

amendments today it was made very, very clear that we would not get involved.

Vocational education is the area where what the gentleman is talking about would be more applicable. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would withdraw the amendment, and work with us between now and the time we bring vocational education to the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that the chairman of the committee would support the general concept that we are trying to advocate here, and with the recognition that this would be something that could be done not only in the high school years but also in terms of community college, and his commitment to working together on this issue in the vocational education bill that would be coming forward later this year, I would be happy to withdraw for the purposes of continuing this effort.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to work with the gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an attempt to improve the Federal jobs training program. We now have over 700 different programs, and quite literally, it is a mess. This bill is a well-intentioned piece of legislation that does make some token changes and some improvement. They may work, they may not.

I would like to address another subject, which is, should we be involved at all? If we have tried it for 30 years and it is not working, when will we ask ourselves, should we be in the business of job training? Quite frankly, I am not very confident that we here in the Congress are smart enough to do it.

Always the argument is that if this is a slightly better approach to last year's approach, this is a movement in the right direction. But some day we have to ask the question whether or not endorsing the same philosophic principle of a bad program is really going to solve our problems. We have no evidence that this approach will work. Most likely this will become just a bureaucratic adjustment. There will be a cost in the adjustment, but ultimately Government will once again fail in its attempt to do something that it was not designed to do. This idea of local control and block grants is something that sounds good, it sounds like they are moving in the right direction, but the odds of it really benefiting are very, very slim.

Government really is not smart enough to do what is intended in a program like job training. We are not,

here in the Congress, smart enough to know what the future is and to make business decisions. It is rather sad to see our business leaders advocating a piece of legislation like this, rather than them understanding and resorting to the market to decide when and how to train workers.

Instead, they use their energies to come and transfer funds from one group to another in the pretense that they are able, in partnership with the Government, to design a program that will fit the marketplace. There is no sign, there is no evidence that a program like this has been permitted under the Constitution. But better yet, under today's circumstances, and eventually this will prevail, do we really have the funds to do something that is not working? The funds are not there, and any time we deal with a program like this, we have to think that it is a contribution to the high deficits that we are running.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1385 is flawed in that it endorses the very same principles that have been used for 30 years, arguing that the Federal Government and government bureaucrats know more than what the market knows.

I would like to list a few mandates of the bill. No. 1, it mandates that States submit a 35-year plan for adult job training and literacy on the approval of the Secretaries of Education and Labor. It mandates that States establish local work force development boards whose functions and composition are determined by Federal law.

It mandates that the local work force board meet Federal core indicators. It mandates that local work force boards be dominated by representatives of the business community. That does not give me a whole lot of encouragement, another step toward replacing the free enterprise system with corporatism.

If Members like mandates, they certainly will be pleased with this piece of legislation. It spends taxpayers' dollars, the victims, for skill upgrading for incumbent workers. Those who are still working are required to pay for those who think they are going to get trained, thus creating a new entitlement program for already-employed workers.

It spends taxpayers' dollars on grants to business and unions for demonstration projects. It spends taxpayers' dollars on family literacy services. It spends taxpayers' dollars on the National Institute for Literacy, the type of bureaucracy this Congress should be shutting down, not expanding. It spends taxpayers' dollars on job training services which the business community and individual workers should be paying for themselves.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, and I know this would be of the least amount of interest to so many here, but the truth of the matter is, Congress has no constitutional authority to mandate or operate any job training programs.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAUL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1215

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I wanted to associate myself with the thrust of his remarks. I may feel a little more benignly toward the uses of government than he, but essentially his critique of this bill I share.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] has expired.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks by saying that I have the maximum high regard for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE]. They are splendid Members, they are honorable and they do marvelous work. I hope that those words will be taken seriously because I do not want to impair friendships over my dissent of their bill. I know how territorial chairmen can get over their bills. But I just cannot support this bill. I think it only fair to give a couple of reasons for my feeling.

First of all, family literacy services, on page 15 and 16, really troubles me. Page 16, subparagraph B, training for parents on how to be the primary teacher for their children and full partners in the education of their children; I think that goes awfully far, beyond job training, to teach parents how to be parents. That is exactly moving in the wrong direction from having the government less intrusive, less influential on our lives. And who is the other partner, a full partner means the other partner has as much to say as you have to say. Those are troubling words and they trouble me.

Another problem, and there are many with this bill, there is a migratory workers program. Funds made available under this section shall be used to carry out comprehensive work force and career development activities and related services for migrant farm workers, seasonal farm workers, which may include employment, training, educational assistance, literacy assistance and English literacy program, worker safety training, housing, so we have a housing program here, supportive services and the continuation of the case management database.

Now, supportive services in this bill consists of transportation, child care, dependent care, and needs-based payments.

I wondered what needs-based payments were and I found that it is money. If a worker, an X worker, a displaced worker, meaning an unemployed worker, has run out of unemployment benefits and has no other income, he is entitled to needs-based payments.

So we are going to pay, provide child care and all these things and that is wonderful. Oh, if we could only afford it. But there is no requirement in this