

Joint L AEL - 6/10/82

BOB GUTTMAN

Hearings Transcript

April 13, 1982

Violet Thompson.

I go to Bob's office to look at the hearings transcripts. I ask if there's any hot news. "We have a new markup document. We worked from the document I drew up for the administration and we talked to the minority. We made three major changes. We hope that will be the Quayle Kennedy substitute for the Quayle Kennedy Bill. We've showed it to the administration but we haven't heard from them. I went to see Angresani; but he just reports everything to Donovan, and they will run it up and down. I'm trying to get them to declare victory. Whether they will or not, I don't know."

"We're going to have a markup on the 22nd, if we can get a room."

Hearings on Employment and Training Programs - 3/15/82

1st of joint hearings - Quayle opens by saying "I certainly feel that by both the House and the Senate getting together that this will be the first step in a number of steps necessary to produce a training and employment bill that in fact will be signed by the President of the US. It's my opinion that this will perhaps be one of the more important pieces or perhas the most important piece of legislation, domestic legislation, that will pass this Congress.

"The problem of the unemployed, underskilled and unproductive workers in this country is among our most pressing domestic problems, but one in which there is bipartisan recognition of the need for effective action. In my opinion, CETA is broken and it needs to be fixed."

Calls CETA "an uncontrolled monster" and says "Though in the past, CETA has been fraught with abuses, fraud and mismangement, it does not mean we

should turn our backs on the plight of the needy and the unemployed. I say, let's fix it. (3)

A critique of CETA "most importantly, it lost its character as a job training program and became instead, an income transfer program". (4)

Re hearings - "There are some rough spots to be ironed out, and I am hoping that this can be accommodated quickly and to the satisfaction of most. The current CETA legislation expires in 6 1/2 short months. I believe we are up to the challenge of coming forth with a replacement bill on time."

"With the spirit of compromise running high, I believe we are up to the challenge" (6)

Hawkins speaks words of compromise and cooperation.

Kennedy says Quayle has been relentless in pursuing through hearings across this country the issue of job and job training programs. There are not many voices certainly a year ago that were cautionary (?) this kind of initiative. Sen. Quayle was a lonely voice for a good many months in the Senate. Now we commence House hearings."

Donovan is 1st witness and talks of "The admin proposal introduced last week by Senator Quayle and Senator Hatch"... and that's the bill he pushes.

When he finishes Quayle says "In these brief moments, within an hour's time, we now have a commitment from a bipartisan group in the H of R, a bipartisan group in the USS, and the admin that we have to do something about our training program. It certainly sends a very definite message to me and to others that we are in fact moving toward getting a comprehensive national training program. I think that is the most significant aspect in the early hours of the hearings that we have achieved quite readily."

He states consensus, and tries to indicate or set a fast pace.

They talk about details and then Quayle differentiates his bill from adminbill. "You and the admin. have come up with a fine proposal, introduced with Senator Hatch... I know you are not prepared to endorse our proposal today. If you would be, we would certainly find that very profound and interesting."

Donovan "a bipartisan approach is most welcome and we want to be a part of it."

Q speaks of "the bipartisan bill that^{is} presently before the Senate, S2036" and asks for Donovan's comments.

Kennedy and Donovan have a sharp exchange.

D: There is a misconception of the training funds that are aimed at decreasing unemployment. That is not the case; it is preparing people for employment when the economic program has had its effect.

K: Well, do you have something else to deal with unemployment then?

D: We sure do. We have the President's economic program. That is the key.

K: The one that has been in place about a year and has seen unemployment grow about well over a million--

D: Are you ready to give up on it? I am not.

K: I never accepted it.

Then K switches to ask about older, unemployment program for seniors.

K: Do you know what percent of the people who are over 55 make up that --make up the employed list?

D: Those who are over 55 as a part of the percentage?

K: Yes

D: I do not have it readily available.

K: Well, it is over 10%.

D: Yes.

K: Do you know what percent of those live in poverty?

D: Of that 10 percent, I do not know.

K: Just over--it is 25% live in poverty. I just wondered how you fashioned a program if we do not know the number of people that are being affected and what the human terms of those programs are going to be and you came up here with the statistics and figures and the organization chart, and when we are trying to find out about the kinds of people that are going to be really adversely affected or impacted, we do not get an answer.

D: I gave you my answer.

K: You said you did not know.

D: You may not be happy with it.

K: You said you did not know, which I am not happy with.

D: I told you we are keeping the funding at or near where we had it last year. I think in these budgetary times, I think that is an exemplary performance."

That's the last word of the questioning. I put this in the notes, because the hostility between the admin and Kennedy, which was so tangible in the hearing room, is one of the biggest problems in the process of getting Senate and admin together.

Angrasani takes most of the questions.

Next witness is Kenneth Smith, Chairman of National Commission for Employment Policy. When he finishes, Quayle asks him to compare his comments on delivery of services "to the two pieces of legislation that are before the Senate S2036 and HR 5320." (Q - K and Hawkins).

Smith replies "if you pushed us to the wall on it...we come out somewhere between the two pieces of legislation." 99

Q: "I wonder in the spirit of... being direct and pushing to the wall, that you might say, take the bipartisan bill, 2036, and tell me what changes in that particular area you would make?

Smith: Well, to be honest, we are not too unhappy with your bill."

Q: Thank you.

March 16 Hearings

Hawkins to Quayle "It is certainly a pleasure to work with you this day and to welcome you from the 'House of the Lords' into the "cave of the Winds'".

Kennedy tries hard to get staement of support for Q-K from Gov. King and can't.

K - "We have developed here in the Senate under the leadership of Sen. Quayle and others on this committee a bipartisan approach to try to deal with the problems of youth and youth training."

Ken to King: "Do you support the Admin. funding of the jobs program on the funding of the program of the legislation which has been presented by Sen. Quayle and myself?"

King: "Specifically, in answer to your question, my answer would have to be guaged in the light of the total federal picture. Whatever it is, we are going to do the very best we can to make that work and supplement it with monies from the state."

K tries again: "I would like to know whether, speaking as both Gov. of Mass. and also speaking for the Governors whether you are supporting the figures which have been outlined in the Q-K proposal on youth training or whether you are taking the admin. figures?"

King: Well there is a difference of almost 2 billion, as I understand it, almost 4B cut to 2B....

K: Now, where do you come out on that issue? Do you come out with the bipartisan effort in the Senate or are you coming out in support of the Admin. program which is going to mean that there is going to be a dramatic reduction in the number of young people both in Mass. and the rest of the country that are going to be able to get job training?"

King: "Certainly I would want to come out with something that is bipartisan, because that is the way that it should be. I would have to again say that I have to adapt it to the Comm. of Mass..."

K: "You are testifying now what is in the interest of the State, from the State's point of view, from Mass. point of view, where do you come out?"

King: "I am talking in this way. I am asking for flexibility as a Governor...."

Kennedy: ...I am trying to get a response out of you whether you support, as Gov. Orr did, the figures that were in the bipartisan proposal here in the Senate or whether you support the Administration's or whether you have some other figure. You have responded each time that Mass. is going to meet its commitments. Does it make any difference what we do? Gov. Orr says he supports the Quayle approach on this. I am just trying to find out from my governor of Mass. as the person who is charged with the responsibilities how you come out?

King: Well my answer before and my answer now is this: as Gov. I would like as much money as the fed. gov't will send. But I want to make that request as I had made all others in all my other positions, on the ability of the fed. gov't to do this."

And so on. Very diff. rel. between K and King than Quayle and Orr.

Quayle tries to get Pierre DuPont - Chmn of Governors Conference to endorse his bill.

"What specific changes would you recommend in the bipartisan bill that is presently before the Senate, the Quayle Kennedy Bill? Do you have any specific objections to that piece of legislation, and what recommendations would you like to make to this committee? If not, we would take on wholehearted endorsement at this time. Are you prepared to do that?

Pierre DuPont: Senator, there are so many fine proposals before this committee that I would hesitate to single out any particular one. However, I think the Q-K bill is a very good piece of legislation."

Q: Okay, do you want to stop right there? Thank you very much. I know you have to leave.

DuPont: That is the truth. That is the truth. It is a good piece of legislation. However, I would suggest that you look at some of the areas of Cong. Jeffords bill..."

Then Quayle tries to pin down Mayors _____ of Louisville and Minneapolis and Baltimore.

Q: "Having talked about the bipartisan bill in the Senate, let me just get to the political reality, at least in the Senate. There are two bills pending over there. One is a bipartisan proposal submitted by myself and Senator Kennedy, Sen. Pell, Sen. Hawkins and others and the other is the admin. proposal. Which one would you prefer?

Mayor Sloan: Well, sir, yours. (laughter)

Q: Mayor Fraser, you have been around this place before. You know how things operate. We've got a couple of bills over there, so which one would you like to see?

Mayor Fraser: Well of the two you mentioned, there is no choice. Yours is far superior to the Administration's bill.

Sloan: I agree.

Q: Mayor Sloane, you agree?

S: I certainly do.

Q: Mayor Schaefer, I assume you agree. Are you going to support the Admin. bill?

Mayor Schaefer: No, No. Wait a minute (laughter). You're a fine Senator, but let me...

Q: You only have an either/or.

Schaefer: No, I think that is wrong. You're saying to us, 'take it or leave it.'

Q: No, I'm just saying that the political reality over there is you've got two pieces of legislation that we're going to be discussing, and I would just like to have some input from the prominent mayors around the country as we get into mark-up on which bill they prefer, the Admin. bill or the Q-K bill.

Schaeffer: Senator, if it were just that simple, that would be fine.

Q: And if it was that simple, which would you choose?

S: You know you can keep pinning me like this, because you're a Senator and I'm only a mayor...

Q: All right. Then let me ask this question, since you don't want to answer that one.

S: I'll answer it. Neither one.

Q: Either one?

S: Neither one.

Q: No, that's not the choice.

S: Let me write your bill for you.

Q: In other words, you would rather have not legislation.

S: No, no.

Q: No legislation. All right, if you want to go on record on no training legislation, that's fine. I don't think you will find too much support here. We all want training legislation.

S: How about an amendment?

Q: Actually Cong. Hawkins, I wish you would consider coming over to the other body because of what may happen in California. We would like to have you over ther.

Hawkins: Either bill has to pass both houses."

Nice exchange with a nice ending.

Pell shows up for a RI witness and discusses the idea of gov't as employer of last resort with Hawkins.

Pell: As I understand it--and I think we're in agreement--you would, Mr. Chairman, be of the view that the gov't should be an employer of last resort if no other employment opportunities were available.

Hawkins: Well, I have always felt, Sentor... that where an admin. fails to provide the proper type of monetary and fiscal policies, that after a certain length of time, everything else having failed, that jobs of last resort certainly should be available.

Pell: I agree with you completely. I wish we could come out with it more forthrightly, because it is better to find a job for an individual and have him working than it is to give him unemployment benefits. I wish we could go even further that way.

Hawkins: We seem to have a lot of weak-kneed individuals in office these days Senator, unfortunately, who don't even want to be identified with CETA or with public service jobs or to say 'jobs of last resort' sound almost radical. However, I think we are coming to that period of time when we may get back to a little sanity. But until that time, some of us have to be

careful about suggesting things to handicap even getting a reasonably good employment and training bill through." (21)

Pell wishout out loud and Hawkins stating the reality of it. Pell is co-sponsor of bill which implicitly runs counter to what he wants.

March 17 Hearings

Q takes opportunity provided by AFL-CIO witness, who proposes a single one year extension of CETA, to articulate the idea that unless a new bill is forthcoming, the opponents of CETA will cut out training legislation altogether.

Quayle's idea is that we must get something different and change that, later, if need be.

Quayle: "I think it would really be much to our disadvantage if in fact we don't get a training bill this year, because I am not sure we could get through the Congress a simple one-year extension. I think it would be very very difficult, from a political sense, to get through. Therefore, some of the people that you are mentioning that may be falling through the cracks, we may miss it the first time around. And we may have to make some adjustments. I have wanted always to keep an open mind on how we can improve the system. And that's why I believe it is imperative that we all get in this boat together and row toward a new structure."

Q & H discuss what the stitution is if no bill gets passed. Quayle's view is that if the houses don't agree, there will be great pressure to cut training altogether. Or, if they can't do better than propose a one-year extension of CETA, that will be take as a sign of bankruptcy by opponents of CETA and training generally.(if there are any such latter people!) Clearly Quayle is trying to structure the situation to put some pressure in this boiler--esp. re Hawkins.

Quayle says to Hawkins that if they can't agree - "I believe that if we would get into that very unfortunate predicament, Mr. Chairman, that you would find a mounting political pressure to further reduce training. There will be mounting pol. pressure, say, well, if the Congress can't get together on a training program, maybe we don't need one. I can hear the arguments right now. And they will be forthcoming. So that's why...you and I have committed ourselves to work as diligently as we possibly can to get a training bill because we do not want that dire potential.

Hawkins: The Senator is correct.