

get priority access to customers across the country and around the world, that small business would have to pay an additional fee to hundreds, if not thousands, of Internet access providers around the country. The priority access fees are a drop in the bucket to that big national chain of hotels that is hurting their business, but if the Taylor family cannot pay the extra fees, they are not going to be able to compete.

A second example of how the absence of Net neutrality would hurt small business—this one involves a business owner who I am calling Jessica Myers. Ms. Myers owns a small legal placement firm with eight employees. In a world with Net neutrality, she saves money on her phone bills as a Vonage customer. She buys all her office supplies on line from another small business she found at Shopzilla, and saved thousands of dollars on new computer equipment from Buy.com. Her employees are able to navigate law firm Web pages, learning of open jobs and potential clients to market these openings to.

Under the Commerce Committee bill, Jessica's business is going to see a huge increase in her costs. Vonage no longer works properly, causing her to pay extra for phone service from the local phone company. The office supply store is no longer on line because they could not afford to pay for priority access and cannot compete without it. Her computer equipment at Buy.com is now more expensive, maybe 10 percent more, because Buy.com is passing on the costs they pay the network operators for priority access. Her employees are much less effective because they now spend hours every day waiting for law firm Web sites to load that are stuck in the Internet's slow lane. Her costs go up. Her productivity and her profits go down.

In each of these two new examples I have outlined of the consequences for our small businesses, the large businesses that own the Internet pipes are going to be extending their reach to the detriment of small business. According to the business plans of the big phone and cable companies, and what they have told Wall Street, what has been outlined in the Wall Street Journal newspaper, that is the direction they are heading. Without Net neutrality, neither of the small businesses in the examples I have cited is going to be able to use the Net in the way they do now, and they are going to be disadvantaged at a time when they are a big part of America's future in competing in the global marketplace.

The big cable and phone companies have spent millions—more than \$40 million since January of this year—to try to make the American people think that Net neutrality is, to quote one Verizon lobbyist, a “lose-lose proposition.” The absence of Net neutrality will be the lose-lose for consumers. Discrimination will be seen in Internet content, and we will see higher prices

for consumers. That is why more than 500 groups of all political philosophies and persuasions have come together to draw a line in the sand and say: We are going to insist that the Internet remain discrimination free.

At the end of the day, this issue of Net neutrality, despite what the opponents and the lobbyists want the Senate to think, isn't that complicated. Today, the way the Net works is you go with your browser where you want, when you want, and everybody is treated equally. Those who oppose Net neutrality want to change all that. They want to make it possible for phone companies and cable companies to play favorites. They will be in a position to charge some people more and some people less. They are people who want to change the way the Net works today, which is that everybody gets a fair shake.

And that is, again, the point of my citing this afternoon AT&T's profits that come from wireless services. I repeat, I am glad to see AT&T do well. I believe in markets, and markets are what make our country's free enterprise system go. But AT&T is doing well with an Internet that is based on the principle of equality, Net neutrality, and no American facing discrimination on line.

I see the distinguished Senator from Tennessee here, and he remembers our discussion about taxation and on-line services and on-line businesses. The Senate worked together on a bipartisan basis, and we have kept the Internet free of discrimination as it relates to taxation. I think it makes no sense at all for the Senate to say we are going to let the Internet prosper as it relates to taxation—and taxation is a big factor, obviously, in business opportunities and business sales—it makes no sense to keep the Internet free of discrimination as it relates to taxation and then to throw Net neutrality in the trash can and allow discrimination as it relates to so many other aspects of on-line business and services that are important to the American people.

So this is the fourth time I have come to the floor to discuss this issue. I do not want to see consumers face the double barrel of discrimination and higher prices on line. It is my intent to keep my hold on that overhaul of the telecommunications legislation on until I see that bill has been changed, until I see it has been altered and revised to ensure the core principle of the Internet—that everybody gets a fair shake and that the Internet is free of discrimination. My hold stays until that bill is altered so we can preserve an Internet free of discrimination for all Americans in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### HONEST LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY CONTRACTING ACT OF 2006

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is a piece of legislation which we offered

previously during this Congress, unsuccessfully, I might add, that I and others intend to offer once again.

I want to describe it and describe why we intend to offer it again as we find additional legislation on the floor of the Senate with which to offer it as an amendment. It deals with accountability in contracting. The legislation we have introduced is called Honest Leadership and Accountability in Contracting Act of 2006. I introduced it on March 2, S. 2361. The bill is sponsored by 30 of my colleagues here in the Senate. Senator REID joined me in announcing the legislation that day. The bill includes contributions from a number of Members of the Senate and the work they did on issues relating to this which we have put in the bill.

I want to describe the bill briefly. It is a bill that will punish war profiteers with substantial penalties for profiteering during wartime contracts. It is a bill that will crack down on defense contract cheaters by restoring a rule on suspension and debarment, to say we are not satisfied any longer when we see someone cheating on a contract and cheating the American taxpayer to say, Well, you get a slap on the wrist and a pat on the back and a new contract. This gets tough. It cracks down on contract cheaters. It will force real contract competition, and it will do so by prohibiting the awarding of large monopoly, sole-source, no-bid contracts.

The legislation has a number of other provisions as well, but it is important legislation. I want to describe why, and I want to describe some of the things I have been doing.

Let me start by saying this is not about Democrats or Republicans. It is not about conservatives or liberals. Waste is not part of it. Waste is just waste. Contract abuse is not partisan. It is just abuse of the American taxpayer. Let me describe a couple of things to begin this discussion.

This is April 30, 2006, in the New York Times. The United States pays for 150 Iraqi clinics and manages to build 20.

A \$243 million program led by the United States Army Corps of Engineers to build 150 health clinics in Iraq has in some cases produced little more than empty shells of crumbling concrete and shattered bricks cemented together in uneven walls.

What is that about? It is about a huge contract, a contract to produce 150 health care clinics in Iraq, and now we see the money is gone, but the health care clinics weren't built—not 150 of them. Only 20 of them were built. Yet the money is gone. Let me talk about these issues and go back to the beginning of what piqued my interest.

In February of 2004, I began hearing from some whistleblowers who said: We want to tell our story. So as chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee, we convened some hearings and listened to them. We held eight oversight hearings on the issue of contracting abuses in Iraq and heard from whistleblowers. I will describe them.

We had two oversight hearings on the response to Hurricane Katrina, and I will describe just a bit of that. But let me describe this, going back to February of 2004, almost 2½ years ago. This is a description of what is happening in contracts in Iraq.

Henry Bunting is a fellow who came to see me. He worked in Kuwait. He worked for Kellogg, Brown and Root, which is a subsidiary of Halliburton. You might recall, they got big no-bid, sole-source contracts and made a lot of money. He worked as a field buyer in Kuwait.

He told us they spent up to \$7,500 a month to rent ordinary cars and trucks. Think of that. American taxpayers pay for that.

The company had purchased monogrammed towels for \$7.50 apiece when they could have cost \$2.50. These are hand towels for American soldiers. The company that was buying them told Henry: We want the company name embroidered on the towel.

That more than doubled the cost to the taxpayer. The company said: It doesn't matter, this is cost-plus; the American taxpayer is going to pick up the tab.

It is almost unbelievable.

Another thing Henry told us, 25 tons of nails, that is 50,000 pounds of nails, were ordered and delivered to Iraq. They were the wrong size. They are laying in the sand.

It doesn't matter. The American taxpayer is going to pick up the tab.

Henry came forward. I wonder what kind of courage it took for Henry to come forward and tell us that, but he did it and good for him. It piqued my interest, however, in February 2004, to hear whistleblowers talk about what was going on with respect to contracting in Iraq. Then, in subsequent stories we would hear about contracting abuses.

"Pentagon auditors found that Halliburton cannot properly document more than \$1.8 billion in work under its contracts," Army officials said yesterday. The \$1.8 billion amounts to about 42 percent of the \$4.3 billion the company has billed to the U.S. Government under the contracts.

Among other things, they were charging the U.S. Government for feeding 42,000 soldiers every day. It turns out they were only feeding 14,000 soldiers. I can understand missing a cheeseburger or two, but 28,000 meals? Overcharging by 28,000 meals a day? I don't think that is just missing a meal or two.

So we began having some hearings because the committees of jurisdiction, the authorizing committees where this money was spent, were not having oversight hearings.

We had a woman named Bunnatine Greenhouse come to Congress. I want to tell you what Bunnatine Greenhouse said. Bunnatine Greenhouse was the highest civilian official in the Corps of Engineers, the Army Corps of Engineers, in the Pentagon. She was the highest civilian official, highest rank-

ing procurement official in the Corps of Engineers. She was in charge of all procurement.

She had the courage to go public. Here is what she said:

I can unequivocally state that the abuse related to contracts awarded to KBR represents the most blatant and improper contract abuse I have witnessed during the course of my professional career.

Let me tell you about this woman. Every evaluation ever given her said she is outstanding, she is exceptional. Now she doesn't have her job any longer. She lost that job because she had the courage to speak out. They are investigating that now at the Pentagon. But that is what she said.

Instead of taking the company to task, instead of taking the folks in the Corps of Engineers to task, they took to task the woman who had the courage to come here and speak the truth.

Bunnatine Greenhouse has been replaced. I mentioned she was demoted. She lost her job. She has been replaced by an American who has no experience in procurement. Isn't that interesting? They bring in a person with 40 years government experience and no experience in procurement. They are actually sending her to school to learn about procurement.

I don't understand this. We have seen what happens when you bring in people without experience. We saw it in FEMA, filling top jobs with cronies who had no experience with disaster preparedness or relief, and it just collapsed.

Now we have the top civilian contracting official in Iraq who pays for it with her job when she speaks out. She says what is going on is wrong, and we don't have to take her word for it; just look at the headlines. It is wrong. She pays for it with her job, and she is replaced by someone who doesn't have experience in contracting. It just baffles me that somehow this is continuing.

I mentioned we have had a good many hearings. I have not preferred to have the hearings, but I have said if the authorization committee of jurisdiction isn't going to hold oversight hearings, and there are whistleblowers who want to speak, I am perfectly willing to hear them on behalf of the American taxpayers. The hearings have shown us just a dramatic amount of waste, fraud, and abuse. Much of it is being investigated.

The fellow working for the U.S. Department of Defense for 30 years who ran the fuel operation to get fuel to the soldiers wherever they are in the world retired. Then he came to us publicly, and he said: What the American taxpayer is being charged to fuel those army trucks in Iraq is unbelievable. They are being so overcharged.

This is from the guy who used to do it all over the world for 30 years.

We had a fellow named Rory show up at a hearing. Rory was a food service supervisor in Iraq. Rory actually testified by Internet. He was a food supervisor, worked for KBR, Halliburton.

He said: You know, we had all kinds of food that was transported in to feed the troops in Iraq. We had food brought in that had expired date stamps on it: This food is expired. Don't serve after this date. Our supervisor said it doesn't matter what the date stamp says, serve the food. Put the food on the table. It doesn't matter that it is expired. He said that was routine.

Second, he said he was told and others were told: Don't you dare talk to government investigators. When they come around, if you talk to a government investigator one of two things are going to happen. You are going to get fired or you are going to get sent to an area where there is significant hostile action.

This man named Rory talked to investigators, and guess where he ended up. He ended up in Fallujah, during hostilities. It is pretty unbelievable to me that we have contractors who tell employees don't dare talk to a government auditor if they show up.

Let me show a picture of some money. This is a picture of a transaction in the country of Iraq. This fellow came and wanted to testify. He was a fellow who was in Iraq, in this room.

This, by the way, is \$2 million in cash in one-hundred-dollar bills wrapped in Saran wrap. He is the fellow who dispensed the money, early on. He had all these contracts going on. This money went to a company called Custer Battles. We had a hearing on that as well. This \$2 million went to Custer Battles.

Two guys show up in Iraq with not much experience and very little money and they decide to get contracts. They get contracts. It is the Wild West. This guy says it is like the Wild West. They say: You bring a bag because we pay in cash. That is the way we operate.

Custer Battles gets a contract to provide security at the Baghdad airport. Among other things, it is alleged they took the forklifts, took them over to a warehouse, painted them blue, and then resold them to the Provisional Authority, which was Uncle Sam. But that is part of the story. They ended up getting \$100 million, and this is \$2 million of that. This fellow said we actually played football with these things. We pay in cash, bring a bag, it is like the old West. He said it was unbelievable.

Let me show what the Baghdad airport director of security said about the company that got this money. He said:

Custer Battles have shown themselves to be unresponsive, uncooperative, incompetent, deceitful, manipulative and war profiteers. Other than that, they are swell fellows.

This is from the director of security, in a memo to the U.S. Federal Government, then called the Coalition Provisional Authority. The Baghdad airport director of security, here is what he said about the people who were getting our money.

I look at all these things, and I ask the question: What is going on? How can they do this?

Just the other day, the Pentagon finally announced that we are going to now require some bidding on contracts—billions of dollars late. Let me show you what they said. “Army to end expansive, exclusive Halliburton deal.”

I am not just talking about Halliburton. It happens most of these press things are about Halliburton, KBR, but there are others—Custer Battles and others as well. Whenever you have this much money being thrown out there with no-bid contracts and sole-source contracts, I am telling you it is like a hog in a crick. All you hear is grunting, there is a lot of shoving, and everybody wants the money.

“Army to end expansive exclusive Halliburton deal,” It says:

Army is discontinuing a controversial multibillion dollar deal with oil services giant Halliburton to provide logistical support to U.S. troops worldwide, a decision that could cut deeply.

Understand, the Army says very late: OK, now we will start bidding. We will have several companies bid. And by the way, once the bidding is done, we will have another company oversee the company that gets the bid.

Oversight is the responsibility of the Pentagon. When they put out a contract, it is their responsibility to provide oversight. Our responsibility is to figure out what we are spending in Congress, who is spending it, with what efficiency, and if it is wasted, to call into account those who are wasting it.

Let me go back to the first chart that I showed today. This is yet another company. This company is Parsons.

A \$243 million program led by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, through a contractor, to build 150 health care clinics in Iraq and has in some cases produced little more than empty shells of crumbling concrete and shattered bricks cemented together into uneven walls.

We pay for 150 clinics and we get 20. The money is gone. The question is, Where did the money go and why? Who has it? What did we get for it? Is there accountability to the taxpayer for this sort of thing.

I understand in wartime money is spent in a way that is different, from time to time, than it is spent in peacetime. Sometimes you just have to spend extra money to get things done. But \$45 for a case of Coca-Cola; \$7,600 a month to rent vehicles? I don't think so. I mean, that is just the tiny little tip of the iceberg.

The question is, What comes of all of this? How do we stop all of this? How do we decide, on behalf of the American taxpayers, that this matters and we are not going to let this happen again? We have some people coming tomorrow who are going to talk about this contract, people who were in Iraq and watched this happen. We are going to evaluate what happened.

As has been the case in every circumstance, we will refer what we find to the Department of Defense and ask why.

We held a hearing on the subject of water. I know the Presiding Officer, in fact, in his subcommittee has taken a look at this and has asked some tough questions and is trying to figure out what was happening there.

We have never quite figured out what has happened because the contractor and the Defense Department each point fingers and say nothing happened. Then they say the other side made it happen.

About this water circumstance, we had people come to testify, saying: We were there.

Here is the report. The report says they were hooking up for nonpotable water—that water which is used by soldiers in Iraq to brush their teeth, to wash their faces, to take showers—they were hooking up hoses that had water that was more dangerous than water that came right out of the Euphrates River, water with no disinfectant at all.

In fact, we had an e-mail from an Army physician who is in Iraq. She said: I have seen this. In fact, I went and tracked the hoses to find out where this water was coming from and what the contractor was doing with it. It was contaminated water that was worse quality than the water you take if you dip a pail in the Euphrates.

It is unbelievable. People get paid for this, they are incompetent, and they decide it doesn't matter? The person in charge of all the water in Iraq to be served to U.S. troops for Halliburton wrote an internal memorandum that I have made public. He said this was a near miss for us. It could have been mass sickness or even death. That was Will Granger, the top water quality manager, on May 13, last year.

Remember, this is a company which says this didn't happen. The Pentagon says it didn't happen. This is the internal Halliburton company report:

This event should be considered a “NEAR MISS” as the consequences of these actions could have been very SEVERE, resulting in mass sickness or death.

Officially, this company still insists this didn't happen. Their internal reports by their own employees in Iraq demonstrate it not only happened, it was very serious.

I don't do this because I am trying to make life miserable for somebody. I do this because we need to protect the American troops, first and foremost; and second, we need to protect the American taxpayers.

I much prefer that the authorization committees of jurisdiction through which this money moves would hold tough accountability hearings, call people in, put them under oath. But that has not happened. As a result, I have held a series of hearings as chairman of the Policy Committee. Such a hearing will occur in the morning on this issue of health care clinics.

My hope is that at some point, we will find an appetite in this Senate from people on both sides. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. I

hope we will find an appetite by everyone in this Senate to decide we are going to insist on people being accountable for the money that is spent and for what is done with respect to providing for American soldiers and doing what is necessary to be done under these contracts.

These contractors have fallen far short. The American taxpayers have been fleeced. They have taken a bath as a result of these kinds of actions. I know as I say this that there are undoubtedly some very good contractors. They have some good workers who risk their lives. They have done some good work. I say, God bless them. But when I see stories such as this, it makes my blood boil.

Harry Truman served in this Chamber. In fact, the first desk I had was a desk sat in by Harry Truman. He sat in this Chamber back in the early 1940s when we were at war. A President of his own party was in the White House. Harry Truman said: There is too much waste, fraud, and abuse in the Pentagon, in military spending, and they established the Truman Committee. He went all around the country holding hearings. They found billions of dollars of waste, fraud, and abuse. That was the legacy of the Truman Committee.

We ought to have one again. I have offered in the Senate, and I have been voted down. I think I have offered it now three times. By the way, I will offer it again. A good idea does not have to die a natural death. At some point, it can survive and succeed.

But more than the Truman Committee, I believe we ought to pass the legislation I described as I started. That legislation is legislation I introduced on March 3 of this year. It is now the end of July. On March 2, Senator REID, myself, and 30 of my colleagues introduced legislation called the Honest Leadership and Accountability In Contracting Act of 2006. It is long past the time for this Congress to have done what we should have done a month or 2 ago, 3 months ago; that is, pass this legislation, punish war profiteers, and do so aggressively. End cronyism in these key positions, especially in contracting, crack down on contract cheaters, and force real contract competition, real competition that gives the taxpayer the best price and holds accountable those contractors for getting the job done and getting it done in the right way.

I am going to pursue this, as I have indicated, with additional hearings, if necessary. I would much prefer they be done by the authorizing committees. One way or another, we are going to pursue these questions and ask for accountability and demand accountability.

As I said when I started, none of this is about politics. Republicans and Democrats work together on things from time to time in this Senate. This is one we can and should and I hope will work together on to fix for the good of this country and for the good of the American people.

## RETIREMENT OF MARTY BERMAN

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the Senate community is losing a longtime and valued employee. After 18 years of loyal and distinguished service, Marty Berman is retiring from the Senate Recording Studio. Marty played an integral part in the television broadcast of the Senate's proceedings and in helping facilitate the audio and video needs of Senators and their staffs.

His service to his country really started 45 years ago. Marty served faithfully, enlisting twice in a military career that began when he was 17 and lasted 6 years from 1961 to 1967. Before leaving the military he was a communications specialist with duty in Vietnam.

Marty brought extensive television experience to his job at SRS. In the private sector he worked at Satellite News Network, CNN, and finally at CBS. His work for Charles Kuralt and CBS Sunday Morning was nominated for an Emmy. A 13-minute-long story he had photographed was aired, which is the television equivalent of a long book.

His career at the recording studio began in 1988 where he quickly came to specialize in audio operations. However, his contributions were not just technical. He also had just the right personal touch with Senators. It isn't always easy to get up in front of TV cameras and lights to speak, even for Senators, but Marty had the ability to put any Senator at ease. When floor directing, he spoke to each Senator easily and with warmth, and they trusted him. He was never intimidated but he was always respectful.

Marty can be a bit feisty, but his bark is much worse than his bite. To those who have gotten to know him, he is warm and caring, too.

Marty ended where he had started, working the Senate television shift. In 18 years he braved many long days and late nights through the Senate's always unpredictable schedule. Throughout his time at the studio, Marty could always be counted on to be at his post. That included his work as chief STV audio operator where for most days during his shift he started up in the audio booth, assuring that the Senators could always be heard in the Chamber and on television.

Marty has two grown sons, Eric and Alex. The two have been the pride of his life and have become responsible and caring adults. His marriage to Darlene has brought him much happiness. Both share the same three hobbies: antique collecting, antique collecting and more antique collecting. Their home is a somewhat cluttered but fascinating museum of American Western and American Indian artifacts, pottery, Big Little Books and just about anything else you can think of. Last but not least, there are four others who hold a place in his heart. They are Hoover the yellow lab, Clarence the basset hound, Crystal the cat, and Birdie the cockatiel. Birdie likes to lie back and

listen to the blues with Marty and Darlene and can even whistle "Bridge on the River Kwai."

Marty's unique personality, loyalty, and dedication will be missed. We all join to wish Marty the best as he begins this next adventure in his life and know he will enjoy the newfound time for family, friends, pets, and antique collecting.

## CARL PERKINS CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2006

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise today to support final passage of S. 250, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act. This legislation represents a bipartisan effort to enhance and strengthen career and technical education programs across the United States.

In my home State of Nevada, career and technical education programs enjoy strong support. Recently, career and technical educators from across the State came together to come up with common course standards for students that focus on certain career and technical education programs. Nevada also has a Career and Technical Education Plan that links these course standards with the academic requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act.

I have always supported the Perkins Career and Technical Education Program because I believe that these programs often catch students that slip through the cracks in traditional education programs. Career and technical education programs provide students with real world applications for what they are learning in the classroom. Students in Nevada have the opportunity to work with state-of-the-art technology in their classrooms to learn the skills they need in the workforce. Too often these are students that would have dropped out of school had career and technical education courses not been available.

During the conference committee on this important legislation, I was honored to work with my colleagues to strengthen this legislation. We worked to ensure that career and technical education programs have strong performance indicators that are linked to meet industry standards as well as academic achievement. The tech-prep grant program was maintained as a separate program to encourage continued innovation in career and technical education programs. This legislation also encourages states to develop articulation agreements and sequences of courses, something Nevada has already worked hard to develop. Finally, this legislation recognizes the importance of strong partnerships between high schools and institutions of higher education that support these programs.

During the conference I worked hard to ensure that funding for the Perkins programs continued to flow to fast-growing States. It is vitally important that funding follow students to their

new homes. To that end, we maintained the current hold harmless level at the 1998 level. This allows millions of dollars to move from State to State according to student population counts. As a Senator for one of the fastest growing States in the country, it is my duty to ensure that each of the children in Nevada, whether they were born in Nevada or just recently moved there, are accounted for when Federal funds are allocated to States.

I am pleased that all of my colleagues supported final passage, and look forward to working with career and technical educators in Nevada to implement this important law.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud the passage of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006. Perkins, the Federal Government's largest investment in our Nation's high schools, provides critical resources for students pursuing career and technical education at the secondary and postsecondary levels. Although the President has proposed eliminating the program in recent budget requests, Perkins has enjoyed a long history of bipartisan support. More than 11 million students are currently enrolled in some form of career and technical education and I am confident this reauthorization will improve the programs and services available to help them realize their goals.

I am particularly heartened by this bill's heightened focus on individualized student counseling and the use of graduation and career plans. For too many students, high school graduation and postsecondary education seem out of reach. That is why I have introduced my Pathways for All Students to Succeed, PASS, Act. The PASS Act provides assistance for schools to hire and train mathematics and literacy coaches; supports the collection and reporting of accurate graduation rates; and targets funding for struggling schools to implement reforms. It also dedicates resources to increase the number of academic counselors working in schools. Research has shown that providing early high school students with guidance boosts the likelihood that they will graduate with a diploma. Early, individualized planning also helps students obtain the coursework and training they need to achieve their professional aspirations. I applaud the increased focus on individualized student counseling and planning in Perkins, which will reach career and technical education students earlier in their schooling and put them on a track to graduate.

This Perkins reauthorization retains and strengthens the Tech Prep program, which encourages states to design and implement innovative programs that combine secondary and postsecondary activities into a coherent set of courses. In my home State of Washington, it is estimated that workforce training at community and technical colleges increases a student's lifetime earnings by more than \$150,000.