

Agenda 104 process in which we examined the various programs within our Committee's jurisdiction to determine their effectiveness. Our Committee will be working to mark up this bill throughout the month of May, and will hopefully send a bill to the floor for consideration early this summer.

We drafted this bill starting from the position that the current Federal Work Force Preparation System is fundamentally flawed and in need of reform. There are simply too many programs, too much bureaucracy, too much duplication, and too much waste of taxpayer money.

The CAREERS bill is drafted based on two overarching principles: quality and local control. For many years, I have been talking to anyone who would listen about the need to institute quality into the Federal training system. Briefly, CAREERS focuses on providing quality training services by:

Simplifying the entire system from more than 100 programs into just four that we believe should be the focus of Federal involvement in job training: adult employment and training; adult education; vocational rehabilitation; and, career education and training for youths;

Giving States and communities the maximum amount of responsibility to run their own programs;

Because we believe that education and literacy hold the key to maintaining the long-term economic competitive position of the United States, we require that these issues are a key focus of the Federal work force preparation system; and

Demanding results in the form of high standards for improvement of local training and education systems.

With regard to local control: let me be clear, we are giving States and localities more power to run Federal job training programs than they have ever had in recent history. Governors will have unprecedented power to coordinate all Work Force preparation State level activities. As a State's highest ranking elected official, a Governor is the key to the job training system in every State.

It is at the local level, however, where the most dramatic change takes place. Work force development boards led by businesses will coordinate the entire system in communities around the Nation. They will create one-stop sites to ensure coordinated access to all local work force preparation programs. They will operate programs for adult training and severely disabled adults, as well as work with schools, libraries, literacy providers, and others to ensure the entire training system works together within the community.

As you can see, this is a tremendous undertaking and truly a dramatic reform in the way the Federal Government does business in job training. The CAREERS bill also undertakes enormous reforms in the higher education arena as well by eliminating SPREs (State Postsecondary Review Entities) and privatizing the SALLIE MAE and CONNIE LEE corporations.

Our final note. We have looked carefully at other approaches that would completely turn this program over to States in a modified version of "revenue sharing." As I have said many times, I do not support revenue sharing because we have no revenue to share. What I support is outlined in this bill: four consolidated programs, additional flexibility for States

and communities, but we must continue the Federal role in demanding results in the form of broad standards and goals to ensure accountability for this important investment of taxpayer dollars.

Again, I salute the hard work of Committee members to come up with this bill, and I look forward to working with the Administration and Committee Democrats to develop a bill that truly reforms our Nation's job training system.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "CONSOLIDATED AND REFORMED EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND REHABILITATION SYSTEMS ACT" THE "CAREERS ACT"

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1995

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the skills levels of the American workforce are more important than ever before to U.S. competitiveness, this country's programs designed to prepare its workers are seriously fragmented and duplicative. Because education and training programs have been developed independently over many years, there is no national strategy for a coherent workforce preparation and development system.

As we all know by now, the U.S. GAO has identified 163 different Federal programs, totaling \$20 billion, which offer some form of job training and/or employment assistance to youth and adults in the United States—yet over the past several years we have continued to add to this number. A major focus of any reform effort must be to eliminate unnecessary duplication and fragmentation in these systems, and at the same time, provide States and localities with the flexibility needed to build on successful existing programs and initiate change where appropriate.

Today we are introducing the Careers Act—a multi-tiered job training reform effort that: Streamlines workforce preparation programs at the Federal level through consolidation of similar programs; and provides flexibility needed by States and local areas to further reform State and local systems—building on existing successful programs, encouraging change where such change is needed, and involving the private sector at all levels in development of the system.

This proposal builds very closely on two bills that Committee Republicans introduced last Congress—H.R. 2943, the National Workforce Preparation and Development Act; and H.R. 4407, the original Careers Act. It also follows through on legislation we introduced earlier this year, H.R. 511, which pledged significant reform in this area. With the Careers Act, we are going much further with reform than anyone dreamed was possible during last Congress.

Specifically, the Careers Act consolidates well over 100 Federal education and training programs (as listed by the GAO) into 4 consolidation grants to States and local communities. The four consolidation grants include: A Youth Workforce Preparation Consolidation Grant—consolidating Vocational Education; School-to-Work; and JTPA's Summer Youth Employment, Year-Round, and Youth Fair

Chance Programs with programs would be built on a model integrating academic, vocational, and workbased learning, and enhancing State and local employer input in the design/development/delivery of programs; a Vocational Rehabilitation Consolidation Grant; an Adult Training Consolidation Grant (including programs for Disadvantaged Adults and for Dislocated Workers); and an Adult Education and Literacy Consolidation Grant (including all Adult Education and Literacy programs). The legislation will provide maximum authority to States and localities in the design and operation of their workforce preparation system; drive money to States—and down to local communities to the actual points of service delivery; require the involvement of local employers in the design and implementation of local systems—through employer-led local Workforce Development Boards; require that service delivery be provided through a one-stop delivery structure; and we even allow the Secretary of Labor and States to use a portion of their funding to establish employer loan accounts for the training of incumbent workers.

Further, the legislation privatizes 2 existing government sponsored enterprises, Sallie Mae and Connie Lee—in the spirit of reduced Federal control for programs that no longer need Government support.

There is no doubt that future U.S. competitiveness is dependent on the skill levels of our workers. In addition to global competition, technological advances and corporate realignments highlight the need to focus on worker preparation. The future of U.S. competitiveness really rests on what I describe as a "3-legged stool." We have already accomplished the construction of the 1st leg—tearing down barriers to trade through the enactment of NAFTA and GATT. We are currently working on the 2d leg—providing tax and other incentives for modernization of the workplace. Finally, the 3d leg, and probably the most difficult to strengthen and uphold, but one that is imperative to succeed, is that of investing in and strengthening the education and training of our citizenry.

I think that the Careers Act accomplishes the building and strengthening of this "3d leg". It focuses on the workforce preparation and literacy needs of youth, adults, and individuals with disabilities. I hope that we will succeed in seeing its enactment this year.

FRANKING REDUCTION ACT OF 1995

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1995

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Franking Reduction Act of 1995, legislation that is necessary if we are to truly reform this House. The bloated franking budget has become nothing more than a blatantly abused political advertising slush fund, and it has got to stop. My bill, which has received bipartisan support, would slash the \$31 million franking budget in half.

The past 100 days have seen the passage of several substantial in-House reforms, proving to the American people our commitment to real change. The American people are getting the message that real change is finally happening here in Washington, which is precisely

why we can't stop now. We need to continue to pass legislation consistent with our promise of reform to the American people.

To keep the spirit of reform moving, I urge my colleagues to join me in some spring House cleaning. The frank has grown from a tool to inform and educate constituents about legislative issues into a campaign advertisement to promote personal and political agendas. We need to restore credibility to the franking process by making Members accountable for the costs they incur.

Not only will my bill cut franking by 50 percent, but it also requires monthly statements of costs charged to each Member's account to be made available to the public. This bill will apply to sessions of Congress beginning after the date of enactment.

The bloated franking budget can be cut without damaging the ability of Members to communicate with their constituents. In the 103rd Congress, I used less than 50 percent of my franking budget, without impairing my ability to effectively correspond with my constituents. It is a common misnomer that a reduction in franking affects a Member's performance. Rather, it forces Members to use their mail budget solely to inform and educate.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that bringing an end to franking abuse is long overdue. Cutting the franking budget by 50 percent will restore the original intent of the frank while following through with our promise of continued congressional reform. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD H.
MACKAIN

HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1995

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise before the House floor today to recognize a major civic leader in the 41st District who has recently retired from many years of public service. The City of Brea has greatly benefitted from the contributions of Mr. Leonard H. MacKain who has been a leader in our community for many years.

Mr. MacKain has previously served on the Brea City Council from 1972 to 1976 with two consecutive terms as mayor from 1974 to 1976. During this period, he played an integral part in the building of the Brea Civic Center and Library and forming redevelopment areas which allowed for the construction of the Brea Mall.

In his career in education, Mr. MacKain has held the positions of superintendent, assistant superintendent, teacher principal, project manager and Board Educator member. His commitment and enthusiasm in this area has led to the construction and expansion of five schools in Brea and has created strong bonds between the city and the school district.

I also want to mention that Mr. MacKain has also served on the Harbors, Beaches and Parks Commission in 1976 and held this position for the next 15 years.

As the U.S. Congressman for the 41st District, I salute Mr. MacKain for his outstanding achievements and dedication as a public servant. Washington is beginning to delegate its power to the State and local level. This re-

quires able leaders to use excellent judgment with this new responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. MacKain is a fine example of a decision maker at the local level who has put in the effort to successfully transform a community by understanding and recognizing how to utilize existing resources given to it. America needs more people like him.

HOME FOR GUIDING HANDS

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1995

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, mentally and physically disabled people are being helped by computers in two homes for the disabled because of techniques developed by Lloyd Hartvigsen. He credits part of the success for the lab he established at the Home for Guiding Hands at Lakeside, CA, to Lorraine Barrack, now 36 years of age, who has had cerebral palsy since birth.

"It just made sense that people who can't speak might find their voice with the aid of a computer," said Mr. Hartvigsen, a retired printer who established a 10-terminal lab for residents of the Home for Guiding Hands. The mother of Lorraine Barrack, Mrs. Elaine Barrack, said "It's the first time my daughter has been able to write us a note that says 'I love you.' This was the first year she's been able to send out Christmas cards. You just can't know how precious these notes and letters are to me."

Mr. Hartvigsen, working with Lorraine's family, decided that the wand and touch screen would be perfect, since she had control of her head movements. "With a touch screen, everything you do with a keyboard can be done just by touching the screen," he explained. "To use the computer, Lorraine puts on a cap with a foot-long wand attached. By leaning forward and tapping the wand on certain parts of the computer screen, she can write a note or play a game."

Lorraine and 14 classmates at the Home for Guiding Hands use the computer system to do schoolwork, to paint and draw, and also to learn to type and send letters to relatives and friends. Mr. Hartvigsen is also employed part-time as a computer instructor at St. Madeleine Sophie's Center for the Handicapped in El Cajon, CA. He began volunteer work at the Home for Guiding Hands in 1988, but it was in the past 4 years that he realized how helpful computers could be as communication tools for the developmentally handicapped. Originally a volunteer at the Home for Guiding Hands, he was hired several months ago by the Home to operate the computer lab that he had set up. He now instructs residents of the Home in the use of computers, as well as residents of the St. Madeleine Sophie's Center.

Mr. Hartvigsen is the son of Austin Hartvigsen of Santee and the late Mrs. Austin Hartvigsen, both of whom were volunteers for several years at the naturalization ceremonies in San Diego. They welcomed the new citizens, answered any questions they might have, and helped them register to vote. The family is an outstanding example of the best in volunteerism in America.

WHY AMERICA NEEDS A DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1995

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a letter written by the Honorable Jesse Brown, Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to Mr. Stuart Butler, Vice President of The Heritage Foundation. The letter is in response to The Heritage Foundation's proposal to eliminate the Department of Veterans Affairs and establish it as a bureau within the Department of Defense.

I believe Secretary Brown's remarks point out how important it is to maintain the Department of Veterans Affairs. In the wake of all the "myths" being printed in the media about the Department's facilities and the services it provides, the facts laid out in Secretary Brown's letter make for very compelling reading.

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, May 10, 1995.

Mr. STUART BUTLER,
Vice President, The Heritage Foundation, Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BUTLER: I was rather perplexed when I read your proposal to eliminate the Department of Veterans Affairs and establish it as a bureau in the Department of Defense. Likewise, I was mystified by some of the specific program recommendations in your report on "Rolling Back Government." About the only statement that I agree with is, "The care of Americans who have served their country in the armed forces is a core function of the federal government." At least you are right in that regard.

CABINET STATUS

VA was elevated to Cabinet status in 1989 after years of congressional deliberation. President Reagan agreed with Congress that the agency charged with administering benefits and services to our veterans and their dependents (who now number 26 million and 44 million, respectively) belongs at the Cabinet table when issues are being formulated and acted upon. President Reagan was right. Your report portrays VA as an inefficient bureaucracy while offering no evidence in support of such a statement. I am curious how you arrive at the conclusion that the existing structure for providing veterans benefits and services would become more efficient with another layer over it, that of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and possibly others. Further, if VA were to be made a bureau within DoD, the Nation's obligations to our veterans would constantly be at risk of being subordinated to National defense and security needs, particularly in time of conflict or great danger. The lack of wisdom of placing veterans programs in such a precarious position has been obvious to Congress and Presidents for many decades. How could you possibly fail to realize—or even address—the fact that a separate VA assures that veterans' needs are addressed on their own merits and not based on whether our Nation needs to spend more or less on defense?

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Turning to the proposals you make for specific VA programs, I found it extremely ironic that, in the name of "allowing veterans to enjoy the benefits of privately provided . . . retirement services" and modernizing the VA disability compensation program, you simply propose taking away compensation from certain veterans. One group who would