

1996

Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996): Correspondence 01

Omer Waddles

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_37

Recommended Citation

Waddles, Omer, "Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996): Correspondence 01" (1996). *Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996)*. Paper 18.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_37/18

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

[7] From: Omer Waddles at Labor 4/16/96 6:49PM (2690 bytes: 41 ln)
To: Colin McGinnis at Wellstone-DC, Kevin Wilson at Pell-DC
To mailing list: #Workforce Conf (D-Committee)
Subject: Friday Conference meeting

----- Message Contents -----

At this point the next Conference meeting on the Workforce bill is scheduled for tomorrow, Friday, April 19, at 10:00 in room 2261 Rayburn. It is now scheduled to go till 5:00 but I am requesting we end it at 1:00 because of critical abences of some staff.

Brian Kennedy is calling the Democratic House staff together at 9:30 in the same room, 2261 Rayburn, to go over any last minute strategy. I will be attempting to join them and would ask for you to consider attending as well so that we can be somewhat coordinated.

Administration's position: They are working on the details but they have made clear to me that they are going to stand tough on at least three central issues.

1. School-to-Work - It must be included in the legislation at least at the level we have in the Senate bill. The Senate bill grandfathers all of the states receiving current grants and requires states to use their "Flex" account funds to continue the grants.

2. Mandatory Dislocated Worker focused skill grants (vouchers) - To satisfy a number of concerns the focusing of this effort only on those dislocated workers who are unable to receive placement as a result of the normal services would limit the overall population. The possible GOP compromise would allow for a pilot without a limit and could mean a program which is simply too big. This approach would provide time to see if this can work effectively and allow us to highlight the needs of the dislocated worker population. We would also have an older population who would be less likely to be exploited by any providers who might try to take advantage of the situation.

3. A Higher priority on dislocated workers - The first alternative would be to have an earmark of training funds designated for use on dislocated workers. Another means would be to make service to dislocated workers as a priority of service. This fits in with my desire to see the overall spending increased as well. More funds in the total means more for the individual priorities.

OMER