

through one-stop delivery described in paragraph (2).

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Education and training services described in subparagraph (B) may be provided to dislocated workers in a substate area through a contract for services in lieu of a voucher if—

“(I) the local partnership described in section 728(a), or local workforce development board described in section 728(b), for the substate area determines there are an insufficient number of eligible entities in the substate area to effectively provide the education and training services through a voucher system;

“(II) the local partnership or local workforce development board determines that the eligible entities in the substate area are unable to effectively provide the education and training services to special participant populations; or

“(III) the local partnership or local workforce development board decides that the education and training services shall be provided through a direct contract with a community-based organization serving special participant populations.

“(iii) PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF ON-THE-JOB TRAINING THROUGH VOUCHERS.—On-the-job training provided under this paragraph shall not be provided through a voucher system.

“(D) ELIGIBILITY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

“(i) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—An entity shall be eligible to provide the education and training services through a program carried out under this paragraph and receive funds from the portion described in subparagraph (A) through the receipt of vouchers if—

“(I)(aa) the entity is eligible to carry out the program under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; or

“(bb) the entity is eligible to carry out the program under an alternative eligibility procedure established by the Governor of the State that includes criteria for minimum acceptable levels of performance; and

“(II) the entity submits accurate performance-based information required pursuant to clause (i), [except that entities described in subclause (I)(aa) shall only be required to provide information for programs other than programs leading to a degree.]

“(ii) PERFORMANCE-BASED INFORMATION.—The State shall identify performance-based information that is to be submitted by an entity for the entity to be eligible to provide the services, and receive the funds, described in clause (i). Such information [shall] include information relating to—

“(I) the percentage of students completing the programs, if any, through which the entity provides education and training services described in subparagraph (B), as of the date of the submission;

“(II) the rates of licensure of graduates of the programs;

“(III) the percentage of graduates of the programs meeting skill standards and certification requirements endorsed by the National Skill Standards Board established under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act;

“(IV) the rates of placement and retention in employment, and earnings, of the graduates of the programs;

“(V) the percentage of students in such a program who obtained employment in an occupation related to the program; and

“(VI) the warranties or guarantees provided by such entity relating to the skill levels or employment to be attained by recipients of the education and training services provided by the entity under this paragraph.

“(iii) ADMINISTRATION.—The Governor shall designate a State agency to collect, verify, and disseminate the performance-based information submitted pursuant to clause (ii).

“(iv) ON-THE-JOB TRAINING EXCEPTION.—Entities shall not be subject to the requirements of clauses (i) through (iii) with respect to on-the-job training activities.”

In section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

In subparagraph (D) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(D)” and insert “(A)”.

In section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike subparagraph (E).

In subparagraph (F) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(F)” and insert “(B)”.

In section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike subparagraph (G).

In subparagraph (H) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(H)” and insert “(C)”.

In subparagraph (I) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(I)” and insert “(D)”.

In section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike subparagraph (J).

In subparagraph (K) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(K)” and insert “(E)”.

In subparagraph (L) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(L)” and insert “(F)”.

In subparagraph (M) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(M)” and insert “(G)”.

In subparagraph (N) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(N)” and insert “(H)”.

In subparagraph (O) of section 716(a)(7) (as so redesignated), strike “(O)” and insert “(I)”.

In section 716(g)(1)(A), strike “(a)(6)” and insert “(a)(7)”.

In section 716(g)(1)(B), strike “(a)(6)” and insert “(a)(7)”.

In section 716(g)(2)(A), strike “(a)(6)” and insert “(a)(7)”.

In section 716(g)(2)(B)(i), strike “(a)(6)” and insert “(a)(7)”.

In section 7(38) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (as amended by section 804, strike “(8)” and all that follows and insert “(9) of section 716(a) of the Workforce Development Act of 1995.”

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2490

(Purpose: To strike provisions relating to workforce development and workforce preparation)

Strike titles VII and VIII of the amendment.

Mr. BREAUX. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be temporarily set aside until it is appropriate that they be considered.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I believe the pending amendment is offered by this Senator under a time agreement of 1½ hours, equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 2466. There is a 90-minute time limit.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Thank you.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wonder whether, rather than waste time in a quorum call, I could have consent to modify an amendment? If I could just extend that consent to follow disposition of the Moynihan amendment?

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

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Would it be possible to proceed for 5 minutes or so on a subject outside of that?

Mr. DOLE. It is all right with this Senator.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Five minutes, and then we can get to this matter then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### CONGRESS MOVING TOWARD A “TRAIN WRECK”

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, it is clear that Congress is moving inexorably toward what the press is consistently referring to as a “train wreck.” And all of us understand as we look at the budget process that there is an inevitable confrontation that is going to take place. That train wreck is already beginning to promote a concern in the financial marketplace. It is upsetting people’s perceptions about what Congress is capable of doing or willing to do.

And I would like to say at this time, Mr. President, I would like to express my hope that bipartisanship and common sense will still be virtues here in Washington and that we can take the steps necessary to avoid any train wreck.

It seems to me that all of us ought to be pretty sensitive to what is about to happen. Despite the fact that a huge portion of the public has said that they did not like the way we do business.

Mr. President, a portion of the public has already said to us they do not like the way we do business here. And a lot of us have come to understand that. Despite the fact that we talk about change, we rarely accomplish it. And despite the fact that we claim we want bipartisanship and avoid politics as usual, Congress and the President are moving in a kind of mindless Alice in Wonderland atmosphere toward an inevitable confrontation.

And that confrontation is going to leave Americans questioning the quality of the leadership of this country and questioning the degree to which people here are in touch with the real concerns of the American people.

I find this a profoundly disturbing and almost incomprehensible equation. It is contrary to all of the things that people are asking us to do. And yet some people around here seem more content to believe that it is better to have a sort of ripeness to the political confrontation before we sit down and discuss what we are going to do.

Mr. President, I think that the American people have made it very clear that they want us to behave like adults and they want an assurance that critical services are going to continue to be provided to the people who pay our bills, who pay our salaries, and who pay for those services. In addition to that, there are very fundamental, basic needs of the country that should not be made poker chips in a political gamesmanship one-upmanship process.

Most people have made it very, very clear that their concerns are whether they are going to have a job, whether we are going to do something about raising their income, whether kids are going to get to school and whether the schools are going to be safe, and whether they will be safe in their communities. These are the real concerns of the American people. And every single one of us knows that there are going to be some appropriations bills on the floor that are going to be passed in a unison of ideological fervor. Those bills are absolutely preordained to be vetoed. They are absolutely preordained to have the vetoes upheld. And we are absolutely preordained to come here to confront the moment of reality. But that moment of reality is being put off into the future in a way that makes the American people the pawns in the process.

And I guarantee my colleagues—and they know it because I hear them saying it in the back halls—this will not serve America's interests. This will not serve our interests. It will be bad for this institution. And those of us who I think are concerned about trying to find a bipartisan, moderate, common-sense solution would like to suggest that rather than waiting for the train wreck, let us do what sensible people are supposed to do. Let us sit down now. Let us begin the process now of a bipartisan effort to avoid this confrontation and to find out if we can behave like the adults the American people sent us here to behave like. It is not very complicated.

I would ask that the President of the United States engage with the leadership, with those leaders of the key committees now, and that we even invite the American people to participate. Hold a meeting in the East Room. Let C-SPAN be part of the discussion of the priorities of this country. Let them see why there are differences of opinion. Let America share together with us an opportunity to prove that we are not going to conduct business as usual, that we are prepared to truly think differently.

I ask for 1 additional minute, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, rather than go through the process of the inevitable confrontation with a continuing resolution, with a then delayed moment of confrontation with another continuing resolution, it is incumbent on all of us to have a responsible process in the interest of this institution and the American people.

I hope that the President of the United States will reach out to the leadership, and I hope that the majority leader will not be stuck in a position where he suggests that compromise is impossible.

Compromise is the nature of the legislative process. Inevitably, everyone knows there will be some kind of com-

promise. There has to be. The political equation of the veto, the political equation of the executive versus the legislative branch dictates that that will happen. What the American people do not want to see is a repeat of the Washington Monument and other symbolic closings that ultimately wind up with more than symbolic closings. It is not necessary.

So I implore our colleagues, let us not make the American people the pawns in a political charade. Let us get away from business as usual. Let us begin the process of a real dialog now that proves to the American people we are prepared to have an important, open, significant debate about the priorities of this country, and we can conduct our business in a mature and sensible fashion.

I yield the floor, and I thank the distinguished managers.

#### THE FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2466

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require for an opening statement.

Mr. President, I rise in an all but empty Chamber to offer an amendment which is in the nature of a substitute for the bill reported from the Committee on Finance and later amended by the distinguished Republican leader.

On May 26, the committee considered the chairman's mark and the bill that I offered, the Family Support Act of 1995. It failed by a vote of 12 to 8 in our committee on party lines, with one exception, and it was not a happy moment, much less a promising moment. It was, indeed, a foreboding one.

Had it not been for the 1994 congressional elections, the wave of what George Will called a cymbal-clash change of the electorate, this measure now before the Senate is pretty much the measure we would have been considering. It brings the Family Support Act of 1988 up to the higher standards, higher expectations that we assumed would come with time and which we also assumed in what might seem the innocence of the last decade would be as bipartisan an effort as was the original.

The Family Support Act passed the Senate on June 16, 1988, by a vote of 93 to 3. We went to conference. The conference committee agreed. It came back, and on September 29 it passed out of this Senate 96 to 1, and then the following day the conference report was agreed to in the House by a vote of 347 to 53, near to an overwhelming vote. And on October 13, it was signed by President Reagan in a ceremony in the Rose Garden. Then Governor Wil-

liam J. Clinton of Arkansas, the Chairman of the Governors' Association was on hand, as was Governor Mike Castle, then Republican Governor of Delaware. The two of them had helped this bipartisan effort in the Governors' Association.

President Reagan said:

I'm pleased to sign into law today a major reform of our Nation's welfare system, the Family Support Act. This bill creates a new emphasis on the importance of work for individuals in the welfare system.

It basically redefined the Aid to Families with Dependent Children legislation, which dates back to 1935. What had been a widow's pension, meant to phase out as survivor's insurance matured in Social Security, had become a wholly different program for a wholly different population, and within a certain measure of delay, when the time came, we redefined the program, redefined its objectives. We did so, Mr. President, with a measure of realism, even of modesty, in the face of extraordinary change in our social structure, our social system, if you will. This change came suddenly and without warning and to this day it can be quantified but scarcely explained. I refer to the subject that has been spoken about with candor and, I think, understanding, with an openness on the floor in this debate already, which is the rise of out-of-wedlock births, from about 6 percent nationwide in 1960 to about 33 percent today.

I have commented several times that this is something we did not know how to talk about, were not sure we ought to talk about, but which Presidents now openly discuss. President Bush was the first President to raise this issue in a State of the Union Message. President Clinton has done the same. President Clinton has suggested projections that we have made in our office which could take us surely to 40 percent, a number without meaning until this moment in history. We could not have imagined it.

We created the JOBS Program, one of those acronyms, Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills. We set quotas, percentages that States had to meet as they moved along with the funds available, and we began to see results.

We never promised a very great deal. We made very clear that the persons we were concerned about were the persons most in need, and they are not difficult to define, Mr. President.

About 42 percent of persons who enter the welfare system are there for 24 months or less. They typically are women with children whose marriages have dissolved, and it takes them a period to put their life back, their affairs back in order, and they do. A fairly considerable amount of research has indicated they do not need anything but time and a certain amount of income support, which is what the Social Security system is all about.

On the other hand, a very large proportion of our children enter this system and stay in it for more than 5