational training. If we take away this opportunity after so many years of bipartisan support, we undermine what we have been trying to do.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment to the vocational education reauthorization bill.

These gender equity programs have been highly successful throughout the Nation and have dramatically increased the number of women who participate in vocational education programs.

We have studies that indicate that women who participate in these programs are able to increase their earning capacity in nontraditional occupational fields and successfully eliminate their cyclical dependency on public assistance.

A recent GAO study of employment training programs found that the 1,300 displaced homemaker and single-parent programs in operation throughout the Nation are among the most successful programs of this type.

In Oregon, for example, these programs increased the employment rates for participants from 28 to 71 percent, increased hourly earnings by an average of \$1.45, and reduced AFDC dependency from 29 to 15 percent.

The study documented similar increases in earnings and placements in nontraditional jobs and reductions in welfare rates in other States as well.

Clearly, the need to ensure equal access to training programs is even more important today than it was when the gender equity provisions were originally enacted by Congress.

For example, the passage of last year's welfare reform legislation places severe restrictions on the ability of poor women and their children to continue to receive welfare.

Since the majority of women on welfare are women with children, it is imperative to provide them real opportunities to earn higher wages in highly skilled jobs to support themselves and their children.

The failure to continue to protect vocational training could severely limit single parents, single pregnant women, and displaced homemakers' ability to find employment and will increase the likelihood that they and their children will remain in poverty or become homeless.

We simply must not abandon the Federal commitment to gender equity in vocational education by eliminating minimum guarantees of funding for gender equity programs.

The gender equity provisions of the Mink amendment strike a reasonable compromise between set-aside programs and assurances that States will continue to allocate resources to gender equity programs.

□ 1245

I urge my colleagues to support the Mink-Morella-Sanchez-Woolsey amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mink amendment to ensure that States continue to operate vocational educational programs for women and girls.

Last year we passed a welfare reform law designed to help individuals become self-sufficient. Many of those struggling to get off welfare are single parents and displaced homemakers. Unfortunately, traditional vocational training programs do not focus on the unique obstacles faced by women trying to raise a family. If we truly value families, we must value those programs that allow parents to provide for those families.

The Mink amendment will preserve important programs that help assure equitable education and employment opportunities for women and girls. The Perkins programs for displaced homemakers, single parents, and sex equity have been very successful. For more than a decade these programs have

helped women move into careers that provide higher wages, better benefits, and the possibility of advancement. Not surprisingly, women in nontraditional occupations earn 20 to 30 percent more than those in traditionally female occupations. We must protect and support programs that help women move into these higher paying jobs. That is how we end welfare dependency and increase family incomes.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that under this bill programs would ignore the needs of women. My colleagues will recall that last month we celebrated the 25th anniversary of title IX, which prohibits gender discrimination in education. We have made progress in promoting gender equity in education since the title IX law was passed in 1972, but we have not put an end to discrimination entirely. We must not undermine the mission of title IX by eliminating the role played by gender equity coordinators in vocational education. The Mink amendment will keep this important activity alive.

When we discussed these programs some time ago, I spoke about Kelly Miles, a single mother of three from New York City who was on public assistance for many years. Through a nontraditional employment training program for women, Kelly was able to move off welfare and begin a career as an electrician. She is a wonderful example of what women can achieve through these very important programs.

The programs preserved by the Mink amendment help us reach thousands of Kelly Miles, women who want to be self-sufficient but need to develop the tools to get there. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Mink amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the question do we need the Mink amendment to deal with displaced home workers, single parents, and single pregnant women? In my view, the answer is no. In this bill it is not mentioned once, it is not mentioned twice, it is not mentioned three times. It is in there four times. From the plan to the benchmarks to all the goals, it is listed again and again as one of our top priorities.

What happens when we have too many Federal rules? Less money to the classroom, more money for bureaucrats. Do we need more bureaucrats in this issue? I do not think we do.

In Pennsylvania I was chairman of Health and Welfare for 10 years and served on that committee for 19 years in both the House and the Senate. I was very much a part of Pennsylvania's historic welfare reform bill, which preceded the Federal bill but paralleled it.

Every incentive that is needed to help this population is a part of welfare reform because it is the majority of welfare recipients who are in this position. Welfare to work money targets this population appropriately. In the

job training bill we made it much easier to use the money for this population, and in this bill we outline it not once, but four times, that this is a population that needs to be served.

In many States, and I know in Pennsylvania we have a very strong displaced homemaker program, vocational schools often have expanded their programs to utilize those State dollars because the need was there. I think we are assuming here at the Federal level that local districts, that States, are not aware of this problem. Everything that is happening in America leads us to serving this population. If States are going to meet the targets in the Federal bill, they must serve this population or they will not.

So for us today to over and above the four-time limits in the bill to say that every school district must prove to the State and to the Federal Government that they spent no less money, that is really more bureaucracy than if we had a set-aside. That means potentially 10,000 to 16,000 school districts will have to be evaluated, and, my colleagues, I do not believe that is necessary. If I thought it was necessary, I would support the Mink amendment.

I think it is important that we follow the lead of this bill of getting money to the classroom. All the incentives are in place to serve this population, and this bill highlights it not once, but four times. I ask for defeat of the Mink amendment. It is not necessary.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the opportunity to, even though I know we are under the 5-minute rule, close debate on this particular amendment. First of all, let me just say that I worry that this debate has turned into an exercise in political correctness, and let me tell my colleagues why I say that. We did not hear from a single witness, nor to the best of my knowledge, did we receive any correspondence in support of maintaining any kind of set-asides to serve special populations. What the Mink amendment would do is essentially replace a State mandate with a local mandate. It would replace a State set-aside with a local set-aside and reduce the flexibility that we want to give local schools to provide vocational-technical education programs. And that is very much in keeping with a longstanding American tradition of decentralized decisionmaking in public education.

In fact, as I mentioned, we did hear from Paul Cole, one of our witnesses and the vice president of the American Federation of Teachers. He testified in support of eliminating set-asides before our Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, and I quote from Mr. Cole's testimony.

"Federal legislation should eliminate set-asides at State and local levels. For instance, funding formulas for special populations are harmful when they provide an incentive for schools to retain students in these categories because the funding depends on it."

And Mr. Cole's statement is very consistent with the report that was done by the Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, entitled "National Assessment of Vocational Education Final Report to Congress," and I quote from that report.

"There are two major risks in broadbrush efforts to include more and more special population students in vocational education. The first is that factors other than the students' best interest will become more prominent in placement decisions. For example, recruiting special needs students in order to keep vocational enrollments up, and thus maintain staff positions, is a familiar practice, and it often complements a desire in comprehensive schools to get hard-to-educate students out of regular classes." That is a practice that is called in some areas of the country "dumping" or "tracking students." "In situations such as this some students will benefit from participation in vocational programs, but others will not."

The report goes on to say, "The second risk is that vocational programs, especially those in area schools, will increasingly become special needs programs separated from the mainstream of secondary education, an outcome opposite to the integration of academic and vocational curricula envisioned by Perkins."

So the other thing I want to point out is I know that the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD] who wants me to yield has some concerns as to whether or not we are building sufficient safeguards into the legislation to ensure that these special populations will continue to be served. I want to go right to the bill because I suspect a number of people who have spoken on the other side of the aisle on the Mink, et al. amendment have not actually looked at the bill. So I am going to read from it.

"Each State application shall describe how the State will ensure that members of special populations meet State benchmarks, and each State will provide vocational technical education programs that lead to high skill, high wage careers for members of special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant women."

These are adequate assurances.

Now I was asked about accountability. Let us talk about accountability for just a moment. Under the accountability section, "Each State that receives funding under this bill shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary of Education a report on how the State is performing on State benchmarks that relate to vocational-technical education programs."

In preparing the report, the report submitted by the State "shall include," again the operative word, "shall"—a description of how special populations, displaced homemakers, single parents, and single pregnant

women participate in vocational technical education programs and, again, have met the vocational-technical education benchmarks established by the State." This is mandatory, not permissive or optional.

And what happens if the State fails to meet those benchmarks? Very clearly, right here, colleagues, in the bill, "If a State fails to meet the State benchmarks, the Secretary of Education may withhold from the State all or a portion of the State's allotment under this Act."

We have taken real concrete steps to address Members' concerns in this legislation. I submit to Members that the language in the bill now negates the need for the Mink amendment. I implore my colleagues, do not replace a State mandate with a local mandate, do not replace a State set-aside with a local set-aside. Support the legislation as it is presently drafted. Vote "no" on the Mink amendment. Just say no to more mandates for local schools.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the logic from the gentleman from California, and I wondered whether or not if we follow that logic through if the idea would be that if we built more prisons somehow we would end up with more crime. The truth of the matter is that simply because we try to solve a problem by fixing it, by assisting in the solution of the issue, by having people work in various school systems and the like to solve a problem of gender inequity does not mean that the inequity is going to be perpetuated; it means that we are trying to solve it.

I mean, the fact of the matter is that when young people in my district and across the country ask me what the great issues of the day that I believe are out there, I say, "Listen, you look at the people sitting in this room in a particular high school, look at the young women in this high school." The fact is that if they go out and get the same job, work in the same number of hours as a young man doing the same kind of activity, they are going to get paid 69 cents for every dollar that the man gets, and the fact is that it is time that we take into consideration the kind of gender prejudice that exists in America.

Mr. Chairman, that is all that we have done in the Congress in the past. That is what we are asking that this bill, and I think the Mink amendment, which is supported on a bipartisan basis by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] and the like, that recognizes what we want to maintain is the effort that has been recognized by the Congress of the United States to end the kind of gender prejudice that exists throughout our country.

The fact is that anyone who has looked at where jobs are and young

women are targeted in terms of what the kinds of jobs that they are going to be able to pursue is that not only is the pay gap currently that 6 out of 10 women are employed in the traditional female roles. One reason for the pay gap that currently exists is that 6 out of 10 women are employed in the traditional female fields of service, technical jobs, sales and administrative support.

□ 1300

In contrast, two-thirds of the men worked as managers, operators, professionals, and craft workers. All we are trying to do in this legislation, and I think the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] deserves a great deal of credit, is to try to maintain the fact that we want to ensure that there is in fact a small set-aside to eliminate the kind of gender gap that has existed in our system, and do everything we can to make certain that that gap is eliminated on the fastest possible basis.

Mr. Chairman, I know we are running out of time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise really in support of the Mink amendment. My office keeps a scorecard on the legislative attempts to take programs and benefits away from women. Unfortunately, we are chalking up another attack today. It is not as if we are asking for new funding. All we want is continued funding at this year's level, and the continuation of programs that work. Displaced homemakers, single parents, pregnant women, and some girls in vocational schools are all populations at risk. Why shut them out? Why, at the same time we are trying to get women off welfare rolls, are we eliminating the very programs that will help them get off welfare rolls?

In Oregon a recent study documented its long-term success in increasing employment rates from 28 percent to 71 percent. Wages increased; 14 percent of the women on welfare got off welfare. There is so much to fix, Mr. Chairman, that is broken. Let us not try to fix what is not broken. Let us continue funding for this program.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support to Congresswoman MINK's amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment asking for financial support

for programs that benefit girls and women. This is essential to help secure a future for millions of female citizens.

Young adults need vocational education and job training because this will provide them the skills needed to succeed in today's workplace. We must provide women with these opportunities because only then will we contribute to lowering the number of women receiving welfare assistance, enabling them to become self-sufficient and independent. Struggling homemakers, single mothers, and teenage women will have an opportunity to live productively and comfortably by having the chance to become educated in employment areas where there is high demand for skilled workers.

Vocational education and job training are directly linked to the reduction of welfare. If we want women to get off welfare, we need to provide meaningful job programs to train them. The participation in these programs results in higher wages and an increased number of work hours for women. I am asking you to support programs that train women for non-traditional jobs—like masons, computer programmers, and plumbers.

Displaced homemakers and single parent programs are crucial to the well-being of the disadvantaged. It is crucial that we provide funding for these programs. Displaced homemakers and single parent programs specialize in individually targeted pre-employment training and counseling services. Women will benefit from life skills development, career exploration, job training and placement, and support services.

In my State of Texas, 52 percent of displaced women rated the displaced homemaker or single parent program as much better than any other government program in which they have participated. Texas needs financial support of these programs. These programs help all women:

There are 1.2 million displaced homemakers in Texas: 47 percent of displaced homemakers are under 50 years old; and 39 percent of displaced homemakers are African-American, Asian, and Hispanic.

There are 561,342 single mothers in Texas: 61 percent of Texan single mothers are between the ages of 25–44; 47 percent of single mothers are African-American and Hispanic; and 53 percent are nonminority.

I urge all of you to support this amendment: you will be building the foundation for displaced homemakers, single parents, and individuals training for nontraditional occupations.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLUG) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1853) to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the