

September 17, 2021

**DISSENTING VIEWS ON SUBTITLE E
BUDGET RECONCILIATION LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO
PART 1. CAREER PATHWAYS THROUGH HEALTH OPPORTUNITY GRANTS**

Committee Republicans oppose Part 1 of Subtitle E. As part of their \$3.5 trillion expansion of the welfare state, Democrat's want to quadruple funding for a program that has proven to be ineffective at helping low-income individuals find jobs. Part 1 of Subtitle E reauthorizes and increases funding for the Health Professional Opportunity Grant (HPOG) program. The program awards grants to organizations to provide education and training to welfare recipients and other low-income individuals for occupations in the health care field that are expected to either experience labor shortages or be in high demand.

Under the Democrats plan, this program would grow from \$85 million to \$425 million at a total cost of \$2.1 billion. We know from rigorous evaluations that the Health Profession Opportunity Grants program has little to no impact on the earnings or employment participants.

HPOG's is a rare federal program that has actually received a robust randomized control trial evaluation to determine its impact on outcomes of participants. A 10-year, \$100 million "gold standard" randomized control trial evaluation conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) found no evidence of the program's impact on recipient earnings or employment. A November 2019 report issued by the HHS Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation looked at outcomes of participants three years after completion. The [report](#) found:

The HPOG logic model suggests the training and services provided by HPOG should produce earnings gains for participants. However, despite the increase in training completion...we found no evidence of earnings impacts in the three years after random assignment.

A more recent publication looking at short-term impacts on the second round of HPOG participants found that the program increased educational progress and training completion in the short run. However, HPOG 2.0 did not have an impact on overall employment – nor did it increase earnings in the short run. There is no sound justification for significantly expanding spending on this program.

Further, Committee Republicans are concerned about the duplication HPOG has with other existing workforce programs. Committee Republicans want to remind our Democrat colleagues that American taxpayers already fund a social safety net to the tune of more than 80 programs and \$1 trillion every year. Instead of doing the hard work to streamline, modernize and re-design our existing safety net. Democrats want us to double down on broken forever programs.

States have the ability to use Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) funds for similar activities targeted at the same population. In addition, other programs operated by HHS such as the Health Career Opportunity Program (HCOP) focus on disadvantaged populations. The Department of Labor also runs a rural health professions program.

Instead of quadrupling-down on a duplicative program that fails to meet its objectives, Republicans suggested an alternative. In the past, Republicans and Democrats worked together on a bipartisan basis to introduce evidence-based policymaking into child welfare programs – creating the Families First Evidence-Based Clearinghouse and providing federal funding for programs with proven results, such as the Maternal, Infant, Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program.

Committee Republicans offered an [amendment](#) to redirect additional funding for HPOG’s to fund the evidence-based programs offered by MIECHV. MIECHV builds upon decades of scientific research showing that home visits by a nurse, social worker, early childhood educator, or other trained professional during pregnancy and in the first years of a child’s life helps:

- prevent child abuse and neglect,
- supports positive parenting,
- improve maternal and child health;
- and promote child development and school readiness.

Through the voluntary home visiting services offered through the MIECHV program, case managers provide tools to children and families during critical early years that will set up our kids for future success. Because the program is foundationally evidence-based, families across the nation experience the life altering results of this program every day. MIECHV, unlike HPOG, proves that connecting children and adults in need with compassionate human support will uplift families and change lives. The amendment was unanimously rejected by Committee Democrats.

DISSENTING VIEWS ON SUBTITLE E BUDGET RECONCILIATION LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO PART 2. ELDER JUSTICE

Committee Republicans oppose Part 2 of Subtitle E. Committee Democrats are in a hurry to push through huge new, duplicative spending programs – recklessly jamming through partisan progressive priorities under the guise of “elder justice” and helping seniors.

Subtitle E – Part 2 would create a loosely defined \$4 billion grant program with a buffet of random supportive services for individuals who work with the elderly, such as home health aides, and nursing home workers, including: (1) workforce training, (2) student loan repayment and tuition assistance, (3) guaranteed child care, and (4) funding to provide employees with not less than 2 weeks of paid leave. What Democrats are really doing is exploiting seniors as a bait and switch to create new welfare programs.

Meanwhile, prior to Subtitle E, Democrats voted to pass out of Committee Subtitles A and C, which provides \$27 billion in new funding for child care and a \$500 billion paid family and medical leave entitlement program. Also, Education and Labor Democrats are marking-up another \$400 billion for a child care guarantee and universal pre-k and \$55 billion for free community college. In addition to all that new spending, we have the Social Services Block

Grant (SSBG), which is an existing \$1.6 billion program that provides funding for Adult protective services similar to those described in this title.

Why are Democrats proposing another \$4 billion specialty program for the same worker supports? Are nursing home workers not covered under those new entitlements? This Subtitle is just one more in a grab bag of pet-projects included in the Democrats' partisan, reckless reconciliation bill.

Republicans would welcome an examination of the actual elder justice program created by the Affordable Care Act. The Committee has held no hearings on the Elder Justice Act since the inception of the program. Last year, on a bipartisan basis, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 invested \$100 million to administer elder justice programs—which was an exponential funding increase. But while the ink was still drying on that deal, the majority used what should have been a COVID-19 relief package to force through an additional \$276 million. While combating elder abuse is a worthy endeavor, it is one that should be addressed on a bipartisan basis through regular order and hearings.

Committee Republicans offered an [amendment](#) to redirect all duplicative funding increases for the Elder Justice Act for bills that the Biden Administration identified as immediate needs - bills coming due now. In his request, the President is asking for \$8 billion for the Office of Refugee Resettlement to deal with the surge of unaccompanied children coming over the border because the Biden Administration has failed to secure our border. The President also requested additional funds to assist Afghan refugees, disabled American veterans, and evacuating Afghanistan. The amendment was unanimously rejected by Committee Democrats.