

Monday,
Aug 10

McLennan,

Here's the whole
transcript - it's very
interesting - Ms Clinton
speaks at pages 30 et seq
and again at pp. 37+38!

I think there must
have been a rollout
of the report in 1990
at which Ms. C. also
appeared. — Best, Nick

Nick Littlefield
(617) 832-1125

FedEx USA Airbill FedEx Tracking Number 8186 0295 3090

1 From This portion can be removed for Recipient's records.
Date 8/10/00 FedEx Tracking Number 818602953090
Sender's Name Nick Littlefield Phone 617 832-1000
Company FOLEY HOAG ELIOT LLP
Address 1 POST OFFICE SQ
City BOSTON State MA ZIP 02109

2 Your Internal Billing Reference 90212-500

3 To Recipient's Name Ms. Melanne Verveer Phone 202 456-6266
Company Chief of Staff Office of First Lady
Address The White House
To "HOLD" at FedEx location, print FedEx address. We cannot deliver to P.O. boxes or P.O. ZIP codes.
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
City Washington, D.C. State ZIP 20500



0131005981

Form ID No. **0215**

4a Express Package Service Packages up to 150 lbs. Delivery commitment may be later in some areas.
☒ FedEx Priority Overnight Next business morning ☐ FedEx Standard Overnight Next business afternoon ☐ FedEx First Overnight Earliest next business morning delivery to select locations
☐ FedEx 2Day* Second business day ☐ FedEx Express Saver* Third business day * FedEx Envelope/Letter Rate not available Minimum charge: One-pound rate

4b Express Freight Service Packages over 150 lbs. Delivery commitment may be later in some areas.
☐ FedEx 1Day Freight* Next business day ☐ FedEx 2Day Freight Second business day ☐ FedEx 3Day Freight Third business day

5 Packaging * Call for Confirmation. * Declared value limit \$500
☒ FedEx Envelope/Letter* ☐ FedEx Pak* ☐ Other Pkg. Includes FedEx Box, FedEx Tube, and customer pkg.

6 Special Handling
☐ **SATURDAY Delivery** Available for FedEx Priority Overnight and FedEx 2Day to select ZIP codes ☐ **SUNDAY Delivery** Available for FedEx Priority Overnight to select ZIP codes ☐ **HOLD Weekday at FedEx Location** Not available with FedEx First Overnight ☐ **HOLD Saturday at FedEx Location** Available for FedEx Priority Overnight and FedEx 2Day to select locations
Does this shipment contain dangerous goods?
☒ No ☐ Yes As per attached Shipper's Declaration ☐ Yes Shipper's Declaration not required ☐ Dry Ice Dry Ice, 9, UN 1845 x kg
Dangerous Goods cannot be shipped in FedEx packaging. ☐ Cargo Aircraft Only

7 Payment Bill to: Enter FedEx Acct. No. or Credit Card No. below ☐ Obtain Recip. Acct. No.
☒ Sender Acct. No. in Section 1 will be billed ☐ Recipient ☐ Third Party ☐ Credit Card ☐ Cash/Check

Total Packages Total Weight Total Charges
* Our liability is limited to \$100 unless you declare a higher value. See the FedEx Service Guide for details.

8 Release Signature Sign to authorize delivery without obtaining signature

By signing you authorize us to deliver this shipment without obtaining a signature and agree to indemnify and hold us harmless from any resulting claims.
Questions? Call 1-800-Go-FedEx (800-463-3339)
Visit our Web site at www.fedex.com
SRS 100/Rev. Date 5/99 • Part #134813 • ©1994-99 FedEx • PRINTED IN U.S.A.

359

202 - 456
2878

HIGH SKILLS, COMPETITIVE WORKFORCE ACT OF 1991 S. 1790

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1991

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:37 a.m., in room 1000 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Chairman of the committee) presiding.
Senators Kennedy, Wellstone, and Jeffords.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

CHAIRMAN. We'll come to order.

I place my entire statement in the record as if read, and we begin this morning by hearing from two of the principal sponsors of the legislation in the Senate and the House of Representatives, Senator Hatfield and Congressman Regula. We are delighted to have you here to speak on this subject, which I think all of us regard as of vital importance in terms of our economic security and democratic institutional security as well.

[Prepared statement of Senator Kennedy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

The American economy is at a turning point, and the future of living for all Americans is at risk. Success in international competition and a high standard of living for all citizens depend in large measure on the education and skills of the nation's workforce. In turn, that means businesses must invest in their workforce and improve the way they produce goods and services. Major international competitors have long recognized this and they are ahead of us in meeting it. They are all pursuing a high productivity, high wage strategy for their workforce. The United States does not yet have such a strategy. In fact, we are pursuing a low-wage strategy that is driving our standard of living down instead of up. As a result, we are at a competitive disadvantage in the new global economy, and the disadvantage is growing.

The High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act is designed to stimulate cooperation by business, labor, schools and colleges, and state and local governments to improve the education and training of the workforce, and to develop new systems and strategies for meeting the economic needs of business and workers.

In essence, the Act does four things:

First, it calls for the development of voluntary education, occupational standards to assess student performance and meaningful information on worker skills;

Second, it creates school-to-work transition programs, including job finding assistance for students and graduates, and "life chance" programs for dropouts;

Third, it encourages businesses to improve their productivity and competitiveness;

Fourth, it increases the training and education of America's workforce, requiring employers to provide training, or else contribute one percent of payroll into a state-administered training fund.

This effort has special urgency, because the American standard of living is slipping, and our international competitive position is eroding. We must invest in our workforce. In today's global economy, the quality of a nation's workforce is its most important asset. Investing more in America's workers is the key to America's economic success.

In the United States today, we are failing to make those investments, especially for our "front-line" workers—the men and women who build the cars, operate the computers, and care for the millions of other jobs that make the economy go.

All of our major competitors invest more in training. A newly hired Japanese auto worker gets over 300 hours of training in the first 6 months of work. In contrast, American workers get less than 50 hours—a 6 to 1 advantage for the Japanese.

Development of this legislation was stimulated in large part by the groundbreaking work of the bipartisan Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, chaired by former Labor Secretaries Bill Brock and Ray Marshall. Their 1990 report, *America's Choice*, correctly identified the choice facing the Nation: higher skills or low wages. The report summons us to action, before our current economic decline becomes irreversible.

On an issue of this magnitude, all sectors of society must participate—schools and colleges, state and local governments, business and labor, community organizations, and many others. This is not a partisan issue, nor is it confined to a narrow set of interests; it touches all Americans.

In the coming months, we will be asking many groups for their assistance. This legislation is not a new centralized Federal program, but an effort to catalyze and stimulate activities being carried out at the State and local level and in the private sector.

In each of the topics addressed by the Act, there already exist world-class examples in the United States. But these isolated, uncoordinated efforts are not enough. They are not being coordinated across the Nation. There is no national policy to identify or encourage them. That is the why we need this legislation.

This legislation, like the OSHA bill I introduced a few weeks ago, seeks to find the best way that government can work with the private sector for the most effective pursuit of goals that we all share. Whether the issue is the plant-level health and safety concerns we called for in the OSHA bill, or the increased private sector effort called for here, we are not seeking new areas of regulation. Rather, we want government and the private sector to be all

achieving a strong and just economy. We want to find private multipliers for public programs, because otherwise these public programs will fail.

The American economy is in more trouble than any of us like to admit. We can continue to pursue a low-wage "live for the moment" strategy, but that short-sighted step will worsen our long-run problems, and put us in a "race to the bottom" with Third World nations. That is a race that we cannot win, and should not run. No other major industrial nation is pursuing this strategy—and neither should we. The United States cannot afford to become an economic colony of Europe and Japan.

There is another path. We can return to a high productivity, high wage strategy, with the promise of a better standard of living for all Americans, not just for the few who can avoid being stranded by the receding tide. The Act that we are introducing today can make a major contribution to implementing that strategy, so that future generations can continue to realize the promise of this country. The required steps will not be painless or easy, but they are absolutely necessary for our future prosperity.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HIGH SKILLS, COMPETITIVE WORKFORCE ACT OF 1991

School-to-work programs for all students, including career preparation, assistance in finding jobs, technology education, and youth opportunity centers where government-funded education programs would be available for students who drop out of school to enable them to achieve educational and occupational proficiency.

Corporate support for worker training. The bill would require that companies either invest in training or pay the equivalent of one percent of their payroll into a State administered training fund. Companies that already make such training investments would be exempt, as would firms with fewer than 20 employees.

Research by the States on voluntary performance-based student assessment systems, and development of voluntary occupational standards crafted by committees with business, labor, and public representatives.


High performance work organizations. The bill authorizes technical assistance to employers to help them develop work organizations that emphasize teamwork, front-line decision making, and increased worker responsibility. Only 5 percent of American businesses have moved to the type of high performance work organizations employed successfully by our chief economic competitors.

Coordination of State and local training programs. The bill encourages the development of State and regional training boards to coordinate the administration of Federal, State, and local employment and training programs, including the Job Training Partnership Act, vocational education and rehabilitation, and dropout prevention. A Federal study would be commissioned to examine ways to eliminate gaps in service and unnecessary duplication of services and increase overall effectiveness of employment and training.

Other Nations' Wages Are Rising Faster Than Ours

From 1973-1990


Based on U.S. Currency




SOURCE: Bureau of Labor Statistics

Other Nations Invest More in Employment and Training Policies


Percentage of GDP



SOURCE: OECD for Statistical Construction and Development (STECI)




SCOW L. Standard Cost for Labor for 11-Pills Brewery



Twelve Industrialized Nations Have Higher Wages Than the United States

Hourly Wages for Production Workers - 1990

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, BEA



Wages for Production Workers Are Falling Behind
Changes in Wages and Benefits Outpacing Productivity in Industrialized Countries

1983 1990

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, BEA

UNCLASSIFIED

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hatfield?

STATEMENT OF HON. MARK O. HATFIELD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM
THE STATE OF OREGON

Senator HATFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will offer my full statement to be placed in the record, and I would like to just highlight if I could.

Mr. Chairman, many years ago, when I entered Salem High School, it was a brand new building; it was made of beautiful brick and there were about 1,800 students. In the back of the building was a parking lot, and in the middle of that parking lot was a grand concrete building—no brick—designed somewhat as prisons are designed, I guess—and that was the shop, called "the shop". And you had indicated strongly to your counselor or to your advisor that you had no plans to go to college, for whatever reason, you were counselled to "the shop", detached from the main building.

The chairman this morning of this outstanding commission talked about the elitism that has developed over the years in our education systems. I call it educational snobbery.

I am proud to be a product of the liberal arts. I believe in liberal arts education. Nevertheless every student, even in my generation was not headed for college, and yet the curriculum was geared solely and exclusively for college preparatory work, assuming that everybody at least should go through that same curriculum.

Many years later, when I became Governor, having come out of the academic field in a private university role, the assumption was that my budget would carry the highest priority for the existing 4-year degree-granting institutions. We were in a recession at that time, there was a tight squeeze on money, and I indeed put the highest priority on higher education. But at the same time we launched a community college program which was to be a two-year transfer program and a 2-year terminal program focused upon vocational-technical education, built upon a very important study that had been set up by the legislature. So we had in a parallel pattern, so to speak, a database on the need. In all of this, we were hoping at the same time to draw into a greater role the business community.

Now, I only tell that little incident, that is totally irrelevant, perhaps, to many, but still to illustrate the point that what is proposed in this piece of legislation is innovative but not strange. It is founded on a broad base of information and data to give it authenticity and to focus on the need. I think it is also in its real essence not an effort to Federalize the problem but, if anything, to decentralize the problem into the areas where resources already exist.

I think too, oftentimes, we assume that a problem has to be centralized in order to deal with it, and out of that comes frustration of bureaucracy and frustrations of costs and rising costs and administering a program, and less and less of the appropriated dollars that actually ever gets to the recipient, for whom the program was really created.

But here, what we are doing is maximizing what is going on out there already and the resources out there already. Let me just give an illustration. Cities in Schools is one of the very important programs that was founded out of the private sector by Bill Miller

during Pre today, you sources of local school functioning and teaching and teaching.

If you go drug comp program, public high school.

If you go There is a ready the future need.

Now we to the evidence meal and people leaders.

I mention at the present this need 12-year program they may if later they pursue the.

We don't of our House proposed mixtures study it, tell you, addition can sometime some of the al institutions are all the experience.

So that the

Now, I the Secretary and the You and math-sci are not would be to But for of

I am a secretary all, it would be a reduction, And the

Hatfield?

ARK O. HATFIELD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM
STATE OF OREGON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Statement to be placed in the record, and
at if I could.

years ago, when I entered Salem High
new building; it was made of beautiful
300 students. In the back of the building
the middle of that parking lot was a
black-designed somewhat as prisons are
it was the shop, called "the shop". And
to your counselor or to your advisor
to go to college, for whatever reason
"shop", detached from the main building
morning of this outstanding commission
that has developed over the years in
it educational snobbery.

duct of the liberal arts. I believe in liber-
less every student, even in my generation
age, and yet the curriculum was geared
college preparatory work, assuming that
go through that same curriculum.

When I became Governor, having come out
private university role, the assumption
carry the highest priority for the existing
institutions. We were in a recession and
squeeze on money, and I indeed put the
tion. But at the same time we launched
program which was to be a two-year transi-
program focused upon vocational-technical
very important study that had been sepa-
had in a parallel pattern, so to speak.
In all of this, we were hoping at the same
time the business community.

Little incident, that is totally irrelevant
to illustrate the point that what is propo-
n is innovative but not strange. It is for
information and data to give it authentic-
I think it is also in its real essence not
a problem but, if anything, to decentralize
as where resources already exist.

So we assume that a problem has to be
with it, and out of that comes frustra-
strations of costs and rising costs and
and less and less of the appropriated dollars
to the recipient, for whom the program

is doing is maximizing what is going on
resources out there already. Let me just
Schools is one of the very important
out of the private sector by Bill Miller

during President Carter's presidency. If you went down to Atlanta
today, you would see that they have very effectively linked the re-
sources of the private business community into the needs of the
local schools of Atlanta. It is also in other cities. But it is a well-
functioning activity of linking those resources for technical train-
ing and technical education.

If you go out to Kalamazoo, MI, you will find that the Upjohn
drug company has done the same by coordinating the math-science
program, as I have testified before this committee, amongst the 12
public high schools in Kalamazoo.

If you go out to the West Coast, you'll find Hewlett-Packard.
There is a lot of activity of industry knowing and recognizing al-
ready the needs of getting trained personnel to feed not only their
future needs, but to be competitive in the world market.

Now we have in addition a national commission that has added
to the evidence. We are really just adding to evidence that is piecemeal
across this country by the experience of people in business
and people in the local communities—leaders in education, political
leaders.

I mentioned the State of Oregon—and I will not repeat myself—
at the press conference and the innovation of trying to deal with
this need at the secondary school level in the last 2 years of that
12-year program by providing a fork in the road for students where
they may choose one or the other fork, not locked into their choice
if later they want to cross over to the college prep program or to
pursue the vocational-technical curriculum.

We don't know it is going to work. When Vera Katz, our speaker
of our House of Representatives, the Portland representative, first
proposed this, it was greeted with gasps of disbelief or surprise,
mixtures of various emotions. But as people began to look at it and
study it, like anything else that breaks the traditions—and let me
tell you, tradition can be a very great continuity of history, but tra-
dition can also be a great impediment to progress and I think
sometimes, coming out of the field of education, I can say this, that
some of the worst examples of fossilized traditions are in education-
al institutions and structures themselves. That's not to say they
are all that way, but I certainly found that in my own personal ex-
perience.

So that consequently, we are maximizing the activities out there,
the resources out there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I see in no way that this is competitive with
the Secretary of Education and President Bush's Education 2000
and the program that has been launched by the administration.
You and I had the experience of having to meld our efforts in
math-science to make sure the administration understood that we
are not standing out here in a competitive role, even though it
would be our legislative constitutional right to do so if we wanted
to. But we are trying to be helpful and complementary to the ef-
forts of the administration.

I am very hopeful that we will get a ringing endorsement by Sec-
retary Alexander and by the administration officials for this. After
all it was bipartisan from its founding; it is bipartisan in its intro-
duction, and it will only be successful through bipartisan effort.
And there is enough of the problem—the problem is so huge I

think any effort is complementary to any other effort and not competitive in that sense.

So I make those comments in the sense of trying to lay the foundation for public understanding that we are not saying to you, "You are derelict"; we are not saying to local educational institutions "You are benighted and not facing your responsibilities"; we are not doing this as a critical action; we are doing it to a critical problem and employing all of our resources and giving opportunities for all of them to participate in the solutions.

It is very interesting to note that in 1909, Henry Ford produced his first Model T. History tells us that it cost about \$950. In a very short time Henry Ford was producing Model Ts from a moving assembly line, and that brought the price down to a reasonable level because of increased technology.

Then, it was very interesting—by 1914, he was producing an automobile every 24 seconds, and he was paying his employees \$5 per hour, which was about twice the wage rate of factory workers in 1914, and in part to keep them on the job, because it was a notonous, dehumanizing experience.

Now, you could say that we are now facing another level in the development of production. Today it is not so much that we say those assembly are being "manned" with the human element, the word, not by people, but by electronic monitors, robots, computers, etc, etc, because of the Nation's technological advances. But the sad news is that many of our Nation's young people do not possess the skills and knowledge to either pursue higher education or enter that workplace to work these high technical positions.

So this to me is the opportunity to at least address the problem. There is no panacea that is going to cure every facet of it, but certainly it is a step that is so important to take, and I am honored, Mr. Chairman, to be associated with you again in a national cause and to be in company with our distinguished colleagues, Mr. Gephardt and Mr. Regula from the House of Representatives.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Hatfield follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATFIELD

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend you and your colleagues for your leadership in the critical issues of workplace skills, school-to-work transition, and economic competitiveness.

I am proud to be here this morning representing my state of Oregon, and I have taken a nationally prominent role in addressing these issues in relation to our education system. The problems we face are, unfortunately, one consequence of the inability of our educational systems to keep up with the rapidly changing technology in the world outside the classroom.

When Henry Ford marketed his Model T in 1909, he sold 11,000 of them a piece. When he introduced the moving assembly line a few years later, the price plunged to under \$300, and by 1914 his factory was turning out one Model T every 24 seconds. Ford's workers were paid \$5 per day, almost double the wage of factory workers, to prevent them from quitting what has been described as a notonous, dehumanizing assembly line.

Today, the assembly line has indeed been dehumanized. It is attended no longer say "manned"—by electronic monitors and robot arms, products of the Nation's technological advances.

is complementary to any other effort and not a response.

we comments in the sense of trying to lay the foundation of understanding that we are not saying to business "we are not saying to local educational institutions "enlightened and not facing your responsibilities" —

is as a critical action; we are doing it to meet and employing all of our resources and giving one of them to participate in the solutions.

interesting to note that in 1909, Henry Ford produced a Model T. History tells us that it cost about \$950. Within a year, Henry Ford was producing Model Ts from the first line, and that brought the price down to \$300.

very interesting—by 1914, he was producing a Model T in 24 seconds, and he was paying his employees about twice the wage rate of factory workers at the time to keep them on the job, because it was a humanizing experience.

I say that we are now facing another level of automation of production. Today it is not so much that we are being "manned" with the human factor, but by electronic monitors, robot arms, and products of the Nation's technological advances. The sad news is that many of our Nation's young people do not possess the skills and knowledge to either pursue higher education or enter the workplace. Many of our young people lack the skills to enter or to retain positions in the current job market. In 1990, the report America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages forced us to confront nationwide deficiencies among our youth, not only in academic achievement but also in workplace preparedness. This report stimulated a lot of discussion in many States. There was more than talk in my home State. The Oregon State Advisory Council for Career and Vocational Education developed its 1991 recommendations for workforce development, naming its report "OREGONizing America's Choice." Guided by the recommendations of the High Skills or Low Wages report, State Representative Vera Katz of Portland formulated legislation called "The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century," which was signed into law by Governor Barbara Roberts in July. The Oregon plan was developed for Oregon by Oregonians. It is not intended to be a blueprint for other States. The essence of the legislation Senator Kennedy and I are introducing today is that each State must confront, in its own way, the dilemma of high skills or low wages. Our legislation challenges the States by providing resources to address the critical problems of reclaiming high school dropouts, preparing all students with basic workplace skills and career awareness, upgrading employee skills for creating high performance workplaces, and coordinating Federal and State training programs. This legislation includes a number of provisions, each of which is significant enough to stand alone but which, together, reveal the magnitude of interrelated problems that we face and must solve. In the Excellence in Mathematics, Science, and Engineering Act of 1990 which became law last year, Senator Kennedy and I sought to strengthen the educational opportunities of the people who will develop the new technologies which will eventually find their way into all American workplaces. In the High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991, we hope to provide opportunities for those who will use existing technologies and adapt to new ones to keep our Nation competitive in the global economy. I would like to insert in the record a letter from Governor Barbara Roberts of Oregon in support of this important legislation. Thank you.

statement of Senator Hatfield follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATFIELD

would like to commend you and your colleagues for your leadership in addressing these issues in relation to the problems we face are, unfortunately, one consequence of the educational systems to keep up with the rapidly changing technology in the classroom.

When Henry Ford marketed his Model T in 1909, he sold 11,000 of them. By 1914, the moving assembly line a few years later, the Model T was being produced at a rate of one per minute, and by 1914 his factory was turning out one Model T every 93 seconds. Workers were paid \$5 per day, almost double the wages of the time, to prevent them from quitting what has been described as "the assembly line."

Today, the assembly line has indeed been dehumanized. It is attended—work is done—by electronic monitors and robot arms, products of the Nation's technological advances.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Salem, OR, October 1, 1991

Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Chairman,
United States Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Oregon's Legislature and I drew heavily on "Am Choice: high skills or low wages!" as we developed the Oregon Educational Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991.

Like our education reforms in Oregon, the Competitive Workforce Act sets al, world class standards for excellence and provides broad career choice through the college preparatory and certificate programs. And the Act coordi and promotes employment training programs so that they are as efficient and ductive as possible. The Competitive Workforce Act makes a smart investment our future by developing our greatest natural resource: our people.

I applaud you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Hatfield, Representatives Gephart, Regula, and the other involved Members of the Senate and House for your and support in developing this landmark legislation.

Sincerely,

BARBARA ROBERTS
Governor

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.
Congressman Regula.

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH REGULA, A REPRESENTATIVE
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO, 16TH DISTRICT

Mr. REGULA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimously sent to make my entire statement a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be included in its entirety in the record.

Mr. REGULA. I was interested that the National Association of Manufacturers in the press release said—and I quote—"While we cannot support the bill in all of its particulars, it correctly recognizes that the best investment business can make is in its employees. We can talk all we want about producing quality goods until we ensure that our workers have the necessary education to keep up with technology, we are going to lag behind our international competitors." They go on to say that "by devoting resources to improving the education of our workers, we will have the capacity to produce higher-quality goods, which translates into more jobs and a stronger national economy."

I think that says very well what the objectives of this bill are. Obviously, there will be many differences in the ideas brought before this committee and others that are participating in the evolution of a final product. Senator Hatfield mentioned the President's program, the objectives for the year 2000, and I think this is complementary to that rather than in conflict because it adds a gap in our education program.

And obviously, to support the kinds of objectives of the 2000 program, we need to have a strong industrial economy. It is the industrial economy and those who participate that provide the jobs that support our public education facilities, and therefore it is vitally important that they be strong and productive and competitive if they are to be able to support the services of government, particularly in education, in the years to come.

On a personal note, I was very much involved in the leadership and the creation of Stark Technical College in Ohio some years ago. This institution is meeting an extraordinary need in our

For instance, Students how to amount of was Stark Tech is g who do not go c tively in our inc

I think one of in the evolution enormous poter and technical sc their capabilities that as we evolve programs, but r

We in America to meet each a Kennedy set a s that goal was la jective. But one that we have to dent Kennedy i And I think tha our ability to c bowl, with the reward to the v quality of life, a

We have to co society in develc ample, a couple 67,000 candidat school diploma, of people who c langes of today.

Chrysler repo are written at a tes now read at

Motorola, 80 1 grade English co think the anatc dropout and illi tries, and it is a that kind of a sit

A point was r workers who wil today—two-third lems among the cause they are g productive socie

And of course, and that is that challenging pro money, it will in excessive amoun

Business know would help their

instance, Stark Technical College offers courses that teach students how to advise factories and business about limiting the amount of waste they produce even before the production starts. Stark Tech is geared to address the 70 percent of our young people who do not go on to college and yet need skills to participate effectively in our industrial economy.

I think one of the things that has not yet been mentioned is that in the evolution of this program we need to take into account the enormous potential resources that already exist in our vocational and technical schools in this Nation; I see this as a way of utilizing our capabilities even more effectively on behalf of skills. So I hope that as we evolve this legislation, we will avoid duplicating existing programs, but rather enhance them with the objectives of this bill. We in America are capable of meeting great challenges. We seem to meet each and every goal we set out for ourselves. President Kennedy set a goal of reaching the moon, and I think only because that goal was laid out did America respond and succeed in that objective. But one of the things that is characteristic of our Nation is that we have to be convinced that something is important. President Kennedy made that an important goal, and we achieved it. And I think that something that is important for tomorrow will be our ability to complete in what I call the world economic superhighway, with the common market, with the Pacific Rim. And the reward to the winners will not be a gold ring, but rather a high quality of life, a high standard of living.

We have to convince ourselves that we do have a challenge as a society in developing highly-skilled workers. Just to give you an example, a couple of years ago New York Telephone had to interview 4,000 candidates to fill 2,000 jobs that did not require a high school diploma, clear evidence of the fact that there is a great body of people who do not have the necessary skills to meet the challenges of today.

Chrysler reports that while its training and technical manuals are written at an 8th grade level, at least 25 percent of its employees now read at our below a 6th grade level.

Motorola, 80 percent of the applicants cannot pass a simple 7th grade English comprehension exam or a 5th grade math test. And I think the anatomy of our crisis is simple. We have the highest dropout and illiteracy rates among the advanced industrial countries, and it is a challenge to upgrade these skills so we don't have that kind of a situation in the future.

A point was made by Secretary Brock is that two-thirds of the workers who will be working in the year 2000 are in the work force today—two-thirds—and that means we need to address those problems among the existing people who are part of the work force because they are going to determine our ability to compete and be a productive society. And this legislation is aimed at that problem. And of course, I think Senator Hatfield made a very good point, and that is that this is not a case of Federalizing the answer to a challenging problem. If the Federal Government provides the money, it will impose regulations and restrictions and will have an excessive amount of bureaucracy.

Business knows what sort of formal education is best and what would help their employees and their profit margins, and I think if

this is to be successful—and therefore I am pleased that we have support from NAM, and I am sure the statement of Mr. Sloan for NFIB will fit into this also—the business and industrial community needs to be very much a part of shaping a final package. This is not intended to be the last word on how we solve the problem. It is a work draft, one attempt. We are focusing on those who have dropped out of school and those who go from one entry-level position to another, and on our business community and businesses where they cannot afford to train employees who will then be hired by others.

In my own district, the Wilbert Company—Mr. Featherstone is here this morning, the CEO—has done, I think, a very good case study as an example of how this can work extremely well. It is a relatively small business, and yet their program of upgrading skills of their employees has been quite effective in making them more competitive in the marketplace. And perhaps the most important thing is that the employees like it. They like the fact that they are getting an upgrade of skills—and it spills over not just to their ability to be more effective in the 40 hours a week, but it means they gain skills that will enhance their quality of life. The gaining of greater math and literacy skills means that they will have a better quality of life for every dimension of their personal lives.

So this has great ramifications. It means that they will participate more effectively in the society and our political process. I suspect that the program generates volunteerism on the part of these individuals. In our own community we have literacy programs, and people who learn to read suddenly want to get involved. They have always been reluctant to do so for fear that their secret would come out.

So in this program, we not only improve our competitive position but we enhance people's lives and that, after all, should be one of the great goals of any society. So this to me represents a benchmark in the enhancement of our society generally, and I hope that we will have a lot of participation by interested groups so that we can provide an effective means of addressing a great challenge that exists today for all of us.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Regula follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE REGULA

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to address this committee and to join you, Senator Hatfield and Representative Gephardt in introducing the "High Skills competitive Workforce Act of 1991." We have each worked in our spheres to address these issues, but today we join forces to face our workforce. We do so because of the bipartisan Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. By proving that leaders from so many diverse fields can unite in recommendations of such magnitude, they have challenged those of us in Congress to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I am a former educator. I have been a teacher, a principal, a State school board member. I am a farmer and a lawyer, also, but it was through my role as an educator that I was able to see our future. These children hold much promise, but they need our help. Because of their unique attributes, they or may not be well-served by the traditional course of high school on to college.

Many of my students went on to college and are successfully participating in society. They will have many advantages in this world and will be able to move in and out of several jobs and careers. But those who complete a college education represent only 30 percent of our young people. Are we willing to bet our country's economic future on the higher education of three out of every ten of our citizens?

not willing to. In fact, I believe so strongly in helping that other 70 percent provided leadership in the creation of Stark Technical College in Ohio. This institution is meeting an extraordinary need in our area. For instance, the Technical College offers courses that teach students how to advise factories and businesses in limiting the amount of waste they produce, even before the production starts. I am pleased that Stark Technical College is providing solid educational opportunities for some who never go on to receive a liberal arts degree. This institution is having an enormous impact on the residents of Central Ohio.

In America, we are capable of meeting great challenges. We have sent men and women into space; we have cured diseases; we have peaceful elections; we seem to be able to meet each and every goal we set for ourselves—but only when we are convinced that something is important.

Something that is important for tomorrow will be our ability to compete in the world economic superbowl. The reward to the winners will not be a gold ring but rather a high quality of life.

Now, Mr. Chairman, can we not convince ourselves that we have a crisis in our workforce. A couple of years ago, New York Telephone had to interview 57,000 candidates to fill 2,000 jobs that did not require a high-school diploma.

Employer reports that while its training and technical manual are written at an 8th grade level, at least 25 percent of its employees now read at or below a 6th grade level.

At Motorola, 80 percent of the applicants cannot pass a simple 7th grade English comprehension exam or a 5th grade math test.

Each of us believes that the business we are in is doing well, and that the dropout rate in our local school is not a problem. But added together, the forecast for this country is dismal. Our productivity growth is not keeping pace with other industrial nations.

The anatomy of our crisis is simple. We have the highest dropout and illiteracy rates among the advanced industrial countries. At least one out of every four of our children does not graduate from high school, and one out of every five adults is in some way functionally illiterate.

We have relied for too long on this large pool of low skill, low wage labor, and yet we know from numerous studies that higher literacy and skills proficiency improves productivity, positively affects morale, and enables employees to articulate their needs and suggestions.

Relying on low skill, low wage labor has been acceptable because, as the Commission report shows, "Our economy has grown because we now have 50 percent of the workforce working instead of 40 percent as in 1973. We added 40 million new jobs. Most of us have been working, so we have produced more. Because our economic growth has not come from improved productivity, however, our wages have not improved."

We are about to enter into a labor shortage, a fact which colleges and universities are already witnessing in their enrollment figures. According to former Secretary of Labor, two-thirds of the workers that will be working in the year 2000 are in the workforce today. We cannot rely on finding enough skilled workers among our new hires, but must instead teach our current employees the skills they will need.

Those who oppose this legislation simply because we ask businesses to finance their own worker training are missing the point. If the Federal Government provides the money, it will impose regulations and restrictions. Businesses know what kind of formal education is best—what would help their employees and their profits. And by spending their own resources on their employees, businesses will ensure that the training they are providing is useful and the best the market can provide. Yes, we are asking businesses to finance a training program, but to ask them to reinvest their resources in their employees is much different from taking their money and then telling them how they should use it.

We have heard from the businesses in our communities over the years that they are attempting to provide ongoing education and skill training programs, but they are losing these employees to their competitors. This legislation levels the playing

field. We dedicate the resources of the Federal taxpayers, and to ask our businesses to do the same in their employees is not something I take lightly. I would not sponsor this legislation if I were not convinced that this is the direction in which our country must go. We must take this problem seriously.

Finally, this legislation is not intended to be the last word on how we solve this problem. It is simply a working draft—one attempt. We are focusing on those who have dropped out of school, on those who go from one entry level position to another.

other, and on our businesses who cannot afford to train employees who will be hired by others.

I hope that those who read this legislation, and who agree that we are in a crisis, will come to the table to help us meet it head on.

The old quotation rings true again—If you are not a part of the solution, you are a part of the problem.

I join you today, Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of the High Skills, Community Workforce Act because I intend to be a part of the solution.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Congressman. We heard very eloquently from Senator Hatfield the story about the tiered educational system he remembers from when he was attending his high school education and what was called "the gap," and you have reminded us of some of the enlightened and innovative programs that are taking place in your own State.

Just a few months ago, I went up to a training program sponsored by Toyota in Framingham, MA, which is tied into a community college there. The program works with kids who are also in the community college about 12 weeks of the year. It provides the program with the top-of-the-line car it produces each year, a brand new car, so that what the students are learning and working on is the state of the art in terms of Toyota. It provides that for the training program, and the program is in much in demand.

When the kids get out of there, they start out at salaries of \$26,000-\$32,000 a year, and in another year and a half of training they can become a master mechanic and get into jobs that pay as much as \$55,000-\$65,000 a year, or even go out on their own and start their own businesses.

I spoke with the Toyota people, and they say, "This is good for us, because our investment in the training program is now beginning to reflect itself in the sales of Toyota because we are improving our service to the consumers." And the people who work in the training program, most of the instructors, could go out themselves and make a great deal more money, but they are interested in training and trying to get them involved in training that provides them with skills that will enable them to earn good wages.

What was also touched on in the earlier part of the testimony is the continuing education element which is such an important part of the legislation we are introducing today. Last week I was at a training center in Needham, MA that is providing additional training for people who have lost their jobs—of which there are tens of thousands in my own State now, white collar workers, most of whom have worked for 25 or 30 years and whose average age is 47—and trying to move them into new jobs in other fields.

When workers lose their jobs at this time in their careers, if they have children, it can have a devastating impact on their families. In many instances, there is tremendous pressure on older workers—to get rid of them because of the cost of their benefits package—and replace them with part-time, younger workers. When we talk about the skills issue, we are talking about a very dramatic human issue as well.

We welcome Senator Jeffords.

Senator
for a few n

I just wa
the work I

communication
I am goi
and will se

The CHA
ing at 11 a

We want

Mr. Rec

you can m

program I

their feeli

family life

of unempl

kinds of se

be vitally

in an obli

The CHA

I thank

with you

preciate v

The CHA

of Senator

Skills of t

of that Co

Labor. We

ton if she'

We are

ments ma

been prep

will be me

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

Mr. May

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEFFORDS

SEN. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I can just be here a few minutes. I have got to leave, and then I will be back. I wanted to thank my good friend, Congressman Regula, for what he has done and also Bill Brock, whom I have had conversation with.

SEN. JEFFORDS. I am going to be gone for about 20 minutes, and then I'll be back to say a few more words.

CHAIRMAN. We are going to have, I believe, two votes starting at 11 a.m.

SEN. JEFFORDS. I want to thank you very much, Congressman.

SEN. REGULA. Senator, one thing you touched on is not something we can measure, but it is a key element, and that is self-esteem. A lot of things like this can do so much for individuals' self-esteem and feeling of self-worth, and that has great ramifications in our lives. We have seen when, for example, you have high rates of unemployment, you have high rates of child abuse, you have all kinds of social ills. It is something we cannot measure, but this will be very important, I think, in addressing those kinds of problems in a unique way.

CHAIRMAN. You are absolutely right on that.

SEN. JEFFORDS. Thank you very, very much. We will look forward to working with you and Senator Hatfield and our other sponsors, and we appreciate very much your presence here.

CHAIRMAN. We'll now move to our next panel which consists of Bill Brock, who is the co-chair of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce and Ray Marshall, also co-chair of the Commission -- both former Secretaries of the Department of Labor. We welcome Ira Magaziner as well, and I'd ask Hillary Clinton to be good enough to join the panel as well.

SEN. JEFFORDS. I'm glad to welcome all of you. We'll include all of the statements made earlier in the record and any other material that has been prepared, and Ms. Clinton, any material you'd like to submit will be made a part of the record as well.

SEN. MAGAZINER.

STATEMENTS OF IRA C. MAGAZINER, CHAIR, COMMISSION ON THE SKILLS OF THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE, AND PRESIDENT, SJS; WILLIAM E. BROCK, CO-CHAIR, COMMISSION ON THE SKILLS OF THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE, AND FORMER SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR; RAY MARSHALL, CO-CHAIR, COMMISSION ON THE SKILLS OF THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE, AND FORMER SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR; AND HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, CO-CHAIR FOR IMPLEMENTATION, COMMISSION ON THE SKILLS OF THE AMERICAN WORK FORCE

SEN. MAGAZINER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. MAGAZINER. I'd like to set a context for the bill by talking a little bit about what is happening with the American economy.

SEN. MAGAZINER. In the past 17 years, the most fundamental and important fact about our economy is that we have improved productivity by only about 1 percent per year in this country, and that compares to a historical average of over 3 percent a year for the rest of the century.

It also compares to 3.5 percent per year in Europe and 6 percent per year in Japan for the same period.

What we have done over this period of the past 17 years is we have grown our economy not in a healthy way, that is, by improving productivity, but rather, by doing two things. One is we have spent other people's money. We have since 1982 brought into this country close to \$1 trillion of foreign money. What I mean by that is if you net out the amount that we loan to foreigners and the amount they loan to us, the amount we invested in their countries, the amount they invested in our country, we have brought in close to \$1 trillion net, and we have spent 98 percent of that, and that has been part of the way in which we have grown the economy. It has made up over two-thirds of the cumulative increase in our GNP. The best way you can explain that or describe it is if you think of an average family of four that in 1982, let's say, earned \$20,000 a year, spent \$20,000 a year, and let's say they inherited a house from their parents—that same family in 1990 spent \$30,000 instead of \$20,000. Well, that felt pretty good. That was growth. The problem is that even though their spending went up from \$20,000 to \$30,000, their income went up from only \$20,000 to \$22,000, and what they did was taken a mortgage on that house they inherited, and then they began to sell off pieces of the house.

Now, if you ask that family how they are doing, and they measure it based upon how much they are spending, the answer is I'm doing fine, I am spending \$30,000 instead of \$20,000. But if you ask a different—and I would argue more important—question, which is what is that family building for its children, you get a very different answer because what they are building is a big debt, and they are no longer going to have the house to pass on to their children because they are selling it off.

That's what we've done to grow the economy during the 1980s. We have spent other people's money, that is, foreign money, to a great extent.

The second thing we have done to grow the economy is we have thrown more people at it. We now have 50 percent of the American population in the work force versus 40 percent in 1973, and yet our unemployment rates are about the same.

Two things have happened. One is the baby boom generation came of work force age so you had a big bulge of people coming into the work force, and second, we have a higher proportion of women working.

But as was pointed out earlier, because we have not improved productivity, the real wage that somebody can get for an hour of work in this country has gone down by over 12 percent, and if you look at it stands now where it stood in 1958, the real wage.

So two important facts about the economy—we have not improved productivity, and the way we have grown the economy has been by spending other people's money and by throwing more people at the economy, and therefore real wages are down.

One final fact that is very important. If you look back 25 years ago, and you take all the developed countries in the world and look at the distribution of income, America had the fourth most equal distribution of income among the 22 developed countries. If you look 10 years ago, we were twelfth among the 22 countries.

you look at the most recent distribution of income of any country.

What has happened during this period the average wage has gone down by over 12 percent, and if you are in the top 30 percent of income earners, you have gone down by over 20 percent.

Now, those have been the problems. The Commission looked forward to a future where it was desirable to continue growth, but it is not going to be possible—neither is it not going to be possible. But even if it were desirable, the people who have been loaning money are not going to be investing all this money in the future. They are taking their money now, and at the same time, the people who are more for it. And also the desire to come out of retirement age is the first time since post World War II. The number of people coming of working age is going to be able to throw more money into the economy.

And finally, if we continue that we have had, it was our mistake. It was very difficult to preserve what we have had in this country. We have had in this country a developing country growing one out of every four children are born today, we are a developing country, and the developing country is not going to allow us to maintain the kind of growth we have had.

So in the view of our commission, we have to change direction, and there are two ways to change direction. One is we have to improve productivity at 3 or 4 percent a year. Second, we have to make sure that the benefits spread faster than the benefits spread. We have to make sure that the benefits spread faster than the benefits spread.

One final word about how we have organized work in this country. We have organized work in this country that were first developed in the early part of the 20th century. We have organized work in this country that were first developed in the early part of the 20th century. We have organized work in this country that were first developed in the early part of the 20th century. We have organized work in this country that were first developed in the early part of the 20th century.

That form of work organization is the early part of the 20th century. In the future we are going to have a new form of work organization called high-performance work organization. It is more on groups of front-line workers.

d 6 percent of income of any developed country in the world. What has happened during this period—remember I said real average has gone down by over 12 percent. But if you are in the top 10 percent of income earners, your real wage has gone up by 9 percent. And if you are in the bottom 70 percent of income earners, your real wage has gone down by over 20 percent.

These have been the trends of the economy, and as our country looked forward to the future, we found that even if it were possible to continue growing the economy the way we have, it is not going to be possible—and I would argue it is not desirable. If it were desirable, it is not going to be possible because the people who have been loaning us all this money from abroad are not going to continue all this money here have other things to do with it. And also the demographics are changing, so that for the first time since post World War II, the number of people retiring is going to be roughly equal to the number of people coming of work force age. So basically we are not going to be able to throw more people at the economy.

So, if we continue the skewing of distribution of income that we have had, it was our commission's view that it is going to be difficult to preserve the kind of social and political ideals that we have in this country when effectively what you have is a developing country growing up inside a developed country. With every four children being born into poverty in this country, we are a developing country inside a developed country, and that will not maintain the kinds of democratic ideals we have had. So, in the view of our commission, we have to fundamentally change the way we do things, and there are two things that have to happen to make that change. One is we have to rediscover how to improve productivity. We have to get 3 or 4 percent a year instead of one percent a year, and we have to make sure that as we improve productivity the benefits spread to everybody and not just to the 30 percent at the top.

So, the word about how you improve productivity in the 1990's is to reorganize work in this country according to principles that were first developed in the early 1900's by a man named Frederick Taylor. He is a man who has had a more profound effect on the daily life of the average American than almost any other man. And what we have done is we have taken work and divided it into simple tasks, and we have assumed that the front-line workers who were going to do that work were not capable of thinking or understanding. What would happen is that the experts would design the work for them, and the front-line workers would repeat the same one- or two-minute task 700 or 800 times a day, and that was the way we organized the work. So, the kind of work organization, while it could produce productivity in the early part of the century, no longer can do so. Increasingly, in the future we are going to have to organize work in what is called high-performance work organizations where we rely much more on groups of front-line workers to be thinking members of the

organization, not just robots who do the same one- or two-task 700 or 800 times a day.

And when you start talking about improving productivity that way, then you have to have highly educated and skilled workers. They must be thinking members of the organization. They must be trained, they must be skilled, and they can not be illiterate or people who don't have sufficient education.

That's the challenge we face. There is no way that we can survive in this world economy with a high wage if we don't have skilled and productive front-line workers. All of our living standards depends on it.

So the key to productivity, which has bedeviled us for years, how do we get productivity up, has to lie in the reorganization of work to make better use of everybody, not just the 10 percent who are the managers. And making that better use of going to depend upon upgrading their education and training. That is the fundamental message of connecting economic growth to productivity.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Magaziner follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. MAGAZINER

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to participate in this hearing and to respond to your request to comment on the National Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991. This bill, based closely on the recommendations made by the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce in its report, America's Choice: high skills or low wages, allows the Federal Government to play a catalyzing role to insure that our Nation's businesses remain competitive in the global marketplace and our Nation's citizens will enjoy a high standard of living.

The Commission applauds the leadership you have shown, Mr. Chairman, in introducing this bold and comprehensive measure. You have taken the first pieces of a broad agenda and identified the Federal role in such a way that it does not create additional administrative burdens or mandates, but rather focuses on rationalizing a complicated array of services and programs by using existing resources to develop a national consensus on investing in our human resources.

The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce is a bipartisan commission led by two leaders from the business, labor, education, government and advocacy communities, chaired by former Labor Secretaries William Brock and Ray Marshall. Established by the National Center on Education and the Economy in 1989 to study the current and future skill needs of our nation's non-college workforce, the Commission has been concerned about the serious economic problems facing the United States: a long-term drop in productivity, a decrease in real wages and the increasing number of Americans living in poverty.

America's Choice: high skills or low wages found that American businesses and competitors are able to sustain high wage jobs and improvements in productivity by reorganizing their workplaces for high performance. By shifting productivity to their front-line, highly skilled workforce, our competitors are able to improve productivity, improve quality, and rely on flexibility: all key ingredients for a high wage economy in a global marketplace. From interviews with workers and managers in the United States and six foreign countries, the Commission found that only 5 percent of American businesses have moved to high performance work organizations employed by their European and Japanese competitors.

Faced with the inter-related problems of less productive workplaces and a less prepared workforce, the Commission recommended that America make a national commitment to reorganize its workplaces and invest systematically in human resources to build a high wage, high skill economy. The Commission recommended that the United States develop a comprehensive human investment strategy with the following ingredients: setting new educational standards for all students to be met by age 16; assuring that virtually all students reach these standards; establishing alternative learning environments for students unable to succeed in traditional schools; creating a comprehensive system of technical and professional

states and assoc
Baccal
educat
work organiza
and c
How did th
way American
level? We beg
From the 1
ation was
then, the rate
of income in
preparing, b
each year
these have
productivity
the same pr
continues to
down. Eithe
between 70 p
very togethe
If we are
our rate of
to work, as
lower skill
higher pro
improvin
the past wi
lower den
tion, the n
lower den
were hard
to organiz
breaking
again by t
the organ
teracted
the other
through
helped to
out of a
out school
job exper
major re
states, I
that red
variety
maybe at
that vari
which a
of this r
panies c
flexibility
recordh
Japan fi
not to ar
reference
Cont
these
the stu
these
virtua
goal of
our wo
this is
shown

become more efficient, it can sell more and it can expand in the end, while operation requires fewer people, employment increases and wages rise.

The Commission found that high performance work organizations require workers to have much higher skill levels than in traditionally organized places. Higher skills require large investments in training and increases in pay as employees gain credentials and greater responsibilities. But productivity quality gains more than offset the costs to the company for training and increased wages. Despite these advantages, most American companies still cling to the model of work organization. In our survey of over 550 U.S. companies, the Commission found that only 5 percent of our Nation's businesses are high performance work organizations.

The Commission concluded that our Nation must employ 21st century work organization to compete in a global marketplace and we must have a force that can meet the challenge. This means that our future and current force must have the skills that high performance workplaces demand.

No nation has produced a highly qualified technical workforce without providing its workers with a strong general education. In the United States, we receive a clear message: If you are not college-bound, expectations for achievement are low. The result of low expectations, not surprisingly, finds American students placing near the bottom on international tests compared to their counterparts in other countries. Our front-line workers will not be able to compete in the educational arena because they are unable to compete in the educational arena.

We communicate to millions of students every year, especially to low income minority students, that we do not believe they have what it takes to learn. And live up to our expectations, despite evidence that they can meet very high performance standards under the right conditions. In fact, most employers look at the school diploma as evidence of staying power, not of academic achievement. They realized long ago that students can graduate from high school and still be functionally illiterate. And these are the graduates who our companies depend upon to drive productivity.

Even more troubling is the lack of effort the U.S. places on helping school dropouts, both before they drop out and with efforts to recover them. More than 10 percent of our Nation's students drop out before completing high school. The Commission believes we can no longer afford to drain our economy by sustaining uneducated, unproductive individuals, but instead, we must make an up front commitment to help them reach an educational standard that is world class.

Once a student completes high school, we make very little effort to facilitate school-to-work transition. Here again, schools are focused on assisting the college-bound. The result is that typical high school graduates mill about in the labor market moving from one dead-end job to another until the age of 23 or 24, with little more in the way of skills than they had at age 18, they enter the labor market, unable to compete with their German, Danish, Swedish or Swiss counterparts.

Once on the job, front-line workers receive little training. The occasional training for these workers is generally limited to orientation for new hires and motivation training for long-term employees. The one exception is the ongoing training provided to skilled crafts people. Of the \$30 billion that American employers spend each year on formal training, only one-third of this amount is spent on our non-college educated workforce, affecting no more than 8 percent of our front-line workers.

Federal and State training programs do exist to train adult workers, but these programs are designed exclusively to aid the disadvantaged and dislocated workers, leaving the U.S. with a bewildering array of services, programs, providing limited benefits for the larger labor market.

This bleak picture caused the Commission to doubt whether America could employ a highly qualified workforce particularly since Germany, Sweden, Denmark and Japan, share an approach to the education and training of their workers and high productivity work organizations which the United States lacks.

While their economies and cultures differ from the United States, the countries which we compete with economically share the following commitments:

They insist that virtually all of their students reach a high educational standard. They provide professionalized education to non-college educated workers to prepare them for their trades and to ease their school-to-work transition.

They operate comprehensive labor market systems which combine training, market information, job search and income maintenance for the unemployed.

They support company based training through general revenue or payroll-based financing schemes.

They have a national system of work organizations. Each of these nations has the United States, and it is.

The Commission believes a choice for high skill change the way work. Our recommendation work for developing a linked to high performance American. It has the competitors, but also.

The Commission reflects in its identification and should be set for established nationally.

The Commission all students that we demonstrated ability dents would also have and in groups and some might take to dents would be aware whether they enter technical and professional work.

The United States world. Most of the from the school curriculum for these tests, and testing system. A part of either teaching fundamentally character series of performance and take over a performance standards for employers an objective.

To set the assessment recommends the establishment that broadly represents.

This bill to move on national standards.

2. The States should achieve the Certification Training Boards. A learning environment is regular schools.

The Commission neighborhood school dropouts. The Center all the local students had expected to reach the trained had they stated that they need to.

The first priority: a Certificate of Instruction techniques that are the year.

School districts student who drop Center an amount have received for school, Youth Center to develop

national consensus on the importance of moving to high productivity organization and building high wage economies. These nations has maintained higher rates of productivity growth than ours, and their living standards and real wages have been rising steadily.

The Commission believes that to remain prosperous, the United States must make high skills, not low wages. To make this choice we must fundamentally reorganize work is organized and the way we educate and train our people. Foundations, which are the basis for Senate Bill —, provide a framework for developing a high quality American education and training system closely aligned with performance work organization. The system we propose is uniquely designed to have the potential not simply to put us on an equal footing with our neighbors but also to build the world's premier workforce.

The Commission recommended the following five-point program which the bill recommends identification of a federal role: 1. A new educational performance standard be set for all students, to be met by age 16. This standard should be nationally and be benchmarked to the highest standard in the world. The Commission envisions a new national performance examination system for that would ensure that every student leaves compulsory school with a demonstrated ability to read, write, compute and perform at world-class levels. All students have exhibited a capacity to learn, think, work effectively alone and solve problems. The standard would be the same for all, though some students may take longer to achieve it than others. On meeting the standard, students would be awarded a Certificate of Initial Mastery entitling them to choose to enter the work force, begin a college preparatory program or enter a professional certificate program to prepare them for skilled entry-

The United States is the most over-tested and under-examined nation in the world. The tests that American students take are deliberately decoupled from the curriculum. Teachers are not supposed to prepare students directly for the tests, and students are not supposed to study for them. As a result of this system, American education does not clearly reward academic effort on the part of teachers or students. A performance based assessment system would change this situation. At the heart of such a system would be a performance based examinations for which students can explicitly prepare for a period of years. While the assessment system would establish objectives for students and educators it would also motivate students and give them an objective means to assess the capabilities of job applicants.

In setting standards and certification procedures, the Commission recommends the establishment of an independent national examining organization that represents educators, employers and the public.

The Commission moves in the direction of national standards by authorizing research standards and pilot projects to develop multi-state assessment systems. States should take responsibility for assuring that virtually all students receive a Certificate of Initial Mastery. Through the new local Employment and Training Boards, States, with Federal assistance, should create and fund alternative environments for those who cannot attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery in school.

The Commission recommends creation of Youth Centers which would provide a new source of alternative education, counseling and job experience for students. These Youth Centers would be funded by transferring to the Youth Centers the local, State and Federal funds that would otherwise be available to students had they stayed in high school. Students in these Centers would be expected to achieve the same high level of academic mastery that they would have attained had they stayed in school, and to acquire the work skills and job experience needed to get a good job, if they choose not to go on to college.

A primary priority of the Youth Center would be to ensure that all students receive a Certificate of Initial Mastery. Youth Centers would utilize alternative learning methods that are individualized and provide a family-like atmosphere throughout the center.

Schools would be required to notify the nearest Youth Center about any students who drop out. The school district would make available to the Youth Center an amount equal to the average per-pupil expenditure that the school would have received for that student. Whether established within a school or outside of a school, Youth Centers would create a powerful incentive for schools and governments to develop programs to retain and educate their students properly the first

through which adults could acquire the Certificate of initial Mastery, manage a market information system and coordinate existing programs. The Boards would be composed of company, union and public officials, as well as representatives of community based organizations. In cases where labor, management and the community agree that they have been effective, Private industry councils should be the building blocks upon which the new Boards should be created. State should also create a parallel structure to support the local boards, coordinate statewide functions and establish State standards for their operation. The High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991 begins this difficult transition from a multiplicity of unconnected programs to a comprehensive system. It provides money to States to organize statewide, integrated delivery systems for employment and training.

The Commission's recommendations and the Federal legislation provide an alternative for America. We do not pretend that this vision will be easily accepted or quickly implemented. But we also cannot pretend that the status quo is an option. Underlying this proposal is a philosophical change in the way we view human resource policy in America. Traditionally we have operated systems that work on the margins of our labor market. We envision a new, more comprehensive system where upgrading for the majority of our workers is a central aim of public policy. The recommendations in America's Choice have received support from policy makers, business and labor leaders, educators, training professionals and advocacy groups throughout the country. Since the release of the report, Commissioners have attended hundreds of meetings in almost every State in the Nation. They have found that the time could not be riper and the need for reform more critical to undertake implementation of the Commission's proposals.

The National Center on Education and the Economy, the organization that created the Commission, found the need for a national standard of educational excellence so compelling that it has embarked on a project to develop a performance based assessment system that could result in the awarding of a Certificate of Initial Mastery. In partnership with the University of Pittsburgh's Learning Research and Development Center, the National Center has assembled a volunteer group of States and school districts to guide the initial development effort. The 16 States and six school districts that make up the "New Standards Project" represent over 42 percent of our nation's students. Some exams and frameworks in the initial subject areas will be field-tested and ready for use in the 1993-94 school year. Others will follow over the next few years. By the fall of 1997, examination programs should be in place for all major courses of study at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Leaders of the New Standards Project are working closely with the Administration, Congress, the National Education Goals Panel and the National Council on Education Standards and Testing to determine how the project fits in with work on a national examination system.

The Commission is also working with a number of national industry associations to begin building a system of industry standards for non-managerial workers. Companies and labor unions in the telecommunications, electronics, retail and metalworking industries will begin to establish job-related and industry specific skill standards, built around core proficiencies, and to develop certificates to accompany these standards.

At the State level, the Commission has helped to develop legislation based on the recommendations in America's Choice in several States, among them Oregon, Washington and New York. Other States, including Rhode Island, Minnesota and Virginia, have formed commissions or task forces to study the recommendations in America's Choice and develop implementation strategies for State level action.

America's Choice and this bill call for a fundamental shift in the way that America prepares its young people for their futures and the way that American business and industry structures work and invests in their workers. The Commission asks you to carefully consider the proposal before you keeping in mind that while the mechanisms for achieving our goal are important, the necessity for developing some means of investing in our front-line workers is essential to America's economic health.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for allowing us to comment on this legislation. The Commission recognizes the immense amount of work that went into producing this comprehensive bill. The Commission stands ready to assist you in any way as you move forward with this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. We have been joined by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives, who participated in the press conference earlier this morning and then was down at the White House.

time. S. ——— provides Federal incentive grants to local communities to support the establishment of Youth Opportunity Centers.

3. A comprehensive system of technical and professional certificates and associate degrees should be created for the majority of our students and adult workers who do not pursue a baccalaureate degree.

Most students who attain the Certificate of initial Mastery would be expected to enroll in a program leading to a Professional and Technical Certificate. These programs should combine continued education in school or college with a structured program of on-the-job training. A National Board for Professional and Technical Standards should be established to develop a national system of industry-based standards and certifications of mastery across a broad range of occupations. The Board would be made up of distinguished representatives of employers, unions, education and advocacy groups, industry and trade-based committees appointed by the Board would develop standards for each industry and trade. Each committee would build upon existing certification procedures, and develop a single coherent and internationally competitive set of assessments to guide career progression within each industry or trade.

Each occupational program should combine school and work-based learning to balance general education and industry-specific requirements. The system should offer mobility, both horizontally among occupations and vertically into optional further training or study. Above all, it should be designed to avoid dead ends. High schools, community colleges, proprietary schools and other educational organizations should compete with one another for the students in these programs.

The High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991 establishes such a National Board to develop voluntary, industry-driven occupational standards.

4. All employers should be given incentives and assistance to invest in the further education and training of their workers and to pursue high productivity forms of work organization.

To make full use of the productive potential of our workforce and to encourage the use of high productivity models of work organization, the Commission recommends that employers be provided with financial incentives to train their workers and with the technical assistance necessary to move toward higher productivity work organizations.

The Commission recommends that all employers would be required to spend a minimum amount of funds annually to send their employees through certified education and training programs. Those that cannot, or will not do so, would be required to contribute one percent of payroll to a general training trust fund to be used by the states to upgrade worker skills. The Commission believes this expenditure should come from employers, not employee contributions. The contribution would give employers an incentive to reorganize work to take advantage of higher skill levels for which they are paying.

The Commission also recommends that a comprehensive program of technical assistance be provided to firms, particularly small businesses, to assist them in moving to high performance forms of work organization. Up to 15 percent of funds in the training trust fund should be set aside for efforts to redesign work.

To focus national attention on the issue of work reorganization, awards programs designed to recognize and promote quality, excellence, productivity and improved workplace environments should be expanded.

The bill authorizes a system of technical assistance to employers to assist them in establishing high performance work organizations and to train front-line workers. The bill would require employers to invest at least 1 percent of payroll in worker training or pay into a trust fund to be used for such training.

5. A system of Employment and Training Boards should be established by Federal and State Governments, together with local leadership, to organize and oversee new school-to-work transition programs and training systems we propose.

The Commission's research showed that, where other countries have comprehensive and coordinated programs for helping future front-line workers acquire the skills they need, connecting them to the labor market, and retraining them, the typical State in this country has dozens of unconnected programs that fail to meet the needs of individuals and are almost impossible for clients to negotiate.

The Commission recommends that the states create local Boards for each labor market, headed by community leaders, that would insure that the system recommended by the Commission works at the local level, and eventually replace the existing—often competing—bureaucracies. These Boards would oversee the Youth Centers, manage the school-to-work transition process, oversee the process of awarding Technical and Professional Certificates at the local level, manage the system

through labor market

The 1 represent a Council of States

The 1 from a need for

The 1 native 1 quickly Underly

source 1 margin: skills u

The 1 makers, groups 1 attended found the

The 1 pted the lence su

based as Mastery Develop. and school d

cent of areas w follow o in place

levels. I. tration, Educatic a nation

The C to begin panies a working standard

these sts At the recommit ington a

is, have ca's Choi Ameri

ica prep and indi you to c mechan

means o health. Thank to comm work the

ready to The 1 the Ho ence ea

t to tell us about that meeting, we'd be glad to [laughter.] I know the Majority Leader has some other things to attend to, so if our panelists would be good enough to make what comments he'd like, we'd appreciate it.

OF HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI AND MAJORITY LEADER

HARDT. Senator, I'd be happy to wait until you are done with the votes on the Senate floor. I know you have a committee meeting and I'd be happy to wait until then.

IRMAN. The votes haven't started yet, so if you'd like to make comments now, you would have the assurance, of about 10 minutes, because I would not have to leave here to go to the second bell.

HARDT. Why don't you finish with the panel—I don't want to interrupt them—and then I'll go.

IRMAN. All right. That's very kind.

y Brock.

ACK. Let me start, Mr. Chairman, by thanking you for the opportunity to speak with Mr. Gephardt and Mark Hatfield and Ralph Regula. I think the leadership on this bill is remarkable, and I appreciate it.

I note that Ray Marshall and I worked under the chairmanship of a Magaziner, who is our chairman, and we appreciated it.

Let me say something at the outset, Mr. Chairman, since we were talking about Toyota up in Massachusetts. I went out to the Toyota facility in Georgetown, KY, and it was quite interesting. I have been through automobile plants before, and I was quite like this. I asked at one point if there had been any dissatisfaction in the plant because they seemed to have a very good work force, and I had the same response, I think, in Massachusetts. That was that the only complaint was that they weren't getting enough training. They were spending so much money they were spending on training, and it was a very small percent of payroll.

Earlier we were talking about one percent. These workers, if they don't get more training, they can't move. They are capable of moving and as fast as they want to. One percent. I wish that an awful lot of American managers were thinking as creatively as that.

They have found in the firms that do this is that the cost is repaid many, many fold, and the high performing organizations in the United States are all doing that. That is only 5 percent of our firms.

What are we proposing here today? What's the proposal of the commission? Simply put, we say that we've got to get people to enter the work force. We have got to get people to understand that there is reason for them to be in school. That school has something to do with their ability to be productive as human beings.

We sort of drew back from what I personally think is almost a charade in America called the high school diploma, which measures almost nothing but time in seat. If you ask any business what does the diploma mean to them, it doesn't mean anything other than time in seat.

We asked what is the sort of magic moment. We looked at Germany, Sweden, and other countries. Some start at the age of 12; others, at age 15. In the United States, you can leave school at the age of 16, so we chose that age, and we said we ought to get our kids up to a global performance standard by the age of 16.

Each of those words is important: "global"—it's not something that we think they ought to know—we are not all-wise—but a standard which is benchmarked to what the rest of the world has decided is important, because if we can't match them and improve on that, we're not going to compete. So, a "global" standard, globally derived.

A "performance" standard. I am sick to death of people who talk about the present testing system as if it were a competence system. It is a ridiculously inadequate system. We are the most over-tested and under-examined people in the world. Tests don't tell us anything—or they tell us the wrong thing. A performance standard is something very different. What we thought was maybe a series of exams, running over several years, sort of like Boy Scout merit badges, that would allow people to earn their way up through, a progression, so that it is never a barrier to progress, it is never a talking down to somebody, it is never a putting down of individuals, but it is an opportunity to constantly reward them and recognize their progress as they went, like Eagle Scout badges or something like that.

It is a system that is technically doable. It requires us to change very much the way we measure.

The word "standard" is important. We really have to have, as I said on the global point, a measurement of values in a whole range of different areas that is a standard that we commit to them. We are not asking them anything. We are asking ourselves what are we doing to give them the tools to be productive. It is a standard for us. It is a standard for us to say we commit to you as kids that we're going to get you to this standard.

Just to conclude, I started working on this when I was at the Department of Labor, and we published "Workforce 2000". We came to the conclusion that this country wasn't going to compete unless it changed, and changed radically and fast. We are running out of people. We have exhausted this huge reservoir of new entrants to the work force that we had in the 1970's—women, the baby boom product, new immigrants.

We have taken our work force from 40 percent of the American public working up to 50 percent. Sixty-plus percent of women of child-bearing age in the United States are working now. They now are 47 percent of our work force. We have exhausted that huge pool. They have kept us moving in gross economic terms. They have kept families alive. But we have paid a very substantial price in the process.

We went from "Workforce 2000" through the Skills Commission and through the report that we reached, and then we said maybe

If you want to tell us about that meeting, we'd be glad to hear about it. [Laughter.] I know the Majority Leader has some other responsibilities to attend to, so if our panelists would be good enough to permit him to make what comments he'd like, we'd appreciate it.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI AND MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. GEPHARDT. Senator, I'd be happy to wait until you are finished with the votes on the Senate floor. I know you have a couple of votes, and I'd be happy to wait until then.

The CHAIRMAN. The votes haven't started yet, so if you'd like to make your comments now, you would have the assurance, of about 8 or 9 minutes, because I would not have to leave here to go to the floor until the second bell.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Why don't you finish with the panel—I don't want to interrupt them—and then I'll go.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. That's very kind.

Secretary Brock.

Mr. BROCK. Let me start, Mr. Chairman, by thanking you and Dick Gephardt and Mark Hatfield and Ralph Regula. I think the bipartisanship on this bill is remarkable, and I appreciate that very much.

I should note that Ray Marshall and I worked under the guidance of Ira Magaziner, who is our chairman, and we appreciate that.

Let me say something at the outset, Mr. Chairman, since we were talking about Toyota up in Massachusetts. I went out through the Toyota facility in Georgetown, KY, and it was quite an experience. I have been through automobile plants before, but nothing quite like this. I asked at one point if there had been any worker dissatisfaction in the plant because they seemed to have a very happy work force, and I had the same response, I think, that you got in Massachusetts. That was that the only complaint the workers had was that they weren't getting enough training money. I asked how much money they were spending on training, and they said 10 percent of payroll.

Now, earlier we were talking about one percent. These who are saying if they don't get more training, they can't move as fast as they are capable of moving and as fast as they want to move, it is 10 percent. I wish that an awful lot of American-made firms were thinking as creatively as that.

What they have found in the firms that do this is that that investment is repaid many, many fold, and the high performing work organizations in the United States are all doing that something, but that is only 5 percent of our firms.

So what are we proposing here today? What's the proposal of the Skills Commission? Simply put, we say that we've got to prepare our young people to enter the work force. We have got to prepare them to understand that there is reason for them to be in school and that that school has something to do with their ability to perform and be productive as human beings.

cl
u
de
th

m:
otl
ag
kit
J
thi
sta
dec
on
ly
A
abo
It i:
and
thin
som
exar
badg
prog
talki
uals,
nize
thing
It
very
Th
said
of dif
are n
we de
for us
we're
Just
partm
to the
it cha
people
the wo
produc
We i
public
child-b
are 47
pool. T
have ke
in the p
We w
and thr

we need to do some things beyond that. Maybe we need to get school to work in a more tangible fashion. So we are presently working on something called the SCANS work, which suggests that we now know what those functional skills are that are required to be employable or productive as a professor or a plumber, it doesn't matter—for everybody.

We now believe they can be taught, and we believe they can be measured, and we believe that that should be incorporated into the core curriculum. And when we get beyond that, we have the Commission on Work-Based Learning, which will take the product of all of this and try to pull these threads into a common whole.

The essence of this work that has been going on for a number of years now, literally, dating from 1983 with "A Nation at Risk" to create in the United States a continuum of education that will get us with us thinking about the fact that 15 percent of children in the United States enter school intellectually disadvantaged. That tells us that we ought to think about some things like prenatal care, postnatal nutrition, and then carry that process all the way through grammar school, high school, all the way up to postsecondary, and then to lifetime learning on the job by training programs such as incorporated in this particular legislation.

What we are saying in effect is that the global environment that we inhabit is an environment in which the competition is going to be based on human skills, on our human capital, and unless the United States starts paying attention to its human capital, it simply can't compete.

To repeat what Ira said, we have been making a choice, and without knowing it, of holding down wages and therefore holding down skills in order to compete. There is only so far we can go that. We have reached the limit, and we have no choice other than to reverse our course, to put our money and our energy and our time and our emotion behind education and training in the long run, to raise our skills so that we can get our salaries and the quality of life in this country up to the standard that we believe is important for all of us.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Secretary Marshall.

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me start by thanking you for the invitation to appear with my colleagues on the commission and also to thank you for your leadership in bringing this important legislation to this floor.

What I would like to do is add a little to the comments about the economy and then to discuss primarily the issue of the school-to-work transition which I think is one of our weakest links in the United States relative to every other country.

I think that we need to have a certain sense of urgency about the economy and the facts that Ira has laid out here, partly because I think one of the things that deserves underscoring is that declining productivity growth that in the future, our national family incomes will decline along with real wages because declining real wages the only way we have been able to get family incomes and national incomes is more people working

longer hours. And we need to continue to sustain growth by supporting the way, there is the work force growth around, real wages, and become more unious to this country to get rich together because income long into the future.

The reason, it is of urgency also to be 55 in the start trying to live on a slow, next 20 years is a very large part.

The good news is that we are educated, most of us, and if we are able to turn the performance to see to it that after the year trying to retire added to all of the problem and the

It is also very unless we pay for learning system than education learning system this country because what is happening

We have a major industrial problem basic learning that.

Schools, as we need schools. Stand they create in to work hard. for college the hard because doesn't mean

So establish to judge the employers so is, what do people

longer hours. And that is self-limiting, as we will not be able to continue to sustain incomes in the future with declining productivity growth by supplying more labor.

As Ira points out, the work force growth has declined. Put another way, there aren't many families with another wife to put into the work force, and therefore unless we turn the productivity growth around, then the family incomes will decline along with real wages, and I think that is very serious. They will decline and become more unequal. And if you project that trend, it is pretty serious to this country because it means that either the rich will continue to get richer and the poor poorer, or we will all get poor together because we cannot sustain such an unequal distribution of income long into the future and maintain democratic institutions.

The reason, it seems to me, that we need to have a certain sense of urgency also relates to demographics. The first baby boomer gets to be 55 in the year 2000, and there were 77 million of them. They start trying to retire in the year 2010. Now, think of the implications of a slow growth economy between now and then, say, for the next 20 years if we don't improve things, and we start to have a very large part of our work force trying to retire.

The good news, of course, is that the baby boomers were the best-educated, most privileged generation in our history, and therefore if we are able to create high-performance work organizations and turn the performance of the economy around, then we can do a lot to see to it that we don't get the conflicts that we are likely to get after the year 2010, when you can get conflicts between people trying to retire and people who have to pay for their retirement, added to all of our other conflicts. So I think that is a very serious problem and therefore ought to create a certain sense of urgency.

It is also very clear that we are not likely to turn this around unless we pay some attention to those serious deficiencies in our learning systems. I like to refer to it as learning systems rather than education and training systems. One of the most important learning systems is the family, and our families are in trouble in this country because of what is happening to the economy as well as what is happening to family structures.

We have a larger proportion of our children in poverty than any major industrial country. That will create a serious competitiveness problem for us down the road because the family is the most basic learning system, and therefore we have to be concerned about that.

Schools, as Bill Brock has emphasized, need to be restructured, and we need to have some standards for completion of secondary schools. Standards do three things that are very important. One, they create motives for young people to take the hard courses and to work hard. Under present arrangements, if you are not headed for college there is no reason to take the hard courses or to work hard because the grades don't mean anything and what you learn doesn't mean anything.

So establishing standards will do that. It also gives you some way to judge the system and to see what is happening to it, and it gives employers some knowledge about the products of the system, that is, what do people know and what can they do.

But fixing the schools won't fix the problem because most of our workers are already in the work force and because we have a very high proportion of our young people who don't finish school and a large proportion of those who do don't go on to college, so you only get 25-30 percent of the work force pursuing a baccalaureate degree. The recommendations in our report as well as in this legislation address the issue of not only establishing the standards for school completion, but what do you do about the dropouts, who will be a very large part of our work force.

Under present arrangements, it is not well-understood, but the dropouts subsidize people who stay in school because most schools get their money on the basis of average daily attendance for some time in the fall, and therefore if young people drop out, the school gets to keep that money. Now, that creates no incentive for the schools to prevent dropouts. In fact, it is a perverse incentive that creates an incentive to encourage dropouts. It also creates an incentive to encourage dropouts with the people who are hardest to serve, that is, people who need to be in school most.

So one of our main recommendations to address that problem is that we recommend that the States take responsibility for assuring that virtually all students achieve their certificate of initial mastery, which would signify that you have met the standards for leaving secondary school, and that this be done through new local employment and training boards proposed by this legislation and recommended by our board, and that this be done by the State with Federal assistance and that they create and fund alternative learning environments for those who cannot attain the certificate of initial mastery in the regular schools. In other words, we have recommended creation of Youth Centers, and that these Youth Centers be alternatives to the schools, and that the young person who is performing satisfactorily in school or for whatever reason is allowed to leave the school and take their money with them to the Youth Center. We believe that that would create an incentive for the schools, because right now they have disincentives, to try to do some things to retain people. But it also is the case that school is not for everybody. We learned that in the Job Corps. In fact, in my mind the model of the Youth Center is the Job Corps, where we create an alternative learning system that is very efficient and in which some young people adapt much faster than others. It would have the primary responsibility of seeing to it that these young people who had not done well in school and either had dropped out or elected to go to the Youth Center met the certificate of initial mastery through some alternative means. I think that is an extremely important component. I think that would create an institution that would do a lot to deal with the problem of dropouts in our system.

The second recommendation related to this question of school work is that we create a comprehensive system of technical and professional certificates and associate degrees for the majority of our students and adult workers who do not pursue the baccalaureate degree. The model that I have in my mind for that is the prenticeship system. That is where people work and go to school at the same time, or take so-called related instruction. It is a very good system but there are not very many people in it, and what

ne
pr
wl
ar
Th
pr
er
su
lyw/
pl
m
ne
prm
ex
in
ce
tom
ex
co
an
Stle
w
tic
ale
in
it.be
arSt
he
ar
is
hear
m

to

need to do is to expand that concept and to create standards for the professional skills and to create a board, which we recommend and which the legislation contemplates, to come up with these standards, that is, to develop standards for each occupation and area. That is also based on the apprenticeship concept, which is a mainly private system, I might add, and the main role of the Federal Government is to first establish minimum standards and then put its stamp of approval by issuing certificates for people who successfully complete the apprenticeship training program.

Then a third recommendation that this legislation contemplates which I think is extremely important is to create a system of employment and training boards by the Federal and State governments, together with local leadership, to organize and oversee the new school-to-work transition program and training system that we propose.

Some would argue that this is creating a new bureaucracy. In my mind, that's not what it's about. What it is doing is simplifying the existing system. We already have a Federal employment and training system out there, but it is very complex; it is very hard to conceive of it as a system. And what this proposal would do would be to systematize.

I think the two most important words I learned about management in Government are to simplify and concentrate, and that's exactly what this would do. It would simplify the structure and concentrate the responsibilities in a primarily local employment and training board, which would be part of a system of national, State and regional boards.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that these recommendations and this legislation would do a great deal to overcome the most important weakness in our learning system, that is, the school-to-work transition. I believe it is a uniquely American approach to the thing. It is a combination of Federal, State, public and private responsibility. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Before we hear from Hillary Clinton, I'd like to ask our colleague, Congressman Gephardt, if he would like to chair the hearing.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I don't know if that's legal, but I'd be happy to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't hear any objection to it. I think it would be fine. It would be very helpful. We are working closely together and will be working closely with the House on this legislation.

I will be gone for just a bit. We have three votes on the Senate floor. So in whatever time you have available maybe you could hear from Hillary and then make whatever comments you have, and then question the panel, and by then I should be back. If there is a time slot before I get back, you could recess, and then I may have just a few final questions or will submit them. Good.

Mr. GEPHARDT. [Presiding.] I don't know if this is legal or good or anything else, but we'll do it. I don't think I can vote here, but maybe I will try to influence some opinions.

Mr. BROCK. None of us will tell.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Maybe for the purpose of this bill only. [Laughter.]

Hillary, we are happy to have you here as well with the commission. I know you have worked and labored hard with all the other members, and perhaps today is a beginning of bringing to fruition these ideas. We'd be very happy to hear your testimony at this point.

Ms. CLINTON. Well, Congressman, I think we have just seen an example of high-performance work organization where we were not bound by the categories and in fact broke through them in order to continue the work of this hearing, and I applaud Senator Kennedy and yourself for being flexible and high-performance-oriented so that we could go forward. And I mean it very seriously. It is a very signal representation of what we are asking for in this bill and in this commission report because the only way this legislation will be successful, the only way the other efforts that we are engaged in on behalf of the commission's agenda will be successful, is for people to start thinking differently about the tasks that lie before us.

We have been gratified by the support that this legislation has already received from governors and leaders of both business and labor as well as other educators and people throughout the country because standing behind those endorsements, we hope, is a commitment to start doing away with some of the sacred cows that prevent us as a society from dealing with our ingrained economic problems that have already been so ably described.

I would just add a few additional points. The first is that there is much concern about the educational performance of our youngsters, and with the latest report yesterday a continued emphasis on how we are not progressing the way we need to if we are to be competitive.

One of the reasons that we have not made the progress we need to is because we have not married our economic and educational agendas. Many people in Government and business have been more than happy to point fingers at our schools and say that they are not performing ably, without recognizing that business has a role to play in setting standards for itself and in sending signals to youngsters in schools and providing incentives to them to do better. That does not exist now.

It is rare that an employer in this country asks for a high school diploma, for a front line worker, for a noncollege entrance job. It is even rarer that if they ask for a diploma, they care about what is on the diploma in terms of the kinds of courses that are taken.

One of the differences between our society and that of many of our competitors in Europe and Asia is that we don't send a signal from our job market to our students in our schools that what you take and how well you do is important to us when you walk out of that door.

It is related to the rather unusual American position of decoupling effort from performance. In many of the international studies that have been done, asking parents in other cultures what do you think is the primary criterion for your child's academic success, parents in Europe and Asia say hard work, effort, performance. Parents in the United States say natural ability, aptitude.

There is a wonderful book out now called *You Gotta Have Wa*, which talks about baseball in Japan. The American baseball players can't understand why the Japanese baseball players practice 10

hours a day how we have learning with and their system the stands on provide incentive need from

A second level of pe Tayloristic legislation mental challenges for mprise. It r workers ir vanced an the model which we

So when dren to a l have the e organization in order fr business s our child kinds of h

And fin lation as ings arou help the because, f to the av about the

The fir a journal training What I s assessment problems what we ly elimin ment the communi going to really be eary for Choice"

Thank Mr. G bers of tl I'd like cause I t talked to

ours a day. Well, that is another reflection of our differences and how we have to in this country reconnect academic effort and learning with outcomes that are easily understood by our children and their parents. We cannot expect to change our educational system the way it needs to be changed if our economic system stands on the sidelines and lectures and hectors, but doesn't provide incentives for those kinds of investments in effort that we need from our people.

A second point is that if we do educate our children to a higher level of performance, we cannot expect them to function in the Tayloristic production model that Ira Magaziner described. This legislation and the "America's Choice" agenda calls for a fundamental change in the way business management treats workers. It calls for more respect for them as contributors to the overall enterprise. It requires that business managers begin to involve their workers in decisionmaking, which is something that has been advanced and implemented in other countries, building off many of the models that Demming and others put forth in this country but which we still have failed to embrace fully.

So when we turn to our schools and ask that they bring all children to a high level of functioning, we can't on the other hand then have the economic enterprises waiting for them in the same old organizational mode that is no longer adequate. They have to change order for there to be this kind of push-pull relationship between business and education if we are going to be truly able to educate our children and then find them productive places in these new kinds of high-performance work organizations.

And finally I think it is very important to use this piece of legislation as a kind of bully pulpit, to be able to go out and hold hearings around the country, to visit high-performance work sites, to tip the press and others understand what we are talking about. Cause, frankly, a lot of these concepts are still somewhat abstract to the average American and to even people who have worried about the education and economy.

The first question I was asked after the press conference was by a journalist, who said: "I can't imagine my boss investing money in training us." And I could have said something tacky, but I didn't. What I said instead was, "Yes, but if your boss did a realistic assessment of the costs that are now being paid for turnover, quality problems, shutdowns and the like, your boss would understand that what we are asking for is a front-end investment that will gradually eliminate those back-end costs." And that is the kind of argument that we have to take to the American business and labor communities, the education communities, and all of us if we are going to make this legislation not just pass into the law books, but really be part of the change in mindsets that is going to be necessary for us to respond to the challenge posed by "America's Choice".

Thank you.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Thank you very much, and I thank all the members of the panel.

I'd like to start by going at the last point that Hillary made, because I think it is a very important one. A lot of people that I have talked to about this legislation, especially in the labor movement,

have said that's great, we need training, training is always good, but where are the jobs that will require this kind of training. We get to this "chicken and egg" problem that you present.

And I guess I want to ask what is it in this legislation that you have helped suggest that will convince our business leaders and managers that the Tayloristic work model is one that is no longer appropriate in all cases here in the United States and that not only a commitment to training but a commitment to changing the way we work and the way we think about work and the way we organize the workplace is going to be essential to bring about this overall revolution that you are really talking about.

What in the bill tries to get business people to think anew about how we work?

Mr. MAGAZINER. I think there are a couple of things. One is, of course, the requirement to spend at least one percent of payroll on training. If you have such a requirement, you then begin to think about what you are going to do with the training and with the skilled workers that you will get from the training and how to recoup that investment. So it provides kind of an incentive to think in that direction as opposed to a how can I get a penny off the wage rate sort of direction.

Another piece I think has to do with the standard-setting for the professional and technical programs because a lot of companies and CEOs that I am familiar with tend to read business publications, talk to their friends on boards of directors and so on, and then tends to be a climate of opinion that forms about what is the right thing to do. And if you have a number of leading businesses beginning to work with community colleges and vocational schools, the professional certifications, and if that becomes something which then industry associations pick up and are sponsoring, and is being talked about at their industry association meetings and so on, it makes it easier for individual companies, particularly small companies, to know what to do, to think about how to utilize the for their own existing workers.

So I think by putting those two structures in place, we will be encouraging the move to new work organizations, and that in itself, the move to new work organizations, will create jobs and preserve employment because it will show companies how they can take the high productivity path toward keeping jobs here rather than moving them offshore or some other such.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Bill Brock, when I talk to some of my friends in the business community about this legislation, they have not had a universally positive reaction to the one percent of payroll training requirement. I might ask how the commission came to that conclusion, what other alternatives did you look at, and perhaps you could tell us why you came down on the one percent and how you think the business community in America will ultimately look at this suggestion.

Mr. BROCK. Well, how we came to it was when we looked at all six other countries, and we came to the conclusion that we had. I think we said, the worst school-to-work transition program of any industrial country in the world; that every other country we looked at insisted that their students reached a higher standard, and that we do not, and they provided professionalized education to non-

lege-bound workers. And then we began to see that lead them to technical cases, virtually all, work force. I think that's the case, in Germany. It's not, I think. But all of the data of the Nation and its ability had to require consideration over whether to do it.

We started off tall, maybe we ought to have made pledges and all the sides of the aisle in we came to the conclusion was about all we could do and truly, almost we are approaching.

It was an incentive earlier that I felt that by an awful lot of effort to obtain and improve the of payroll; we're not about 1 percent just.

When you look at other major firms in their unions to provide good investment, not We have to do this.

Now, let me emphasize that I really don't. I really and truly do not spend at least 1 percent refuse to do that would fund for training—and if the firm refuse it, by the way, they refuse for whatever reason, allow the community a minimal thing to ask. doing it are going to not, that frankly probably will come around to it any reason for it are time trying to hold down are going to say, "We're doing it."

I don't know how any country has got to make mental parts of that skills or not, or do we have years, of sitting on the couch.

lege-bound workers, and we do not—a number of things like that. And then we began to ask what are the incentives in their system that lead them to take the path that they have taken. And in most cases, virtually all, there was a requirement for training of the work force. I think the highest was about 3.5 percent, if I remember, in Germany. It went down as low as 1 percent in Singapore, I think. But all of them had come to the conclusion that as a mandate of the Nation and as a commitment to the well-being of the Nation and its ability to compete in a global economy, they simply had to require constant upgrading of skill. The debate was never over whether to do it, but over how much.

We started off talking, well, if somebody else is doing 3.5 percent, maybe we ought to do 5, and then we started talking about tax pledges and all the rhetoric and hyperbole on that subject on both sides of the aisle in this Congress and elsewhere in this town, and we came to the conclusion that politically, probably one percent was about all we could ask on the front end, but I think we really and truly, almost without exception, viewed that as a de minimis approach.

It was an incentive, it was a beginning point, but I think I said earlier that I felt then, I feel now, and I think my view is shared by an awful lot of others, that one percent is inadequate to maintain and improve the skill base of this country—that is, 1 percent of payroll; we're not talking about 1 percent of sales, we're talking about 1 percent just of payroll.

When you look at the fact that General Motors and a number of other major firms in the United States have signed contracts with their unions to provide for this, and they have found out it is a good investment, not a bad one. It is not a cost; it is an investment. We have to do this.

Now, let me emphasize one other thing, Congressman, and that is that I really don't view this as a tax. That's an honest statement. I really and truly do not, because I think any business ought to be spending at least 1 percent of payroll on training. Only those that refuse to do that would be required to contribute to this community fund for training—because somebody has to train those workers, and if the firm refuses to do it—and the firm is the best place to do it, by the way, they really are—but if they refuse to do it, or can't for whatever reason, then a one percent tax on payroll in order to allow the community to engage in that responsibility is a very minimal thing to ask. And my guess is that the businesses that are saying it are going to find no fault with it. The businesses that are not, that frankly probably privately know they should, probably will come around to it. Those that don't want to do it and don't see any reason for it are probably the ones that are spending all their time trying to hold down wages and all the other areas, and they are going to say, "We don't like that." Well, they don't like anything.

I don't know how to summarize it other than to say that this country has got to make a decision, and this is one of the fundamental parts of that decision—do we commit to upgrading our skills or not, or do we continue to hold the pattern of the last 20 years, of sitting on wages and considering labor a discretionary cost.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I certainly agree with that. I think we are at crossroads, and we do have to make that decision. I would suppose every American would agree that we want to be a high-wage, high-skills society. That would be an easy agreement to get. But the harder question, the more important question, is are we serious about that; do we mean it; do we have intent. And what I hope these hearings—and I hope they are around the country—on the eventual mark-ups will give us is a real energetic debate about what it will take to be serious about actually achieving these goals. If it is not one percent, then what is it? What other idea is there? Is there a better way?

But I think if we just State platitudes and lay out ideas and do not put serious mechanisms behind them to actually make it happen, then I think we won't reach the goal, and we'll just do a lot of talking and not serious acting and moving toward the goal.

Ira, I would like to ask if you are aware, as I'm sure you are, of firms in America today that are already adopting the model we are seeking here of high performance, high productivity, high amount of training and high wages in the new kind of workplace.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Yes, there are a number of companies who have been moving in this direction. They tend initially to be companies that in a sense were forced by international competition and the requirements for international levels of quality to do so. But I found in our interviews a number of companies around the country—somebody mentioned Mr. Featherstone is here, and his company is certainly one which is moving in that direction, and I should say it is a relatively small company. You don't have to be a General Motors in order to do this type of thing.

So yes, we do have American examples of companies which are moving this way and achieving 4, 5, 6, 7 percent productivity improvement per year by doing so and achieving extremely high levels of quality by doing so. They have had the guts and the courage to make the investment, and we just need to spread to a broader base the number of companies who are doing that.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Ralph.

Mr. REGULA. If I might follow up on what Senator Brock said and also your statement, it is my understanding that at the big companies, at least General Motors, there is a contractual obligation to spend a certain amount of money on skill upgrades. Is that correct?

Mr. BROCK. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. REGULA. So that would indicate that the unions thought it was a valued part of their contract in terms of skill upgrades to the point that they insisted. I'd like it if you could amplify a little more on that.

Mr. BROCK. I know Ray has had the same kind of experience. I had. I think before you came in, Senator Kennedy was talking about a facility up in Massachusetts where they were doing that and they had an incredibly fine training program that not only trained, but it motivated, because people get so excited when they get training that they want to get more training. And I mention my own experience of going out to Georgetown, KY to see the automobile facility run by Toyota there, and I asked the workers, and they were really feeling pretty good about themselves and very

proud of what you get through Saturn's factory.

You run on the pay we've got the Toyota training?"

cent—of 1

There is a point is the productivity to accumulate

Mr. M

ment about to explore

stood the wages in

the reason

petitive in Clothing

are Union

ductivity knew the

There main sta

ing trade

apprenti

are going

competit

joint ap

of the w

Now,

the very

employers

think y

have; in

strating

turns to

port the

cause th

high-we

ployers

the inc

low way

But

short r

rounded

trained

and, as

work. I

ed that

produc

proud of what they were doing, as they were doing down at Nissan; you get the same response down at Smyrna, TN with Nissan or Saturn's facility down in Tennessee.

You run into the same kind of attitudes. There is an excitement on the part of these workers. And they said, "The only complaint we've got is that we aren't getting enough training." And I asked the Toyota management, "How much money are you spending on training?" and they said 10 percent—not 1 percent, but 10 percent—of payroll. And the workers are saying, "We want more." There is a hunger out there. People really respond to this. The point is that the more you do, the more they want, and the more productive they become, and all of a sudden the investment begins to accumulate. It is fabulous.

Mr. MARSHALL. If I could follow up on that, I think your comment about the unions and unions' attitudes is one that we ought to explore in a little more depth because unions have long understood that the only way they are going to be able to have high wages in a competitive world is to improve productivity. That is the reason, for example, that some of the unions in the most competitive industries like the garment industry, the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers-International Ladies Garment Workers Union, have always given very high priority to improving productivity of the employees that they had organized because they knew that that was the only way they could have a higher wage.

There was a time when the industrial engineer was one of the main staff groups of both of those unions. And you've got the building trades. One of the reasons that they give such emphasis to the apprenticeship system is because they know that the only way they are going to be able to have higher wages than their nonunion competition is to have well-trained, well-educated people. So the joint apprenticeship committees in the building trades are a model of the way we could have a very good education system.

Now, the reason that the unions' involvement is so important is the very thing we are talking about here, and that is that most employers are out to maximize profits, not train workers. Now, I think you can show them that in the long run—and economists have; in fact, one of our colleagues got the Nobel Prize for demonstrating that the unions to human capital are higher than the returns to physical capital—and we've got a lot of evidence to support that proposition. But because of the way our system works, because there are no national policies to cause employers to pursue a high-wage, high-productivity option—and that's what many employers tell us, not only do we not have the workers, but most of the incentives in national policy are for us to pursue a short-run, low wage, competitive market-oriented approach to our business.

But union is not interested in that. They are not interested in short run profit maximizing; they are interested in having well-rounded workers. The main reason for that is that if you are well-trained, you are flexible, and you don't get unemployed as fast; and, as the unions put it, you can police a larger proportion of the work. I have done a lot of work on apprenticeship and demonstrated that apprenticeship people have less unemployment and higher productivity than people who don't serve their apprenticeship.

Now, the way to get that is well-rounded, so the balance I think the value of the apprenticeship example is that the employers—the individual contractor is not interested in a lot of training because you break the benefit-cost cycle; the training, and somebody else gets the benefit—but as they are willing to do the training because they see that they all benefit from that process. And then you bring in the industry having well-trained workers.

The apprenticeship system in the building trades also in the free rider problem. There are not many nonunion contractors in America, major contractors, who could operate without workers who had been trained through the joint apprenticeship committees trained through the union process. That's the reason I think in legislation it is very wise to say we don't want to do anything that dilute those kinds of apprenticeship training programs that exist out there. And your point, I think, about the community colleges is absolutely on mark, and that is that they are a major institution in this country, and we ought to build to them rather than threaten them.

Mr. REGULA. I was wondering how far you explored the use of our network of vocational, technical, and community colleges. It seems to me that has to be an enormous resource that could be utilized in avoiding duplication and bureaucracy, and in head in getting the job done on the ground.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Absolutely. We have the potential for a good delivery system already in place through the vocational schools and community colleges. Two things that are lacking in the community college community and vocational community have been very supportive of this report around the country—but what they lack is industry leadership and a clear set of standards in terms of what they should be doing.

They link up with industry on advisory panels and so on, but they don't have a set of national industry-defined standards as this bill would provide for, which can then say to them, okay, I can become an American Electronics Association certified deliverer of an associate degree in electronics, and I can have the local industry involved with that. And what this bill will help provide to help them do their job is better.

So you are absolutely right. We have those mechanisms in place. We are not utilizing them to the fullest. And by linking up with industry through a system of standards with them, we think we will be able to do that.

Mr. MARSHALL. If I might add a point to that, the other thing that we don't have that this legislation contemplates and recommends is an infrastructure out there to provide oversight and coordination for all the employment and training systems that we have. That's the reason that the employment and training board, I think, can do a lot to simplify and to provide that kind of infrastructure which is missing. It would create a national system which we don't have. It is mainly a local process, but there is a national responsibility, and I think to have that structure would be very important in strengthening the ability of the providers who are already out there to do their work.

REGULA. Where

Mr. BROCK. Yes. We have similar programs—even if we have not done a lot of a coherent whole, who are disadvantaged. We don't prevent the entry of somebody who says, "I'll do surgery. That's crazy. But surgery in the United States is not there."

One of the things that is that we're just not in the business world faster than you are in these areas. I'm very good at saying "better" mean? We are

What we are saying for business and labor some of these areas; the coherent standards. They are world class—and the

A great story. Back in the days of the high school and Senator Kennedy, and a third. We didn't have any anybody. Everybody was well, we found out the insurance.

But why don't we do it? We start giving an honor what you want." Do the telling them up to the level out of our school and your technical institute that we want. Then then create, as boards to oversee the camp all of this folded in look at it they've got a shot at a disconnect. It is

Mr. CLINTON. I would of mindset we have by is now viewed as a part of the mainstream offer it to very few of those youngsters have somehow inadvertent as part of a lifelong

Mr. REGULA. Where does JTPA fit into this? Have you explored that?

Mr. BROCK. Yes. We are doing so many things like JTPA and similar programs—even Job Corps, that Ray talked about earlier. What we have not done is to try to fit all these things into some sort of a coherent whole. What we do now is we deal with people who are disadvantaged, we deal with people who are unemployed. We don't prevent the problem; we try to go in after the fact. It's like somebody who says the only medical practice we need to do is surgery. That's crazy. I hope nobody would suggest go to nothing but surgery in the United States. We like to solve problems before they get there.

One of the things that really is astonishing about this country of ours is that we're just a bunch of disconnects. We've got networks in the business world that are just weaving the world economy together faster than you can imagine, and yet we never talk to each other in these areas. Business doesn't talk to education. We're all very good at saying to our teachers, "Do better." What does "better" mean? We are not very specific.

What we are saying here is if we can create national standards for business and labor to work on in a given area—and we've got some of these areas; there are certain areas where we've got very coherent standards. The electrical standards in the United States are world class—and they had better be.

A great story. Back when we came up with electricity and Edison came up with the light bulb, and we were electrifying the Northeast and Senator Kennedy's territory, we put all the textile mills up there, and a third of them burned down in the first 10 years. We didn't have any apprenticeship program, and we didn't train anybody. Everybody was just putting up wiring hand over fist. Well, we found out that didn't work real well; we couldn't pay the fire insurance.

But why don't we do that in a whole lot of areas, and why don't we start giving an honest answer to our teachers who say, "Tell us what you want." Do that with standards at the base level. Do it by telling them up to the age of 16 what functional skills we want produced out of our schools. Beyond that, tell your community colleges and your technical institutes, "These are the standards of performance that we want. These are the criteria by which we measure," and then create, as we suggest here, local labor-management boards to oversee the development of these institutions, and try to fold all of this into some coherent whole, so that when kids look at it they've got a lot of choices, but the choices fit, and there's not a disconnect. It makes sense.

Mr. CLINTON. I would add, too, Congressman, that part of the kind of mindset we have to overcome is that training in this country is now viewed as only for the disadvantaged. We have JTPA, and you have to be so marginalized in order to get in that you are not part of the mainstream to begin with. We have Job Corps, and we offer it to very few of the youngsters who can benefit from it, and those youngsters have to be extraordinarily disadvantaged. So somehow inadvertently, we have created this idea that training as part of a lifelong learning system doesn't need to be part of

our mainstream educational economic systems. It has been marginalized.

So that in addition to following the examples of what we think are good, coherent systems that bring together and integrate all these services, I would also point to the experience of the American military with the all-volunteer military because they take our high school graduates, but they then give those high school graduates world class state-of-the-art training. They do not expect that a youngster who graduates from Little Rock High School can walk right in and figure out how to work a Patriot Missile. Yet in the civilian side of our economy, we think that, gosh, if the schools haven't done everything that needs to be done to make these kids work-ready, then the schools are at fault.

If you look at the amount of money—and I don't know the percentage of payroll; we calculated it one time—that the military is spending on training, it is far, far in excess of anything we are talking about here. The net result we all got to watch on television last spring, and it certainly made a lot of people feel very grateful that our youngsters were so well-trained.

Why do we expect that our civilian side is not going to need the same kind of training to bring those same kinds of youngsters with the same kinds of backgrounds and educational experiences up to the world class competitive level that is now demanded economically, not just militarily?

So I think the question about JTPA leads to a much broader inquiry about what have we done about training, and when we look at where we are really training adequately in this society on the military side, why can't we make something comparable required on the civilian side domestically with these same youngsters who are in the mainstream as well as being disadvantaged.

Mr. GEPHARDT. On Saturday I was in an electronics plant in Mexico where young women are working for 63 cents an hour. What appeared to me to be a very clean, efficient, productive plant. It obviously was the Taylor production model, but it was producing a lot of impressive high-tech products that were coming out the back end on their way to America and probably other places in the world.

A lot of people will criticize this legislation, saying that, though we might be able to create some high productivity, high skill, high wage workplaces, that in today's world the prime competition we continue to face is the kind of plant that I saw in Mexico.

How do you respond to that kind of thought? Are we trying to have an America where those plants are all in China and Mexico and none are left in the United States, or how does this work?

Mr. MAGAZINER. I've got two answers to that. One is that if you look at a number of our major trading partners who have higher wages than we do, but also positive trade balances, they manage to accomplish that and employ as many of their people as we do in places like Germany and so on. There are two issues there. One is that that plant you saw in Mexico, if it is like the other ones, has about a 150 percent turnover rate per year. What that means is that there are certain products and certain production processes which you really can't move down there if you are an American company, and it gets very specific. I can think of

some work in the military and there were certainly moved to Mexico and tried to move a slight and the plant fell apart and the quality output was necessary for the

I think the answer is certain production in other countries. What I think the deficit today is in not paying at least as high as we need to do is speed up and make sure we win the going to stay in the toward those two goals accomplish.

Mr. BROCK. One made in our group low wage workers. The essence of the point is on the basis of production.

If you look at the we will probably be American work force by the turn of the century. We are already people is on any as thought that we thought that we were skill jobs is, frankly, is concerned. I don't

We used to have when I came out of other States. The

industry, and down the Rust Belt States. They were providing at the kinds of States, but to State hour wage plants. factories.

And we had a technology. I don't want any subsidy body paying a dollar for any we want. We want Japanese investment. It has been a lot better of

So I just think it now. Do we buy a subsidy, or do we have a lunch, which we are

some work in the motor industry, the making of electrical motors, and there were certain types of simple motor processes which were moved to Mexico and worked quite well, and then the company tried to move a slightly more complex motor down to be assembled, and the plant fell apart; it couldn't be competitive, they could not get the quality out, because there was too much knowledge that was necessary for the assembly process to work right.

I think the answer to your question is that there are going to be certain production processes that are going to remain in developed countries. What I worry about is that over 50 percent of our trade deficit today is in situations where the country we are losing to is paying at least as high wages as we are, over 50 percent. What we need to do is speed up our product development activities and also make sure we win more of the battles in those pieces that are going to stay in the developed countries. If we set our attention toward those two goals, I think we can accomplish what we need to accomplish.

Mr. BROCK. One of the most interesting statements that was made in our group was by a businessman who said, "I can't afford low wage workers. I can't afford minimum wage workers." The essence of the point was that he couldn't keep competing on a world basis on the basis of wages; he had to compete on the basis of production.

If you look at the pattern of employment in the United States, we will probably be somewhere down around 5-8 percent of the American work force on any assembly line anywhere in this country by the turn of the century, and we'll be producing more product. We are already down below 12 percent now. One out of eight people is on any assembly line anywhere in this country. And the thought that we would compete on the basis of wages, or the thought that we would hold those jobs here that are low wage, low skill jobs is, frankly, an irrational thought insofar as this country is concerned. I don't think we want that.

We used to have a debate when I was growing up in Tennessee when I came out of the Navy, about how did we compete with other States. These rich folks in Arkansas were buying all of our industry, and down in Texas, they were buying industry out of the East States like Ohio and Pennsylvania and Missouri, and they were providing them with all these benefits. We started looking at the kinds of plants that were moving—frankly, not to your States, but to States south of us—and they were mostly dollar-and-a-half wage plants. This was back in the 1950's. They were shirt factories.

And we had a terrible debate, but we won the fight. We said we didn't want any shirt factories in Tennessee. We don't want anybody paying a dollar an hour, because that's not the kind of economy we want. We went for a diversified economy, and we went for Japanese investment and a lot of other things, and frankly, we've done a lot better off.

So I just think the country has to make that kind of a decision. Do we buy competitive viability by inadequate wages, by subsidies, or do we change the way we do business and really eat their lunch, which we are capable of doing competitively?

Mr. MARSHALL. I think your question goes to the heart of the competitiveness problem, and that is that we should not try to compete with those plants in Mexico. Part of our main theme here is that if you look at our traditional Tayloristic organization of work the way we did it was we had relatively standardized technology in spite of what that technology in Matamoros—I can tell you you were—it looks like it is leading edge, but it is really standardized. You can do that kind of thing anywhere in the world. You take that plant and do it anywhere. So our traditional pattern was to have relatively unskilled workers—that was Taylorism—in his view was the more thinking the workers had to do, the worse the system was, and therefore you had to be an appendage to the machine.

Now, obviously, in an internationalized environment, standardized work will not be done in high wage places. Nobody is going to pay an American worker \$10 an hour and be competitive if you can get it done for 65 cents in Mexico.

So what do you do? I think that's the basic question. And as I pointed out, what many States did was to try to compete with a low wage strategy, so they attracted industry that was on its way to the Third World anyway, which means they were going to be in doing that kind of work.

Now, what some of our companies have done is equally interesting. In the automobile industry, for example, some of our companies responded to that competition by saying we won't pay attention to reorganizing the work and training the workers—we'll automate. So they tried to go to the second stage, which was to have relatively unskilled, uneducated workers and then get leading edge technology. Most of the time, that was a disaster. Why? Well, workers have to make the technology work. Every machine is idiosyncratic, and therefore a small number of our people—and they don't understand it—General Motors learned that lesson the first time believing that the workers were the problem and technology was the answer. And it was disaster for them in competitive terms—it might pay off down the road, but it certainly didn't pay off immediately. And the Numi plant in Fremont, CA taught them that the workers are not the problem, and technology is the answer and that what you do if you really want to be world class is you go to the third stage—you combine well-trained, well-educated workers with leading edge technology, which those workers in Matamoros, Mexico could not do because they couldn't organize themselves for high performance. They don't have the education, training and skills to be able to do that. And that's the way it is here that we have to think about competition in the country.

Your question earlier about what is in this bill that would require employers to do that, to go to high performance—one thing that is in other countries is that once you produce a well-trained, well-educated work force, it is hard to get Tayloristic organization to work in it.

Volvo went to an early form of high performance system because they thought they were going to improve productivity because the education and training system had produced workers who wouldn't work in the traditional Tayloristic plant. And once they reorganized, they found that you could produce

and productivity was kind of the same thing.

Now, if we pay attention to what they learn when they learn, they wouldn't get the same thing. As Ira, I think, in the United States, deal with that to upgrading people.

We will have people in direct contact with people who have built up the uneducated people. But the best thing is the harder it will be.

I think if we both pursue it, then they will have problems with it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I present said you and we already have, much less training necessity.

I'd like to ask you a lot of attention. Some will say more bureaucracy. Some have not work. They may say some good, but the

getting hold of the bill, and it will just hire a bill, and it will

Mr. MARSHALL. I think that we have not show you who got the idea of the school district here that we can I say it is a success stories

things.

I think Job Corps and the Job Corps

I think it will work. Individual success stories therefore we have together system that we have

and productivity and flexibility in a high performance system. So it was kind of serendipity for Volvo to come to that view, and I think the same thing will happen in the country.

Now, if we had the proper policies in the country so that we paid attention to what would happen to the workers who lost their jobs when they left the United States and went to Mexico, then we wouldn't get the resistance to change that we're getting. Our problem is that because we have pursued this low wage strategy so long. As Ira, I think, put it, we've built a third world within the United States, and it is going to be harder and harder for us to deal with that until we turn it around and begin to pay attention to upgrading people.

We will have in Southern California, for example, people who are in direct competition with Mexico for a long time because they have built up that industry there, and we've got a lot of unskilled, uneducated people who are unable to participate in that system. But the best time to turn that around is now. The longer we wait, the harder it will be to turn it around.

I think if we get two countries, the United States and Mexico, both pursuing low wage strategies, competing with each other, then they will improve more than we will. We will have serious problems with that, I think.

Mr. GEPHARDT. A number of the American workers who were present said you're talking about a free trade treaty with Mexico, and we already have it. It's a question of what we do with what we have, much less what else we do. But they all talked about the training necessity in this situation.

I'd like to ask one other question about this bill that I think will get a lot of attention and criticism and get your response to it. I'm sure some will say that this is simply a call for more government, more bureaucracy, more of the same tired old solutions that sometimes have not worked in other areas, and that it really won't work. They may say what you call for in the private sector may do some good, but these training centers and opportunity centers and getting hold of these dropouts and these apprenticeship programs—we'll just hire a bunch of bureaucrats, and there will be another jobs bill, and it won't do anything. How do you respond to that?

Mr. MARSHALL. I think one of the most important responses to it is that we have not recommended anything in this bill that we can't show you working somewhere. In other words, that's where we got the idea of the Youth Centers; it is happening in the Clearwater school district in California. They are doing it. There is nothing here that we can't show you working somewhere. That's the reason I say it is a uniquely American approach to things. We've got success stories all over the country where people are doing these things.

I think Job Corps is a success story with a different population. I think the Job Corps model ought to be used in a broader perspective.

So I think it will work, and the thing we have is we have a lot of individual success stories; we have no successful systems anywhere, and therefore we have to pay some attention to putting these things together systematically so we can take advantage of these things that we have learned about how to do it. In other words, the

learning technology in the Job Corps—Hillary mentioned that—that's where they got it. The military helped a lot with technology. Private industry, Control Data Corporation developed the first part of it. Now it has been perfected so that it could be used as part of the training for youngsters in these Youth Opportunity Centers.

I think the key to a high performance system, whether it's a firm or any other, a major part is the incentive structure that you build in. And in too many of our systems now we have negative and perverse incentive structures. That is, you say you want to improve productivity, and most workers believe that if they improve productivity they lose their jobs. Well, that's hardly a way to improve productivity. And we have a school system that has no incentive to prevent dropouts. The reason this is building what we know works is if you create incentive for schools to reduce dropouts rather than get rid of them, then you are likely to get positive results, I think, given the way other things work. It's really a new bureaucracy. I think that's the thing. We've got a much fragmented bureaucracy now.

You could look at what we conceived here and see that you actually greatly simplify many of the things that we already have. That debate with one of my business friends in Texas. He said, "I am for everything you recommend here except for this new bureaucracy. We don't need to add another one to what we already have." I said you misunderstand what we contemplate. We'd like to take a lot of those things that are already out there and simplify them into a better structure.

Mr. Brock. Let me approach it from I hope a complementary, slightly different perspective. First of all, there isn't any bureaucracy. The Federal action is to create an educational performance standard that is globally based.

We do have the competence in this town, I hope, to go out and look at the rest of the world and say this is what they are doing with their kids. Are we doing it? If not, shouldn't we say this is the minimum that we ought to be doing? We can do that. And from that point forward, what the bill does, and our commission report is to say the States—that's where the action is—the States have to take the responsibility for creating these new employment training boards. The employment and training boards at the State level have to oversee the development of these alternative learning centers or youth centers, whatever they are called, for secondary education.

The private sector, the labor and management committees—I'm not talking just organized labor, but worker-management committees—that develop these standards, those are people in the private sector. Nobody in Washington is competent to make the decisions about what it takes to be a good electrician. For goodness' sake, anybody who suggests that we do it ought to be hung up.

This is not Federal intervention. It is a program to create an incentive for change. And again, the thing that terrifies me is where this training is—we get into these shibboleths—Federal that, tax this, tax that. We've got a problem in America. The problem is, to put it in the most radical way that I can, we don't have a skills shortage. We are producing exactly what

business long, sh system if he he we've g system.

So we skills s dollars room, v cause a teach, t regulat interve percent our sch of paper take th they go job aft where And w wages real w years o

We a skill do we are

I do cycle a educat we've t three, shed w system system employ

What to bres

Mr. commu tute fo

Mr.

bill pu fact w which not tr And tl stands and th

The your f nity w whole

businesses want—uneducated kids who will do rote tasks all day long, show up on time and not complain. We've got an educational system that is structured—Taylor couldn't have done it any better if he had done it himself—it is miserably incompetent, not because we've got incompetent teachers, but we've got design flaw in the system. It is a fundamental design flaw.

So when you've got a Tayloristic system that's got a hierarchical skills system where all the money or 60 percent of your education dollars are going to bureaucracy and 40 percent gets to the classroom, we are loading up all the management on top of teachers because we don't trust them to be individuals, we don't trust them to teach, and we don't trust our principals, so we layer rule after rule, regulation after regulation, paper after paper, and we meddle, we intervene, we interfere, and we get what we want. We get what 95 percent of business is asking for. We get a product coming out of our school who stayed in school long enough to get a doggone piece of paper that doesn't mean anything, called a diploma, and they like the diploma and they say, "I've got a diploma. Hire me." And they go through five or six or seven or 8 years of dead-end jobs, one job after another, jumping around. Finally, they might get somewhere where they can settle in, but they are lost, they are gone. And we are surprised that they are now being held down in their wages for 20 and 30 years. We are surprised that in effect their real wages have not gone up but have gone down in the last 20 years on average.

We are surprised that the SAT scores that form the basis of their skill development are down from 20 years. And I don't know why we are surprised.

I do know that what we are trying to do here is to break that cycle and to say look, we've got to do both; we've got to change our education system, we've got to change our training system, and we've got to change the way we organize work. We've got to do all three, because if we keep the present work organization, it is satisfied with the way things are. If we keep our present education system, it is satisfied with the way things are. And our training system only applies to the people who are disadvantaged and unemployed, and that's such a small number that it doesn't matter. What we are saying is that this is a dumb system, and we've got to break it.

Mr. MARSHALL. And that is complementary. I would make one comment about it, and that is that standards and incentives substitute for rules and bureaucracies.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Exactly, and I think that's the key. What this all pushes toward and what this whole theory pushes toward is in fact what industry has learned in the total quality movement, which is that the proper role is to set goals and measure outcomes, not try to micro-manage the processes by which things are done. And that is what this whole program aims toward is setting goals, standards and outcomes, not trying to micro-manage what is done. And therefore it is not bureaucratic.

The other thing which has been bothering me since you asked our first question—I know a lot of people in the business community whom I talk to about this. The first kneejerk reaction to this whole tax thing is going to be a negative kneejerk reaction—it has

as Americans, we don't like to be told we NO. 613 do P. 9/12
mean, it is not in our nature, even if it is something we want
to respond when somebody tells us we've got to do it.

So I think even if I am a company that understands training
port, and I believe in it, and I'm investing 3 percent of my pay
in it, my first kneejerk reaction is to say, "Well, I'll do it, I
don't want to be told I have to do it."

So I think we are going to get that, and we've already gotten
but a lot of companies move beyond that pretty quickly, and I
think we'll find that as this debate goes on, it will mature. As
think as Bill said earlier, a significant portion of the business com-
munity will come forward and understand some of these arguments
about free riders and so on and say maybe it does make sense
something that is universal, so that if I'm going to do this I
get trapped paying for somebody else's training.

So expect that we're going to get some criticism on this
doubt, but I think we can get past a good part of it.

Mr. Gephardt. I thank you all for your testimony and more
importantly for your hard work over a long period of time. It re-
comes to the fore today, and I hope that our coalition that ad-
cates these approaches will only grow and build in the days ahead.

Senator Kennedy, I appreciate the opportunity to have dis-
cussed this panel and to have had this discussion today. I think
we were able to bring out some important points.

The CHAIRMAN. I am enormously grateful to the panel. This
be a continuing process as additional points concerning the im-
portant issues addressed in the legislation we are introducing
are brought out by our colleagues and questions raised by people
around the country. So I commend all of the panelists for being
very, very thoughtful, constructive and positive recommendations.
We are very much in their debt.

And I thank you, Congressman Gephardt. As I was walking
over here, realizing that you had the gavel, I wondered whether
I should call Boris Yeltsin to find out how to get it returned,
that doesn't seem to be necessary. [Laughter.] We want to thank
you very much for coming over and helping. This has been an im-
portantly important hearing.

I bring the good wishes of Senator Pell, who very much regrets
he couldn't be here, and Senator Bingaman, who is looking forward
to reading the hearing record, as well as a number of our col-
leagues who were necessarily detained but are aware of what's
going on here and wanted me to express their best wishes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Senator, I have written testimony with me today
and I would simply like to ask that it be made a part of the record
and commend you for taking on this effort. I look forward to work-
ing with you and the other members on both sides of the aisle
as we try to make this legislation a reality.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. It will be included.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gephardt follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

Thank you, Senator Kennedy, both for calling this hearing and for con-
ducting this Nation in education, training and so many other areas of great im-

the
the
As you
market th
variety of
global eco
The Hig
ment in t
ceful wo
tions of ch
This Co
labor, edu
work of t
Secretary
will testif
and the n
I will d
draw you
wages. I
choice; th
nothing I
inevitabl
One of
that in t
high skill
growth
period is
force are
this peri
Work
to grow
ings, we
And,
chinery
their pr
and cor
workpla
are to b
Amer
our Eu
A ric
tion.
The
spread
The si
compa
school-
do not
lego; /
tors ir
organi
Now
ic
bill to
acade
a dire
But
living
and d
so see
contli
All
two c
senn.
Uni-

comes to our economic future and social well-being. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the legislation we are introducing today, and the important issue of the competitiveness of our workers in this global economy.

As you well understand, the United States is part of a highly competitive world market that rewards high quality products and services that respond rapidly to a variety of sophisticated and shifting consumer tastes. The key to success in this global economy is the human mind: its ingenuity and ability to innovate.

The High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991 is designed to foster investment in the minds and the skills of our people in areas that are necessary to a successful world-class economy. The bill begins to implement the major recommendations of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce.

This Commission was comprised of an impressive array of leaders from business, labor, education, and government service. I would especially like to highlight the work of the three distinguished chairs of the Commission, Ira Magaziner, former Secretary of Labor Bill Brock, and former Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall, who will testify this morning. Their report addresses the problems facing our economy and the need for the proposals included in our bill.

I will defer to them on the technical points of the report. I do, however, want to draw your attention to the title of the report: America's Choice: High skills or Low wages. I stress this title, because I believe that it says it all. This is America's choice; there are no other alternatives and there is no avoiding the choice. Doing nothing to upgrade the level of skills both needed and provided in our economy will inevitably lead to our becoming a low wage society.

One of the most important lessons to be drawn from the Commission's report is that in the 1990's and beyond, if we are to be a high wage economy, we must be a high skill, high performance economy. Over the past twenty years our productivity growth has slowed to a crawl. The only reason our economy has grown in this period is that we have added many workers to the workforce. Even with this workforce growth, our lowered productivity growth has caused earnings to decline over this period.

Workforce growth will slow dramatically in the 1990's. We will no longer be able to grow simply by adding new workers. In order to avoid further reductions in earnings, we must increase productivity.

And, as a high wage society, we cannot do this simply by investing in better machinery. Today, low wage economies can afford the same machinery and still sell their products more cheaply. So, we must invest in better minds and better skills—and combine these human resources with our high technology resources to create workplaces that emphasize quality, innovation, and speed. Let me say it again: if we are to be a high wage economy, we must be a high skill, high performance economy.

American ingenuity and innovation helped make this country great. For decades our European neighbors considered ingenuity and innovation to be part of the American character. Yet we are now falling behind in the global economic competition.

The reasons for this are many and complex. But chief among them is a widespread failure over the past decade to foster and support the abilities of our people. The signs of this failure are clear: American children do poorly in academic tests, compared to their peers in other nations; the United States has no systematic school-to-work program, despite the facts that at least 20 percent of American youth do not finish high school and of those who do finish, about half do not go on to college; American employers invest far less in worker training than do their competitors in other nations, and have shown less commitment to high performance work organization.

Now, some in this room are economists, and many others enjoy the study of economic analyses. But you and I, Mr. Chairman, and our colleagues sponsoring this bill today, are elected representatives of the people, and we must have more than an academic interest in our economy. The choice between high skills or low wages has a direct impact on the people we represent. It does not take an economist to understand that lowered wages mean a lowered standard of living.

But let us make sure we understand the full implication of a lowered standard of living: not just fewer luxuries, or even less comfort, but diminished opportunities and dying dreams. To take just one example, our working families can barely afford to send their children to college now. If they earn even less, with college tuitions continuing to rise, how will they manage?

Although the popular press might suggest otherwise, the American Dream is not two cars in the garage and a yacht at the dock. For millions of hard-working citizens, the American dream is to live a productive life, to develop to their full potential—and to provide for their children the opportunity to do even better. It is this

dream that hangs in the balance of "America's choice." Nothing can be more important than to protect this dream, to preserve this opportunity.

My constituents understand that this unique feature of American life is in danger of becoming obsolete. At virtually every town meeting in my district, at least one constituent asks me the following question:

Congressman, I earn 10 or 15 or 20 dollars an hour. I want to continue earning this money. I need to continue earning this money: I have children to put through college and aging parents I want to be able to help—as well as trying to provide for my own and my spouse's later years. But how can I compete with workers in Singapore or Mexico, who are willing to work for a dollar an hour?

The only answer is that my constituent will be able to continue earning ten times more than these low wage workers only if he works ten times better and ten times smarter. Now, that worker—all workers—have the right to turn to their government and ask: What are you doing to give us the tools we need to restore our productivity and revive the American dream?

We are obliged to respond with credible answers—answers that do not include capital gains tax cut, a laissez-faire free trade policy, or squandering investment capital in pursuit of expensive and pointless mergers. But the answers can be found in proposals such as the one we are making this morning. "The High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991" is the way to demonstrate that we are serious about effecting the transition to a high skill, high performance economy.

The bill is designed to promote a thorough-going, national commitment to skills and high performance. It envisions a national system of skills training and certification, in academic subjects and a wide range of recognized occupations, enabling our young people either to pursue a college education or to enter a high performance workforce with a high skill job.

The system starts in the schools, where students will demonstrate their grounding in the basic skills of reading, writing, calculating, and reasoning; their mastery of basic material in math, science, history, and language. It creates a solid bridge from school to work, with national certifiable skill standards in a range of occupations, and programs to ensure that high school students who do not go to college have those skills. It provides continuing support for workers throughout their careers, with coordinated high performance skill training.

The High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991 provides the starting point for a comprehensive and systematic national commitment to an economy fueled by highly skilled workers, workers who deliver high quality, innovative goods and services that are second to none in the world. I salute you, Senator Kennedy, for his leadership in this hearing today. I hope it will be the first of many in both the Senate and House. I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress, and with concerned leaders in business, labor, and education, to send to the President's desk a bill that will help to enable all Americans to be productive, earn a good living, and provide their children with a future full of hope and opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. We'll include a statement by Senator Hatch in the record as well as additional statements submitted.

[The prepared statement of Senator Hatch and additional statements follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATCH

Mr. Chairman, American workers have always had to work smarter. From colonial times when we were "land rich and labor poor," we have had to compensate for our small labor force with new technologies and more efficient utilization of economic resources. Today, though the circumstances are different, our task is the same. We must find ways of working smarter; we must ensure that our labor force is prepared to meet the challenges of new technologies and of continually changing conditions in the workplace.

I commend my colleague, Senator Kennedy, for his interest in this key policy area. At some point, I hope to be able to join in sponsoring legislation that will complement our ongoing education and training efforts.

Today, however, I still have many questions about the legislation he is introducing. How, for example, does the new program interface with existing programs such as JTPA and the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act if it is not intended to supplant these programs?

Does the new program intend to impose qualification criteria on school systems or employers? If so, how do we reconcile that fact with our long standing policy of local school control or with the right of employers to hire whom they wish barring illegal discrimination? Shouldn't we restrict our Federal efforts to assisting those economically disadvantaged persons who do not have the means to obtain their own training or job opportunities? How can we finance this program through a "pay-or-play" mechanism imposed on employers and expect that such a tax will not have adverse effects on job creation and competitiveness? This hearing, I am sure, will raise many more such issues.

Nevertheless, job training and education are critical elements in our future ability to adapt to changing economic scenarios. We must work together to ensure that our Federal programs are coordinated and effective at delivering services. Likewise, we must make certain that Federal policies do not stand in the way of private sector efforts or hinder schools from engaging in their own reform efforts. I look forward to working with the chairman to accomplish these tasks.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. KOLBERG

The Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce was the first to show how our international competitors are focusing on raising the skill levels of their workforce to outproduce America. As a member of the Commission, I feel the "High Skills, Competitive Workforce Act of 1991" is a positive step forward in our Nation's efforts to keep pace economically and to revitalize our productivity in the world market.

The Act addresses a broad range of issues--world class educational standards, school-to-work transition assistance, increased employer investment in worker skills--that need to be tied together for an effective legislative answer to a growing national problem. American business can lead the way by transforming their workplaces into high-skill, high performance workplaces and creating the demand for high school graduates educated to the world-class standards called for in the Commission's 1990 report, "America's Choice."

The bill's sponsors deserve a great deal of credit for the diligence and foresight that went into drafting this legislation. Much work lies ahead. Workforce quality is the primary mission of the National Alliance of Business, and we look forward to working with the Congress to ensure that the legislation which is passed helps solve the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 12:25 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○

Senator Jay Rockefeller
Introduction of the Family Income Security Act
Floor Statement
March 26, 1993

MR. PRESIDENT: In June 1991, I was proud to release the unanimous, bipartisan recommendations of the National Commission on Children in a bold report, Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families.

Our report outlined an aggressive blueprint to change policy and programs on all levels, and to promote the well-being of children and strengthen families. Since then, I have traveled across the country to promulgate the Commission's recommendations, and I have been truly heartened by the public's warm response to our call for action.

As Chairman of the National Commission on Children, I am deeply committed to following through on our report and intend to persist in transforming our bipartisan recommendations into law and reality.

The cornerstone of the Commission's report was its proposal to enhance income security for families with children. Americans understand that children need basic financial support, but our taxpayers want a responsible approach toward federal assistance which emphasizes parental responsibility and promotes a transition from welfare to work.

The Family Income Security Act is comprehensive legislation to enact the goals of the Children's Commission. The fundamental principle of our income security package is that every child and every family in America deserves support. The time has come to shift our emphasis from punishing some families, of whom some do not approve, to rewarding each family who embraces the values that we hold dear: hard work, personal responsibility, and family stability.

The legislation includes four major provisions.

The first provision is a \$1,000 refundable tax credit for each child, to replace the existing personal exemption which has lost value over time. A refundable tax credit is the same for each child, but its impact will help lower-income families much more than the present exemption. These families truly need and deserve such support.

The legislation also calls for expansion and simplification of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), an incentive that encourages self-sufficiency by assisting parents who play by the rules and work, but still have problems making ends meet and providing for their children.

Thirdly, the package calls for tougher child support enforcement and a demonstration in several states of a child support insurance program; a government insured minimum benefit for a parent who has a child support award but does not receive the support payments from the absent parent. Commissioners supported a demonstration of child support insurance with the strong hope that its results would lay the groundwork for a nationwide program.

Finally, the legislation would establish a community work demonstration using waivers to redirect federal training funds to parents who are willing and able to work but cannot find a job in an economically depressed region.

As a comprehensive package, the Family Income Security Act will help all families with children. Middle class families would keep more of what they earn. Lower-income working families would be lifted out of poverty, the proper reward for work and responsibility. The tax credit would be provided to each child equally. Every child will benefit.

The commissioners visited Charleston, West Virginia during the course of our deliberations and each of us spent time visiting a family in their own home. These families volunteered to candidly talk with commissioners about their struggles to make end meet on limited incomes. Sitting down with parents and children in their homes, we heard first hand how families juggle jobs and child care; how they decide which bills to pay and which ones must wait until the next pay day; and what kind of personal toll this has on children and the family as a whole.

Based on our visit to West Virginia, hearings with testimony by experts, and in depth research, we developed this comprehensive package which envisions bold systemic reform. But I want to emphasize the point that we also can implement these provisions in incremental steps.

President Clinton has called for expansion of the EITC as part of his economic package, and I hope Congress will do its part to achieve this important goal. The President has also indicated his commitment to strengthen child support enforcement and reform welfare to provide opportunities and training for parents to move from welfare to work. Each initiative is an important step toward enacting the goals of the Children's Commission to strengthen income security for children and families.

I strongly endorse these efforts by President Clinton, and I believe expanding the EITC and strengthening child support enforcement are basic building blocks for a new foundation of income security for American children and families.

While it will take time to fulfill the complete vision of the Children's Commission's bold plan, I am encouraged. There is real potential to move forward on several fronts this year.

As Chairman, I am committed to continue my efforts until we have achieved our goal of a strong income security plan for children and families.

Poverty among elderly Americans was substantially reduced in just two decades because our nation made the economic well-being of seniors a high priority and followed through with the establishment and implementation of policies aimed at ensuring a basic income and protection from extraordinary medical expenses. The reduction in poverty of our seniors has been an historic achievement.

But our children are now the poorest group in our society with one out of every five children in our country growing up in poverty. This is tragic for children, and threatening for our country's future. A major challenge for the coming decade will be to mobilize the necessary political will to come to the aid of poor children and to ensure that all families raising children have the minimum financial resources required and the chance to reach their full potential.

We on the Commission honestly discussed and addressed the costs of our comprehensive income security proposals. But after intensive debate, we concluded that unless our nation adopts a strategy to prevent poverty and ensure the economic security of all families with children, the long-term human and financial costs of our neglect will be far greater. Failure to support the development of the next generation and of the families that nurture them will compromise our nation's future in the 21st century.

I offer this legislation to remind my colleagues and the American people of the direction that the National Commission on Children has recommended in the interest of all children and families. Our society has sadly neglected too many children and families, and must reorder its priorities and its values in order to build a future of productive citizens. It is my fervent hope that we will have the courage and the fortitude to shift course, and take steps like these crucial recommendations of the Children's Commission to build a fundamentally better future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.