

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT  
OF 1995

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RACHEL SCHLESINGER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL MELLINGER  
SCHLESINGER

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

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

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

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

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