

But let me suggest to the leaders, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], of this critically important committee, that we can do more in terms of coordinating services. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] talks about a mom going to a centrally located school, with her small child, and they go together. The child goes for education, whether it is pre-K, kindergarten, first, second, or whatever grade, and mom goes to get the job training services and information, GED, whatever she needs; and together, the Federal programs are coordinated at a single site accessible by the user for the purposes of giving that family full service support.

So my colleagues can see, it is no criticism to say this bill does not go as far as I would like to see it. It clearly takes a critically important step forward in the coordination of services, but I think we can do more, and I look forward to working with the leaders that I have mentioned, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], and others on the committee, because I think we have a context in which we can make a dramatic step forward in the coordination of services at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important subject and I appreciate the ability to talk on it, and to support this very significant step.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], along with his two sons, Matthew and Patrick.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and I am not sure that I will yield time to my two sons.

I want to start off by saluting and commending and applauding the bipartisanship shown by the chairman and ranking members on both the Democratic and Republican side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY]. This is the kind of cooperation and these are the kinds of bills that the people of Indiana, and I think in the Midwest and hopefully throughout the country, want us to work on.

I want to further say that this is the third bipartisan bill that our committee has reported out in a productive and civil fashion to do the people's work. We have worked on the IDEA legislation for the disabled community, we have worked on a higher education commission, and we are now working together on this important legislation for worker training and literacy. I think that this is some of the most important work that we have done in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk in terms of bipartisanship about some legislation that we have put in this bill in a bipartisan way. Several weeks ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], a Republican, and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT], a Democrat, and myself joined together to put a support services bill together that will enhance the way that these programs deliver services in a more effective way with a heart, but they deliver the service and get the literacy programs to the people that need it. Forty-six million people in America lack basic literacy skills. Only 9 percent of those 46 million Americans are currently getting job training skills and literacy program exposure.

One of the things that we attached to this bill in a bipartisan way was to allow these programs to have support services and spend money on child care and transportation to get to the adult services programs and literacy programs at night. When we put these components in, we have found that participation in these programs often times goes from 10 members to 40 members in these nighttime programs, where the people are sometimes single and have children. They need child care, they need transportation at night to get the literacy skills, to enhance their skills at work in the daytime.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] have worked on even making our legislation better, incorporating into this bill the kinds of caring components with transportation and child care that we have found that will help transform our welfare system. We found in welfare in the debate last year that welfare only works when we allow people to get care for their children. We do not want to have to have them pick between work and leaving children home alone.

This bill incorporates those things into making adult literacy programs more available for all people, and that saves us money in the long term, and productivity and enhancing our programs, delivery of efficient services, and helping people learn to read.

Again, I want to end on saying I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. It shows the American people that we work together in a bipartisan way to deliver good bills for the American people, and I hope this bill will become law.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], another new member of the committee.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

After 30 years of Federal Government involvement and two major legislative

overhauls, there are now over 160 Federal programs dedicated to job training. The Federal Government has spent approximately \$4.5 billion just on the Job Training and Partnership Act of 1997. However, the U.S. Congress cannot measure whether or not they are getting a good return on their investment since both Federal agencies do not even know if their programs are helping people find jobs.

The very idea that a government board can somehow determine what occupations will be in demand at any point in the future is an example of what Nobel Laureate Friedrich Hayek calls *The Fatal Conceit*. No central board, even one dominated by local officials and businessmen, can predict which jobs will be in demand in 5, 10, or 15 years. It is doubtful that a local work force board in Silicon Valley in 1978 would have tried to link job training services to personal computer markets. In fact, it is highly unlikely that Steve Jobs will be appointed to the work force development board. The very fact that the boards are compiled of already established leaders for business practically ensures that the entrepreneurs creating the jobs of the future will not be represented on the board.

In this high-technology information age where financial and, more importantly, intellectual capital can travel around the world in a matter of seconds, the jobs in demand in any area can change faster than any geographical local work force board could conceivably update the skills with which to link job training.

The private actions of individual citizens working together in a free market can best build a job training system that meets the needs of its citizens. Private individuals, local communities, and State governments are also more capable than the Federal Government of providing adequate help to those unable to provide training for themselves.

If the Federal Government returns to constitutional size and reduces the tax and regulatory burden on the American citizen, Federal job training programs of any sort furthers the destructive idea that the proper role of the Federal Government is to provide for all the needs of the citizens. The belief that Congress has a moral duty to administer to the health and welfare of the populace, both of America and the world, is directly responsible for the growth of the welfare state, which threatens to destroy America's economic prosperity and liberty itself.

□ 1030

I am strongly opposed to this legislation, and believe freedom and free choices and the marketplace and the Constitution is a much better approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

Congress is once again attempting to repair the broken system of Federal job training. The major Federal role in job training dates back to 1962, with President Kennedy's Manpower Development and Training Act [MDA] and continuing through the Economic Opportunity Act

of 1964, passed as part of President Johnson's Great Society Consistent with the Great Society philosophy that the Federal Government had the solution to all problems, these bills centralized job training authority in Washington.

Soon, however, concerns arose that Federal job training programs were rife with waste and abuse. Congress, therefore, began trying to repair some of the inefficiencies in the job-training program. First, in 1973, Congress, with the support of the Nixon administration, passed the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act [CETA]. CETA was designed to decentralize Federal job training programs. Congress next addressed job training in 1982, with the passage of the Job Training and Partnership Act [JTPA], which promised to turn Federal job-training into a public-private partnership that would operate more efficiently than the three major job-training bills that had previously passed the Congress and failed to accomplish their stated goals.

After 30 years of Federal involvement and two major legislative overhauls, there are now over 160 Federal programs dedicated to job training. The Federal Government spent approximately \$4.5 billion to just JTPA in 1997. However, the U.S. Congress cannot measure whether or not they are getting a good return on their investment since most Federal agencies do not even know if their programs are helping people find jobs.

Congress is once again attempting to repair the Federal job training systems. However, despite the abundant evidence of the failure of the centralized welfare state model of job-training programs, this Congress is planning to continue dictating to all 50 states the composition, content, function, and even the goals and benchmarks of job training programs. The Employment Training and Literacy Act of 1997, [H.R. 1385], tampers with the constitutional principle of federalism. H.R. 1385 redefines the very notion of federalism to mean that States, localities, and individual citizens are given limited flexibility and control over how they fulfill the Federal Government's mandates.

II. H.R. 1385 INTERFERES WITH STATE'S AUTONOMY AND FORCES TAXPAYERS TO SUBSIDIZE BENEFITS FOR SELECT BUSINESSES AND EMPLOYEES IN VIOLATION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

Unlike the mandate federalism embodied in H.R. 1385, the federalism embodied in the U.S. Constitution allows for no Federal role in job training, or education generally. In fact, the tenth amendment, which reserves the authority for carrying out functions not explicitly granted to the Federal Government, to the States and the people, forbids Federal education programs. Yet, as demonstrated below, H.R. 1385 continues the unconstitutional centralization of education power for the benefit of certain members of society at the expense of the mass of American taxpayers.

Under H.R. 1385 States must provide a 3-year plan for adult job training and literacy programs in order to receive Federal job-training funds. These plans must satisfy federally specified content and must be approved by the Secretaries of both the Department of Education and the Department of Labor.

Additionally, States are required to establish local work force development boards whose functions and composition are dictated by the Federal law. Furthermore, the boards must meet benchmarks identified by the Governor

in negotiation with the schools, the local boards do not even have the authority to determine how their performance should be measured. Rather progress under this bill is measured by predetermined Federal core indicators.

Under H.R. 1385, the local work force development boards would be dominated by representatives of the business community. Certainly the input of the business community is important for job training. However, a Federal mandate that representatives of business dominate the job-training boards may provide a means for business to socialize or externalize their training costs. Those businesses which will achieve a direct benefit from a more highly skilled work force should be the ones to finance such programs. Individuals who will benefit from improving their skills could also choose to ultimately pay at least some of the costs of their training. In no instance should the individual taxpayer be forced to subsidize the job training of another person.

Not satisfied with wealth transfers to prepare those without employment for business, this bill provides training for skills upgrading for incumbent workers—those already employed. Despite a budget billions of dollars out of balance, this bill creates a new entitlement for already-employed workers and their employers to receive more training courtesy of the American taxpayer.

Businesses are not the only institution showered with largess in this bill. Under the provisions of this bill, the Secretary of Labor is empowered to provide taxpayer dollars to labor unions to carry out research and demonstration projects as well as grants to public interest groups. Credible accusations have been made that these groups have often used Federal funds to advance their political agenda. At the very least, Congress should conduct a thorough investigation and take steps to prevent Federal funds from being used to pay for political activity before handing out more grant money.

III. H.R. 1385 INFRINGES ON FAMILY AND INDIVIDUAL AUTONOMY

In addition to continuing the practice of running job training programs from Washington, DC, this bill expands the State's reach into Americas' families by authorizing Federal funding for family literacy services. These services are to include training for parents on how to teach their children and interactive literacy activities between parents and their children.

This history of Federal involvement in family literacy raises questions regarding the effectiveness of government programs to teach anything regarding child raising. From 1963 to 1993, Federal spending on education increased from approximately \$900,000 to over \$10 billion, while scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test [SAT's] dropped by an average of almost 60 points. Given the poor track record, it is doubtful whether increasing Federal involvement in family literacy is likely to do anything but ensure lower rates of family literacy.

Furthermore, Federal involvement in child rearing violates the very principles upon which this country was founded. In a free society, such as that bequeathed to America by the drafters of the Constitution, the family, not the Government, is responsible for the raising of children. State control of child raising is, in fact, one of the hallmarks of totalitarianism. Those of us concerned with expanding and

preserving freedom must oppose all measures, including the legislation currently under consideration, which erode the autonomy of the family under the theory that government social workers are better able to address the needs of children than parents.

Along similar lines, the language for disadvantaged youth programs mandates the integration of academic, occupation, and work-based learning opportunities. This is also quite objectionable. This language seems to suggest those youth diagnosed as disadvantaged by the social workers and psychologists will be denied a traditional education, instead disadvantaged youth will be herded into State-run job training programs. Such a federally mandated plan is in no way consistent with the core American value of individualism.

IV. H.R. 1385 ESTABLISHES A SYSTEM INCAPABLE OF ACHIEVING ITS STATED PURPOSE

This bill reaches the height of hubris in its mandate that training services be linked to occupations for which there is a demand in the local work force development area. This provision is objectionable for two reasons.

First, because business-dominated work force development boards will determine which occupations are in demand, it is very likely that the business represented on the board will be the ones determined to be those for which there is a demand in the local work force.

Second, and more important, the very idea that a government board can somehow determine what occupations will be in demand at any point in the future is an example of what Nobel Laureate F.A. Hayek called the fatal conceit. No central board, even one dominated by local officials and businessmen, can predict which jobs will be in demand in 5, 10, or even 2 years. It is doubtful that a local work force board in Silicon Valley in 1978 would have to tried to link job training services to the personal computer market. In fact, it's highly unlikely that Steve Jobs—founder of Apple computers—would be appointed to the work force development board in Silicon Valley. The very fact that the boards are comprised of already established leaders for business practically assures that the entrepreneurs creating the jobs of the future will not be represented on this board. In this high-technology information age, where financial and, more important, intellectual capital, can travel around the world in a matter of seconds, the jobs in demand in any area can change faster than any geographical local work force board could conceivably update the skills with which the link job-training.

V. CONCLUSION

The argument is often made that State-financed job training is necessitated by the failure of the educational system to properly prepare students for the job market. Each of us can understand the frustration of employers unable to find employees capable of adapting to new technologies.

As a physician, I have employed many people in critical positions. I certainly understand the importance of having a readily available pool of skilled labor. I would question, however, whether the pool was better prior to the Federal Government's intrusion into education.

The private actions of individual citizens, working together in a free-market, can best build a job-training system that meets the needs of its citizens. Private individuals, local communities, and State governments are also

more capable than the Federal Government of providing adequate help to those unable to provide for training out of their own resources, if the Federal Government returns to constitutional size and reduces the tax burden on American citizens.

Federal job training programs, of any sort, furthers the destructive idea that the proper role of the Federal Government is to provide for all the needs of its citizens. The belief that Congress has a moral duty to minister to the health and welfare of the populace, both of America and the world, is directly responsible for the growth of the welfare-warfare state which threatens to destroy America's economic prosperity, and liberty itself. Job training should be provided, like all other goods and services, by the free-market and voluntary transactions.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, bills like this could not be written without the staff. I want to thank certain members of the staff who played a major role directly in this bill. On the Democratic side, Brian Kennedy, Marshall Grigsby, David Evans, and Margo Huber.

On the Republican side, Mary Gardner-Clagett, D'Arcy Philps, Lynn Selmsler, Vic Klatt, and Lauren Coberly. We thank you very much for your very, very hard work, day and night, on this bill.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] for his graciousness, and for thanking the members of the staff, and would like to add my thanks, also.

Mary Clagett has worked, what, 8 or 8 years on this. All of those who have worked so hard, we want to thank them. Many people see us standing up here, and we are the ones that finally get the final praise for what has been done. They are the ones that have done all of the work to pull us together to help make it possible, and we want to thank them greatly for this effort.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1385, the Employment, Training, and Literacy Enhancement Act of 1997. This is a bill which will prepare adults for the 21st century work force. It consolidates and improves existing programs under the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA], the Adult Education Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Overall, H.R. 1385 consolidates over 60 existing employment, training, and literacy programs into three block grants to States and localities. I would like to congratulate Chairmen GOODLING and MCKEON for their leadership on this issue, and for crafting a measure that has bipartisan support.

This bill will make a positive impact on adults as they prepare for the jobs of the future. It will help workers get the retraining necessary to compete in the current job market. We find ourselves in a unique economic situation in America today—we have low unemployment rates, but also have high rates of underemployment. We in Congress must take the lead and ensure adequate training is available to all Americans, in their communities.

This bill provides service delivery methods that maximize consumer choice in selecting training providers. I am particularly pleased that training services will be provided through the use of skill grants vouchers. These vouchers will be distributed through the full-service employment and training delivery system. This will enable adults to receive the training they need in their own community. When, for example, individuals want computer training, they can shop around for institutions that best meet their needs.

Some naysayers say this will encourage fly-by-night companies to deceive the hard-working public. But the bill includes protections in the form of requirements that providers must meet in order to receive funds. A provider must either:

First, be an accredited title IV eligible post-secondary educational program, or

Second, be recognized by a local work force development board, which will determine if the provider meets acceptable, locally established performance standards established at the State level. The provider must have a proven completion record for participants in their program, and demonstrate a success rate for job placement after program completion.

There are other provisions in this bill I want to highlight.

The disadvantaged youth employment and training opportunities grant will move the focus of current disadvantaged youth programs from short-term employment fixes to longer term academic and occupational training.

The adult employment and training grant takes a work first approach to training. Priority will be given in resource allocations to intensive training for welfare recipients and other individuals with multiple barriers to employment.

Finally, this bill will extend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which provides rehabilitation and employment training to adults with disabilities, for 3 years.

In summary, H.R. 1385 promotes individual responsibility through vouchers, promotes competition among training providers, and drives resources and authority out of Washington to States and localities. By decreasing the size and scope of the Federal Government's control, this is truly a work-first bill for adults. It will also help get economically disadvantaged youth back to school.

I urge support for H.R. 1385. By passing this bill, we will give many Americans new tools to prepare for the 21st century.

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 1385 but I urge my colleagues to address several troubling provisions during conference.

The current job training programs are top heavy, duplicative, and micromanaged from Washington. H.R. 1385 consolidates over 60 programs, currently administered by 15 separate agencies, into 3 targeted block grants. This will reduce administrative costs significantly, which the bill would redirect to the grants. I would have preferred that the taxpayers benefit from at least some of the savings.

This bill gives States the authority to tailor job training programs to fit their individual needs. Furthermore, it ensures that business and education leaders, who have expertise in work force development, will play a crucial role in development of State implementation plans instead of Washington bureaucrats.

H.R. 1385 received bipartisan support and is widely supported by industry and education groups. In a letter dated May 16, 1997, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated, "H.R. 1385 directly addresses this critical need—work force development—and better targets job training efforts at the State and local level." Additionally, the American Association of Community Colleges and Association of Community College Trustees, one of the primary providers of workforce training, wrote, "We support the flexibility the bill gives states and localities to design their workforce delivery system to best suit the needs of their citizens."

While I believe that H.R. 1385 is a step in the right direction, I do have these serious concerns about it:

The Job Corps Program continues to be championed by those who either will not or can not acknowledge the program's serious flaws. Even the President's own Labor Department study of the program says that it is difficult to defend. Why continue to force Governors to spend limited resources on this program if they can develop better ones? I would have preferred that the legislation passed today would have contained language to allow Governors to experiment with new, perhaps private, job training programs better suited to the particular needs of their local work force.

Why create new federally funded and managed adult literacy programs. On one hand Congress claims to want to end a Federal jobs bureaucracy. On the other hand, they create a new only slightly smaller version, with new programs devoted to adult literacy. This program amounts to nearly two and one half billion dollars of new spending on top of the 33 billion in job training dollars already allocated. Curiously, this bill grants authority over such literacy programs directly to the State Education Department, by passing the Governor's office all together. They will administer the federally designed and funded grant program.

I do think some of the other complaints are mistaken. The bill does not institute government control of where ordinary Americans will go to work, or restrict individual students' career choices. We must remember that these job training programs are set up for those people who need extra help to find an entry-level job, or change careers because their former job has disappeared. They do not involuntarily assign high school graduates to a particular job or employer, any more than the high school guidance counselor does.

The work force development boards advise the State training agencies on what kinds of jobs are likely to need more workers in the future. Obviously, they won't be perfect. But they would do a better job of predicting the needs of the local labor market than the wild guesses of bureaucrats. Finally, the bill was amended to explicitly ensure that the work force boards do not have the authority to change school curriculums or affect home-schoolers.

On balance, I must say that this bill is better than our current job training mess. For this reason, I am voting for the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for those portions of H.R. 1385, the Education, Training, and Literacy Enhancement Act which promote change which is beneficial and supportive of the goals of full literacy and accessible responsive job training programs throughout our country.