

the bill, by listing it as one of the considerations under dislocated workers, which provides a benchmark but does not require it being set aside as a special program, is a very important rationale. Otherwise, we get right back into trying to serve a special population. If we do serve this one, then why should we not serve that one? This would put us right back where we started.

I think expanding the definition is a mistake. I think the requirement that it be so defined is a mistake, and I urge opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] is absent due to a death in the family.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 484 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihhan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pell
Breaux	Inouye	Pryor
Bryan	Johnston	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Robb
Byrd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kohl	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Simon
Dodd	Leahy	Snowe
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	

NAYS—53

Abraham	Gorton	Mack
Ashcroft	Gramm	McCain
Bennett	Grams	McConnell
Bond	Grassley	Murkowski
Brown	Gregg	Nickles
Burns	Hatch	Pressler
Campbell	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Heflin	Santorum
Coats	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Jeffords	Specter
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Dole	Kerrey	Thompson
Domenici	Kyl	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lott	Warner
Frist	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Cohen
Exon

So the amendment (No. 2889) was rejected.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Madam President, for the information of Senators, there will be no further rollcall votes this evening. However, we will continue to debate several amendments this evening. First, we will consider the amendment of Senator CRAIG, from Idaho, that I believe has been worked out on both sides.

Then we will move to debate the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] followed by, I believe, an amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM]. Rollcall votes on those two amendments will occur tomorrow, as well as the disposition of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] and then there will be final passage.

It is my understanding the Senator from Ohio would like to offer a few minutes of comments as in morning business.

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I will not object. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. GLENN. Not more than 5 minutes for a short eulogy.

Mr. CRAIG. No objection.

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

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL M.
SCHLESINGER

Mr. GLENN. Madam President, the United States lost a wonderful woman and we lost a good friend today. Rachel Schlesinger died today in Arlington, VA, after a long-time struggle against cancer. She was the wife, the partner, indeed a wonderful supporter of James Schlesinger, who served in Cabinet positions in three separate administrations for this country. In all the agencies in which her husband served, she was universally loved.

I do not think I ever heard a hint of criticism about Rachel Schlesinger in all the years in Washington. She was born in Springfield, OH, in 1930 and grew up on the family farm, which she still owned with her sisters up to the time of her passing. Her father's family had come to southwestern Ohio from Pennsylvania Dutch country. Her mother's family had migrated from the German Palatinate and settled in rural Missouri. Her father was a livestock raiser and so called himself a dirt farmer who managed to survive the Depression, which was tough back in those days, of course. Rachel was an outstanding student at Springfield High School. She won a scholarship to Radcliffe College, which was then a woman's college at Harvard University, in 1948. She won honors in American history and literature. She graduated with honors in American history and literature.

After college, Rachel moved to New York and became a college editor at

Mademoiselle magazine, and in 1954, she married Jim Schlesinger, whom she had known since her college years. She became a freelance writer but devoted her time mainly to family life.

Over time, they lived in Arlington, MA, Charlottesville, VA, Newport, RI, Santa Monica, CA, and Arlington, VA. Jim and Rachel had eight children: Cora, Charles, Ann, William, Emily, Thomas, Clara, and Jim, Jr. They all reside in Arlington, save for Charles, who is an engineer in Texas, and Ann, who lives with her husband and children in Prague.

Rachel had mixed feelings about her husband's Government service, but only rarely did she involve herself in public issues. One such occasion did occur in 1971 when her husband was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission was about to test the warhead for the Spartan missile in the Aleutian Islands. There were widespread protests developed in this country and overseas primarily associated with the peace movement and the environmental movement. It was said that the underground detonation would probably initiate an earthquake and maybe even a Sunami wave that would inflict widespread damages throughout the Pacific.

Well, Rachel simply packed up two of her daughters and headed with her husband to Amchitka Island, where the test was to take place. The action of the family in going to the island quieted much of the alarm that the prospective test had generated.

In 1975, she accompanied her husband on an extended trip to Asia. It was the first trip to Japan by a United States Secretary of Defense since World War II. Needless to say, the trip, again, generated very widespread protests, but also an outpouring of support along with it. The trip occurred after the fall of Saigon. Kim Il-Song was uttering threats to overrun South Korea, just as South Vietnam had been overrun. And in Korea, there was great concern regarding the strength of the American commitment. The visit of Mrs. Schlesinger and her husband did much to reassure the Korean Government and public that American support was steadfast and that North Korea would be given no latitude for aggressive action.

In the 1980's, with her children departing from home, Mrs. Schlesinger again became active in local and charitable affairs. She was a very dedicated and accomplished musician. She served as a violinist with the Arlington Symphony Orchestra since 1983 and served on the board of directors with the symphony since 1987 and on the executive committee since 1990. She was founder and first chairman of the Ballston Pops, which she originally organized and continued to organize each May, and which will soon celebrate its 10th anniversary.

Mrs. Schlesinger served on the overseas committee to visit the Memorial Church at Harvard. She was deacon of

Georgetown Presbyterian Church. She also taught and began to raise Christmas trees as a business, and even delivered most of these trees herself.

Despite the glamour of much official life in Washington, Rachel always referred to herself as a country girl. In her later years, she became more involved in the preservation of historic sites and increasingly the preservation of rural land. So, in addition to her civic and charitable work and her small business, she was very devoted to music, to gardening and, of course, her biggest devotion of all was to her family.

She is survived by Jim, who is a good friend of ours, of course, and many people here, as she was also. She is survived by her eight children, six grandchildren, and three sisters, Mrs. Ann Kirkwood of Prescott, AZ; Janice Lynn of Croton-on-the-Hudson, NY; and Rebecca Mellinger (Mrs. Jane Engelthamer) of Chicago, IL. She had one sister who preceded her in death, Mrs. Judith Peterson of Upper Arlington, OH.

Madam President, I just wanted to get that in today on the same day on which we lost this very good friend and dedicated American and wonderful supporter. I know her family is missing her, and our thoughts and prayers go out to them this evening.

I yield the floor.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 2892 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2885
(Purpose: To provide for evaluation of State programs)

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] proposes an amendment numbered 2892 to amendment No. 2885.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 105, strike lines 4 through 14 and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall annually prepare and submit to the Federal Partnership, a report that states how the State is performing on State benchmarks, and the status and results of any State evaluations specified in subsection (f), that relate to workforce development activities (and workforce preparation activities for at-risk youth) carried out through the statewide system of the State. In preparing the report, the State may include information on such additional benchmarks as the State may establish to meet the State goals.

On page 113, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(f) EVALUATION OF STATE PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State that receives an allotment under section 102 shall conduct ongoing evaluations of workforce employment activities, flexible workforce activities, and activities provided through Job Corps centers, carried out in the State under this title.

(2) METHODS.—The State shall—

(A) conduct such evaluations through controlled experiments using experimental and control groups chosen by random assignment;

(B) in conducting the evaluations, determine, at a minimum, whether job training and job placement services provided through the activities described in paragraph (1) effectively raise the hourly wage rates of individuals receiving the services through such activities; and

(C) conduct at least 1 such evaluation at any given time during any period in which the State is receiving funding under this title for such activities.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I want to thank the chairman, the Senator from Kansas, for her help and support in arriving at a final form of the performance measurement amendment that I am offering today. I understand and I think we heard the chairman just mention that both sides have cleared this, and I do appreciate the work of both the chair and the ranking member on agreeing to this amendment and working with us to get it to the form necessary for that agreement.

This amendment embodies a simple, commonsense principle but one that is often lacking in many of our Federal programs. I refer to the idea that when we have a program, we should study what we are doing to determine whether it works and, most importantly, how well it works.

This amendment simply would require that each State receiving an allotment under section 102 report on how it is performing on State benchmarks and on status and results of evaluations measuring the impact of job training programs on the wages of the individuals receiving the job training services. The need for and the benefits of such an evaluation process were brought home to me by the outstanding work already being done in this area by the Southwest Idaho Private Industry Council.

The folks at the Southwest Idaho PIC have visited with my staff and me frequently and have prepared an impressive array of information measuring the effectiveness of the PIC's programs. Specifically, the Southwest Idaho PIC regularly computes, among other figures, a return on investment.

Now, that is a very unique concept when we think of Federal programs. But this shows various ways that the clients of the PIC are repaying their entire investment made in their training program. Currently, the average graduate each earns enough, after just 13 months in the work force, to repay in Federal taxes the entire Federal share investment of his or her training.

Mr. President, if every federally funded job training provider across the country had to compute a return on in-

vestment, or similar measure of its performance, based on objective, empirical research data, we would see the best of both worlds. And in Idaho, with the training program of the Private Industry Council, we are beginning to realize that. More importantly, they are able to fine-tune their program to get the highest yield; and, in this instance, the highest yield very simply means a better-trained person, who comes to the job market more prepared and, as a result, is able to perform not only to their own satisfaction, but in a business sense, it returns to the taxpayer the kind of investment all of us strive for in job training programs.

We need to build a body of evidence on the true effectiveness of job training programs. Very few programs have ever been subjected to rigorous and scientific evaluation. We have the opportunity, with this amendment, to debate results, rather than mere hopes.

As a Department of Labor report already has pointed out, "there are many areas where little thorough and reliable evaluation evidence is available."

It is our intent with this amendment to compare the results for served clients with data from control groups—that is, unserved persons. Evaluations would be valid and reliable, and conducted through controlled experiments.

I stress the importance of comparing apples with apples—the control group should be identical to the served group in every way except for the provision of the job training services. This is the essence of scientific studies of this sort. Therefore, it is my understanding and intent that this amendment require that the demographic characteristics in each group be proportional to the characteristics in the other.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their consideration. I urge adoption of this very simple and practical amendment.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Madam President, I would like to say that we are prepared to accept the Craig amendment. I believe it would add an additional measure of accountability to the bill.

I am very appreciative of the Senator from Idaho bringing this to the attention of the committee. Under the Craig amendment, I think States will conduct ongoing evaluations of their training activities. I think that is enormously beneficial. It was something that was recommended in the Heritage Foundation bulletin as a weakness in the bill that we did not have that evaluation. I think being able to strengthen accountability is very important, and I am most appreciative. I think it has been agreed to on both sides.

Mr. SIMON. Madam President, it is a good amendment. We are pleased to accept it on this side.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Madam President, I urge adoption of the Craig amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.