School was dedicated on September 8, 2005, to honor a man who never wanted recognition for himself but whose dedication to his community and to the Latino people of Santa Ana, California garnered him prestige and love.

Manuel was honored to have a school named for him, and from his hospital bed he tried to hold on so he could be there for the first day of school. Unfortunately, Manuel passed away 2 days before he was able to witness the opening of this school with his name.

He will be remembered fondly and his spirit will go on in all those young people who enter the doors of the Esqueda Elementary School in Santa Ana.

□ 1015

TAX BREAKS FOR THE GAMBLING INDUSTRY

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the White House is planning to provide the gambling industry in the gulf region with special tax breaks as part of their economic recovery package. This is a disgrace.

In the wake of devastation left by Hurricane Katrina, taxpayer dollars should be helping these, indeed, the poor and the vulnerable.

In today's Washington Post, White House officials are quoted as saying they do not plan to exclude the gambling interests from receiving tax breaks.

In Mississippi, the gambling interests do not even receive special economic development tax breaks. I am outraged. And probably more telling is the shock coming from the industry itself.

A Harrah's spokesman in this morning's Post is quoted as saying, ''We're actually scratching our heads. We can't ever remember an instance of being offered a tax credit, ever!''

Economists in Mississippi say it is not needed. ''The casinos don't need this. If they are eligible, that would be a complete waste of money,'' from an economist from Ole Miss in The Washington Post today.

It is outrageous with budget deficits growing to historic levels, tax breaks for the gambling industry does not make sense.

The Bush administration, I will tell you, if this is in their package, this will be a disgrace and the American people will turn against this administration.

Give the money to the poor, the needy, the vulnerable, and not to the gambling interests that already have special insurance policies for this.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2123, SCHOOL READINESS ACT OF 2005

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 455

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2123) to reauthorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The resolution before us provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2123, the School Readiness Act of 2005, and makes a good number of important amendments in order and will provide for a full and wide-ranging debate on all the aspects of the Head Start program.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2123 was passed out of the Committee on Education and the Workforce unanimously. It reauthorizes the Head Start program for fiscal 2011. At the same time, the bill incorporates a number of wide-ranging and widely supported commonsense improvements to Head Start which will improve teacher education standards, increase the accountability for the use of funds, and enhance outreach to the most deserving students.

The underlying bill does not include provisions which were deemed by some controversial in the base text, such as providing hiring protection for faith-based Head Start providers. Instead, the rule does provide for this and other items to be debated and voted upon separately so that the House may work its will and the final outcome will reflect the views of the majority of the Members, which is an understandable approach.

The Head Start program has provided comprehensive early childhood development services to low-income and disadvantaged children since the mid-1960s. Today, almost 1 million students are involved in Head Start. The Head Start program is good. In some places the Head Start program is great.

I do not want to be a little bit parochial here, but being well acquainted with those involved in Head Start in my particular area, they do a great job and I am very proud of my association with them. But in each of these situations, the program still could be better. For that purpose, this bill focuses or attempts to focus the academic program more clearly in particular areas. They put greater emphasis on language skills, prereading, premath, and cognitive skills. They insist that any new money above and beyond the funding skills, 60 percent of that be tendered only to teacher quality, which is where that emphasis needs to be.

The Head Start program is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services and is accomplished through grants that directly go to applying entities.

The Head Start program has been largely successful because the Head Start program is locally designed and they are administered by a network of 1,600 public and private nonprofit and forprofit agencies at the local level. Because of this local emphasis, educators can tailor their approaches to fill the specific needs of the populations they serve, instead of a one-size-fits-all approach that too many other Federal programs, including other Federal education programs, have.

Especially important is this particular thing, that in the text of this particular bill it puts a greater emphasis on tying Head Start programs to a State's curricular standards. To be a priority grantee in the Head Start program, they have to show a pure correlation to a State's curriculum standard. This is for the benefit of the kids coming through the system.

Of increasing specific importance to me is the local tie-in that is demanded by this particular bill. The Head Start

programs have to demonstrate an active support in trying to tie their programs into local school districts. This is essential in the long run if you want to have a smooth transition between Head Start and the local schools. Too often programs running contrary to that simply have a disconnect; and, therefore, there is not local support for these programs. This bill recognizes that is a serious problem and a serious error and attempts to try to bridge that gap by insisting that Head Start programs work closely with their local school districts to provide a seamless entry for those kids going through Head Start into the regular school programs in the States where they are.

The GAO was critical of some financial management standards of the Head Start program. To solve that without losing the purpose of Head Start, which is to help disadvantaged kids prepare for school, they have increased the element of competition within the program. The competition that will be new in this particular program will drive improvements in Head Start; at the same time it will meet the needs of a recommended financial management that the GAO suggested. By looking for and rewarding success in Head Start programs and also looking for and punishing deficiencies in any 5-year cycle, there is an element to try to improve this program, taking a program that is good and great and in every situation making it indeed better.

There are also within this guarantees that there is a guaranteed share of the money that will go to Native American programs, migrant and seasonal workers, the most disadvantaged of the groups that Head Start is trying to help and assist, who will never be placed at a disadvantage in the overall process.

In addition to that, this bill removes certain flawed techniques of evaluation that have been standardly used by the Head Start program and replaces them with something that is more scientifically based.

The rule that is currently before us provides for important amendments and policy discussion, and it is a very fair rule. In addition to a manager's amendment, the chairman of the committee who recommended this bill recommended four amendments, two by Republicans and two by Democrats. The Committee on Rules instead, in addition to the manager's amendment, recommended 11 additional amendments, five by Republicans, six by Democrats.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), for their hard work in placing this bill before the House; and I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules reported out a restrictive rule providing for the consideration of the School Readiness and Head Start Reauthorization Act.

A total of 24 amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules on this bill, 16 by Democratic members and eight by Republicans. In typical fashion, however, only 12 of those amendments were made in order. Half of our colleagues' proposals, half of their legislative ideas, half of their amendments are blocked from consideration under this rule.

This includes, among many others, the McCollum-Van Hollen amendment, which calls for providing assistance to Head Start providers complying with congressional transportation mandates and the rising costs of gasoline. This commonsense amendment provided much needed assistance to Head Start programs that are having to cope with escalating gasoline costs. They are now choosing between buying new books for their students and putting gas into their buses. Unfortunately, the House will not have the opportunity to debate this amendment because it was not made in order under the rule.

As all Members should know, Head Start was created to address the preparatory educational deficiencies among economically disadvantaged children as a part of the War on Poverty. Since that time, millions of children and families have been the beneficiaries of a proven winning educational model for early childhood development.

This body likes to talk about readiness in many contexts: disaster readiness, military readiness, emergency readiness. We devise and implement all kinds of plans in order to be ready or prepared for any eventuality. School readiness is more than just being prepared for entry into the educational system. It is preparation for entry into life's systems.

Head Start is just what it says: a head start. It gives systematically, economically and socially disadvantaged children the head start that potentially allows for the navigation and negotiation of hurdles in life's race that they may not otherwise have been able to maneuver without. It is at this very point in the lives of our children that they are introduced to varying themes and concepts that will shape them into the individuals they will become.

Several of my Democratic colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus have designed excellent amendments designed to broaden the scope of readiness for America's disadvantaged children.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) had an amendment and it asked for the recruitment of African American and Latino men to become Head Start teachers. This was made in order.

The gentleman from Mississippi's (Mr. THOMPSON) amendment calls for the Department of Health and Human Services to provide additional assistance in areas affected by Hurricane Katrina, and I suggested to the Chair that we broaden that to include any disaster so that children are covered who are in the Head Start category.

The gentlewoman from California's (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) amendment allows homeless and foster children to be automatically eligible for Head Start. These amendments were designed to help, not hinder; to move forward, not backward; to grow, not stifle.

□ 1030

I am pleased that they were made in order and enthusiastically support each of these amendments.

Unfortunately, although the underlying legislation has the support of both parties, the rule also makes in order a controversial and discriminatory amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), our colleague. His amendment contains language that should give all of us pause and may cause this bill not to pass should it be approved by this body.

The Boustany amendment allows faith-based Head Start providers to discriminate with regard to religion when hiring personnel to run their programs.

Does this not blatantly and egregiously undermine what we are trying to do here? We are supposed to be about the business of creating opportunities and closing gaps.

The Boustany amendment only creates opportunities of systemic disadvantage and discrimination and closes doors to the very ones trying to open them for America's children.

Even more, title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act clearly stands in opposition to the gentleman from Louisiana's (Mr. BOUSTANY) amendment, the same title VII that was voted on and agreed to by the Members of this great body 41 years ago. Title VII provides every citizen broad-based protection against employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

Supporters of the amendment will argue that the Supreme Court decision in the Amos case allows for the amendment to be in order and is, therefore, constitutional. That decision does, in fact, allow for the consideration of religion in hiring practices. However, it does not allow for the consideration of religion to discriminate in hiring practices.

How soon we forget that it is the very same language that made this bill highly controversial in the 108th Congress, and it will allow for it to be controversial if it passes again. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about the lives of our children, if we are serious about readiness, if we are serious about reauthorizing Head Start, then it is critical that we continue to work in a bipartisan fashion and reject proposals which seek to divide this body

and its Members. The chairman of this committee and the ranking member and the members of this committee have worked very actively to fashion a reasonable and bipartisan effort. Congress should not be in the business of supporting State-sponsored discrimination. Forty-one years ago we said no. Today, 41 years later, no still is no.

The House should, without question or hesitation, reject the Boustany amendment and approve the bipartisan underlying legislation with some of the proposed amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If I could just make a note of the amendments that were not made in order, of the 12, four were defeated in committee. So they did have a hearing in which they were discussed. Two were not germane. One was withdrawn in the committee. One was withdrawn before our Committee on Rules. Two dealt with issues that can be dealt with in other bills and should be dealt with in other bills. One was combined and given preference to a similar bill, and one was a policy issue that we simply said would not be there because it would take money away from the training of teachers, in contradiction with what the bill was trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Utah for yielding time, and Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to act on behalf of the nearly 1 million disadvantaged children in the United States who participate in the Head Start early childhood education program every year. The bill before us, the School Readiness Act, was introduced by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), my friend and colleague, and approved unanimously by the Committee on Education and the Workforce in May.

For four decades, Head Start has provided comprehensive services to help prepare low-income preschool children for success in school and in life. Unfortunately, Head Start children still enter school lagging behind their more affluent peers. If we do not address this readiness gap, Head Start children will continue to enter school without the level of preparedness that we know that they need. Another problem we have witnessed is an alarming number of financial abuses in various Head Start programs, showing that taxpayer dollars are not always being used to serve disadvantaged children and their families.

We must demand more in exchange for the money we are investing, and that is why the bill before us reforms and strengthens the Head Start program. To protect parents, children and taxpayers, the School Readiness Act subjects Head Start operators to an annual independent financial audit and requires them to file an annual financial disclosure statement that documents how Federal Head Start funds were used. These protections are a direct response to the reports of chronic financial abuse that have surfaced in recent years.

Another important component of this bill is that it will create greater competition to ensure Federal dollars are being spent wisely. The bill requires Head Start grantees that fail to meet program requirements to compete in order to continue receiving funds. This commonsense reform will fundamentally shift expectations in the Head Start program by demanding nothing less than the highest quality programs, and for the first time ever, programs that fail to meet expectations will face the possibility of losing Federal funding.

Later today we will debate an important amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), which has been a priority of mine, that will complement our efforts to introduce greater competition into the program. The amendment would help implement a reform initiative at the Department of Health and Human Services designed to address the internal weaknesses in the Head Start management structure and improve its overall effectiveness, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Lastly, I would like to note another critical issue we will consider today in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Faith-based organizations were among the first to reach out and lend a hand in service to those impacted by this disaster. It does not take a hurricane or another large-scale catastrophe to rally faith-based organizations to assist their fellow Americans each and every day. They focus on issues from job training to child care and everything in between. President Bush has called them the armies of compassion, and these armies are always on the front lines when our Nation needs them most.

Too often, the Federal Government has ignored or impeded the efforts of faith-based organizations willing to lend a helping hand in providing critical services to the neediest in our communities. The Boustany amendment will protect the rights of faith-based groups to fully participate in serving Head Start children without relinquishing their religious identities.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act made clear that when faith-based groups hire employees on a religious basis, it is an exercise of the group's civil liberties. Former President Bill Clinton signed four laws explicitly allowing faith-based groups to staff on a religious basis when they receive Federal funds, and a 1987 Supreme Court decision unanimously upheld this right. This amendment deserves the support of all of our colleagues.

I think the rule before us today is a fair rule that makes in order an array of Democrat and Republican amendments, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot impress enough to the chairman that title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies to the use of religious organizations' own resources, not Federal taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my good friend with whom I serve on the Committee on Rules.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a program that works, Head Start, and our efforts today to reauthorize the program in this School Readiness Act.

Head Start has proven itself time and time again to be an effective program and a worthwhile investment of Federal dollars. For every dollar invested, we see a $7 return. Imagine those returns on the stock market. An investment of $100,000 means that ultimately you would see $700,000 in your account. In fact, with those returns, we should be authorizing a higher level of funding.

We are all aware of just how critical a child's first years are, and this is a program that is so much more than just early education and reading skills. It is also about health care, nutritional and social benefits for the children as well as their parents. Head Start is about ensuring children are on the right path as they begin their education careers.

Earlier this year, I visited two of the over 110 Head Start centers in Sacramento County in my district. During the visit, I witnessed the tangible reward of this program, as well as the harder-to-define benefits.

At one of the centers, they were learning about shoes, from slippers and sneakers to work boots and rain boots. The children were not only learning about how the shoes indicated what people were doing, but about all of the possibilities available to them; that one day they, too, could be wearing those doctor's booties or those firefighter's boots.

With a goal in mind, maybe not consciously outlined but still a hint of an idea, these children began to dream about the positive benefits of education and where in life an education can take them.

Lifting children out of poverty, offering them hope and possibility instead of despair is truly a worthwhile endeavor, a lesson that Head Start works to teach.

I do have one concern today, and that is about the possibility that an amendment allowing religious discrimination could be added to this legislation. The idea of discrimination is not something we should be teaching our children. By allowing this discrimination, we could be blocking countless parents from rising out of poverty. Already, thousands of parents have transitioned from parent volunteer to a full-time paid Head Start teacher.

There is a bigger and more fundamental issue at stake. Head Start emerged from the civil rights platform of equality and minimizing the reach of poverty in this Nation. Yet, this amendment is about allowing discrimination.

Discrimination only serves to divide us. It pits one individual against another, one group against another, something we see far too often. This is not a lesson the children should learn.

Head Start is a good program. We should keep it that way, for all the children of Sacramento and all across the country. I would hope that during consideration of this legislation today, we would vote down the religious discrimination amendment so we can see this good bill move forward.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am more than pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and of the underlying Head Start bill. Since I was elected to Congress in 2000, we have increased Head Start funding by 28 percent, from $5.8 billion in 2000 to $6.8 billion today.

Head Start is a crucial program for over 900,000 of our Nation's most needy students. It provides child development, educational, health, nutritional, social and other activities to help prepare young children for kindergarten. A good Head Start program will make sure that low-income 4-year-old children will know their ABCs, be able to count to 20, have the building blocks they need to hit the ground running on their first day of kindergarten.

We know today how important early childhood education is to a child's long-term success. Head Start makes sure that children from low-income families have the educational foundation they need to succeed.

As a father of two, I know firsthand how precious our children's first years are and how important they are to our children's future. I am proud of Congress' increased support for low-income children through the Head Start program, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the Head Start reauthorization bill.

□ 1045

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere disappointment in the Committee on Rules decision to report a restrictive rule for consideration of the bill before us today, the reauthorization of Head Start, the future of our children.

Several commonsense amendments were not ruled in order. Not surprising, most of them were Democratic amendments. Instead, several amendments that were ruled in order will weaken Head Start and the opportunity for our children.

In the committee, there was support of adding the language ''faith-based'' into the bill, even though faith-based institutions currently participate in providing Head Start programs. We were happy to do this in committee; I was also, along with my colleagues, because the Equal Opportunity Employment Act is also spelled out clearly in the bill, which does not allow for discrimination in hiring.

But there was another amendment that was not ruled in order, my amendment, an amendment which would have protected the privacy of our faith-based organizations and the integrity of our tax dollars. The amendment that I offered in the Committee on Rules would have simply required faith-based organizations to create a separate bank account, a separate bank account in which to receive Federal dollars for the Head Start program, a distinct and separate bank account from the private dollars that a religious organization collects to put forward their religious mission.

Why do we need to do that? Well, first, we need to protect Federal tax dollars from being used improperly; and, secondly, we need to protect the privacy of faith-based organizations' accounting books for their religious mission. With the commingling of funds, if fraud is suspected, a faith-based organization would have to open up all of their books for inspection. My amendment would have required separate accounts, therefore, protecting the church's mission and the Federal education mission of Head Start.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote from the Covenant Companion, a Christian publication. I quote from this publication, and I will also include this in the RECORD, as well as two other publications that speak to this. From the Covenant: ''Churches are particularly vulnerable to embezzlement because of the high-level of trust given to employees and volunteers that lack the sophistication, fiscal controls, and oversight.''

My amendment simply would have been a preemptive strike against financial abuse that we know will happen because it has already occurred. For example, this past summer, $80,000 was stolen from a Federal Head Start program run by a church.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule. We need a new rule, one that will protect the taxpayers, one that will protect faith-based organizations and stop discrimination.

[From the Covenant Companion, Apr. 2003]

WHEN THE NUMBERS DON'T ADD UP

(By Bob Smietana)

Sandra had a problem—an overdue Visa bill for $672 and no cash to pay it. And the Visa bill wasn't the only problem. Sandra was behind on a number of other bills and her creditors were calling. And calling.

Then Sandra, the bookkeeper at a small manufacturing company in Kansas, came up with a desperate plan. She would use one of the company's checks to pay her bill. ''I thought, just this one time, just to get back on my feet,'' she told Fortune Small Business (FSB) magazine. ''No one will know.''

To disguise her actions, Sandra recorded the check under the name of one of the company's vendors. When the bank statement came, she removed the canceled check, leaving no trace of the theft.

But it wasn't just one time. From 1992 to 1999, Sandra, a former small town cheerleader and mother of two, wrote out eighty-eight checks to pay her bills and made eighty-eight false entries. The total, according to FSB, was $248,383—all of it going to pay living expenses. Since her employers at the small, family-run business trusted her, they never checked her work.

The embezzlement was discovered when Sandra went on vacation. While she was gone, one of the canceled checks was found and her boss discovered what she had done. Sandra was convicted of embezzlement and sentenced to eighteen months in prison.

While fraud at major companies like World Com and Enron have made headlines in recent years, small businesses, nonprofits, and churches arc particularly vulnerable to embezzlement because of the level of trust given to employees and volunteers and the lack of sophisticated financial controls and oversight.

In the past three years, GuideOne, which insures 45,000 churches in the United States, paid 3,845 claims to churches for losses from theft (by people outside the church) or embezzlement (by people inside the church). Those claims total over $8 million, with an average claim of $2,106.

In the past ten years, at least eleven Covenant churches have reported being victims of embezzlement, with anywhere from ''just over'' $10,000 to more than $300,000 taken by people they trusted—volunteer treasurers, church staff, even a pastor. At least one major embezzlement at a Covenant church was discovered in 2002. And the actual number of embezzlements is likely higher because many churches are reluctant to report when a member of the church has embezzled money.

Kent Egging, interim pastor of Bethany Covenant Church in Mount Vernon, Washington, has studied embezzlement in churches as part of a doctor of ministry degree program. Egging also knows the effects of embezzlement on a church firsthand—while he was co-pastor of a Covenant church in Portland, Oregon, the church's treasurer embezzled more than $45,000.

The embezzlement began in 1992, soon after Jim, a member of the church, became treasurer. His main qualification, Egging says, was not formal training in business or accounting—''he was willing to do the job.''

Soon after starting, Jim learned that the church had a separate account to handle funds for a campaign to build a Christian education (CE) wing. Since the funds were not needed immediately, there seemed to be no need to closely monitor the account.

That separate account gave Jim two things that an embezzler needs to succeed—access and no accountability. ''He found he could transfer funds into this CE account and then withdraw them,'' says Egging, ''and absolutely nobody knew.''

The transfers were made by phone, leaving no paper trail, and then the treasurer would create a false financial statement, which made it appear that the transactions had never taken place.

''When the building committee began asking for access to the CE funds, they had a hard time getting Jim to write them a check. In April 1993, he admitted—at first—taking $20,000. After learning about the embezzlement, the church discussed whether or not to call the police. In the process, Egging talked with a friend who worked in the local district attorney's office.

''You call the police now,'' his friend told him. ''You call them now. Here's what I can tell you—if he says it's twenty, it's probably forty. If he says he'll do anything you want right now to repay it, two months from now he won't be willing to do anything.''

Much of what Egging's friend said was accurate. A thorough investigation revealed that $45,000 was missing. While the church filed a police report, they did not press charges. Instead, they reached a binding agreement with their former treasurer to repay the money.

''We ended up having a stipulated statement of judgment,'' says Egging, ''which is a combination of a legally binding confession to a crime, so there is no need for prosecution, and a contract for repayment.'' The agreement for repayment was for about $50,000. The church only received about $300.

Restoring trust after an embezzlement at a church is a long process. The first step is getting an accurate picture of what was lost. ''It was very important for us to do a proper accounting,'' says Egging. ''The biggest issue in all of this is trust, the violation of trust. It's not about the money so much. It's about the trust. He violated our trust. The trust of leaders in the congregation was in question because of this.''

To prevent any embezzlement from happening in the future, the church revamped its entire financial system. They hired a CPA to set up and monitor new accounting procedures. The church changed its bank accounts so that telephone transfers were no longer allowed. All financial statements were kept at the church, and all accounting work was done on the church's office computer rather than on a volunteer's home computer. That's an area of vulnerability in most churches, says Egging.

''I would bet that most churches in America have some or a significant number of financial records at somebody's house in a box or on somebody's home computer,'' he says, ''because home computers are generally better than church computers. A church wants to make it easy for a volunteer who's working on church finances.''

Embezzlement can happen even when a church has taken steps to prevent financial losses. That was the case at Highland Covenant Church in Bellevue, Washington, during the mid-1990s. The church had a number of common financial safeguards in place—two signatures were required on every check, two people were present whenever collections were counted, and the church did an internal audit of its book each year. Highland also practiced a ''segregation of duties.'' One person, the financial secretary, deposited funds; another person, the bookkeeper, prepared checks. Neither the bookkeeper nor the financial secretary was allowed to sign checks.

For the most part, Beth, the church's bookkeeper, generated Highland's checks on her computer. ''But every few months, she would call up and say her printer wasn't working,'' says Dave Kersten, who was pastor of Highland Covenant from 1986 to 1997.

When this happened, Beth would prepare all of the payroll checks by hand and then send them to the church office to be signed. After they were signed, she would alter the checks, adding just a single digit to increase the amount, sometimes by several thousand dollars.

''She would write herself a check and her husband a check, because he was the part-time janitor,'' says Kersten. ''Instead of it being a check for $700—it could become a check for $4,700.'' Over a seven-year period, Beth took more than $300,000.

The embezzlement was not detected because the church's bookkeeper had control of the bank statements. Early on, she had asked that all of the church's bank statement be sent to her home. ''And in a very trusting environment,'' says Kersten, ''that was the big mistake.''

When the first altered check was discovered, Kersten called the Bellevue police and spoke to a fraud detective.

''As soon as he heard that she had control of the bank statements, he knew that he had a real case,'' Kersten says. ''Invariably, when an organization allows a person who is writing the checks to control the bank statements, they are very vulnerable.''

While the church's financial reports indicated that it had money in savings and other discretionary funds, that proved to be false as well. All of those funds had been folded into the church's checking account. And because the embezzlement had taken place slowly, over a long period of time, it was easier to hide even during internal audits.

Each year, two members were appointed to audit the books. They would call up Beth and ask her to send 3 months of statements, picked at random. ''She would pick months she didn't embezzle any funds and send them those accounts,'' says Kersten. ''The books balanced and that was the end of the story.''

The embezzlement came to light in April 1995, after the church let Beth go as bookkeeper because of suspicions that something was wrong with the church's finances. She was arrested, tried, convicted, and sentenced to 40 months in jail. The decision to turn the matter over to the police had been fairly straightforward, because of the amount of money involved.

Because their policy limited the amount of losses due to embezzlement or fraud, Highland received less than $20,000 from their insurance company. But the church was able to recover from the embezzlement, and by the time Kersten left in 1997, had rebuilt their savings and completed a major fundraising campaign.

Most churches, charities, and businesses that arc victims of embezzlement are never able to recover the funds they lost. Often their insurance policies have clauses that limit liability due to fraud. Many embezzlers have financial problems and, despite stealing large sums of money, have no assets left when they arc caught. And while embezzlers often make restitution plans, it is difficult to enforce them.

Remember Sandra, the accountant from Kansas? She was released from prison 2 months early so she could start repaying what she stole. According to FSB, she makes a monthly payment of $100—at that rate, it will take 20 years to pay it all back. She said she told her story because she wanted to help prevent other people from making the same mistakes she did.

''I'm not a bad person,'' Sandra told FSB. ''But I did a really bad thing.''

PROTECTING YOUR MINISTRY FROM INTERNAL THREATS

When Fred Meyers was elected treasurer of First Community Church, it didn't take him long to realize something wasn't adding up with the church's finances. After scouring the church ledger and consulting a private CPA, Meyers informed church leaders that First Community had been the victim of embezzlement.

Church leaders soon discovered that, over the past several years, an usher had been directing offering money into his own pockets. Overall, nearly $10,000 of tithes and offerings never made it into the church's account.

In the business world, embezzlement is the most common financial crime in the Nation. Unfortunately, it's also a frequent crime against churches and not-for-profit ministries. And, unlike other crimes against religious organizations, embezzlement is perpetrated by a trusted person from within.

Most church leaders don't want to acknowledge the likelihood of one of their own parishioners or employees committing a crime against their organization. But, although these types of crimes may not be widespread, they are common enough-and costly enough-to warrant preventive measures.

PUT IT IN WRITING

Develop a comprehensive written policy governing the handling of your ministry's finances. This policy should clearly spell out the procedures for handling church finances, making deposits and withdrawals from church accounts, accessing financial records, and conducting other financial business.

Having procedures in writing and explaining these procedures to employees and volunteers will promote consistent handling of your organization's finances. Written guidelines let everyone know what's expected of them. And, they discourage dishonest employees from using ignorance of proper procedures as a defense of their criminal actions.

In addition to a written policy for handling finances, it's helpful to have written position descriptions for all employees and volunteers. Position descriptions can eliminate confusion over who has access to certain financial documents and who's authorized to perform certain financial functions.

Document all financial transactions clearly and immediately. Record deposits, withdrawals, loan payments, payroll, and any other financial transactions. Keep these records (and duplicates, if necessary) in a safe place. By documenting all financial procedures, your organization can detect discrepancies quickly, protect honest employees from unwarranted accusations, and gather necessary evidence to identify criminals in the event of a financial crime.

Implement a program for documenting suspicious financial incidents. In many cases, at least one other employee or volunteer is aware of—or at least suspicious of—fraud or embezzlement. Making it easy and safe for employees and volunteers to report suspicious financial activity will make it more likely that they'll come forward with helpful information.

Develop a program for handling church finances in which the receipt, deposit, distribution, and documentation of church money is carried out by different people. Require dual signatures for financial transactions like withdrawals or for endorsing and cashing church checks for more than a certain dollar amount. If control over financial operations is divided among several people, it will be extremely difficult for discrepancies to go undetected.

WATCH OVER YOUR OFFERINGS

Tithes and offerings represent the greatest internal threat of loss to churches and ministries. And, because significant portions of offerings are made in cash and are usually collected and counted by volunteers, the misuse or misappropriation of cash offerings is one of the easier crimes to commit against churches.

To protect your church's offerings, follow these steps:

Ask your congregants to place financial gifts in envelopes preprinted with their names and addresses before placing them in the offering plate. This will make it harder to discern what portion of the offering is cash and what portion is checks.

Always have at least two people present when counting the offering. It's best to use longtime church members who've established a reputation of being trustworthy. Develop a list of such people, and periodically rotate those on the list when offerings are counted. Also, avoid counting the offering behind closed doors.

Stamp checks ''For Deposit Only'' when endorsing them. This will make it more difficult for the money to be redirected anywhere except to your church's account. Also, using colored ink, rather than black ink, on rubber stamp images makes it harder to use a copy machine to forge them.

Have an independent certified public accountant (CPA) periodically review your financial control procedures. A CPA can tell you whether your procedures are adequate and give you additional guidelines to help you protect your finances from threats from within.

PROTECT YOUR PHYSICAL PROPERTY

In addition to financial assets, physical property is a favorite target for criminals within an organization. Follow these tips to protect your property:

Use a safe for petty cash, small valuables, keys, and important documents. Keep important financial records and personnel documents in a safe or a locked filing cabinet. Only a few necessary staff members should have access to the key or combination.

Establish a key monitoring system. Use keys with serial numbers on them to keep track of which employee or volunteer has which key. Avoid keeping spare keys. If they're necessary, keep them locked in a secure place. Collect keys from employees or volunteers who leave the organization.

Keep interior office, classroom, and supply room doors locked when not in use.

Give master keys only to those people who need them. If someone only needs a key to get into a classroom, that person may not also need a key that opens the church office.

Control access to security codes. If your church or ministry has a security system, be sure that only a few necessary staff members know the codes. Additionally, it's a good idea to occasionally change codes or passwords. Be sure to change the codes whenever anyone with access to them leaves the organization.

Keep a personal property inventory of your organization's physical property. This will help you quickly tell if something is missing, establish proper insurance protection, and allow a faster, more comprehensive recovery in the event of a loss.

Taking steps to prevent internal crime is just as important as guarding against threats from the outside. Following these guidelines will help you reduce the chance of being victimized from within and help you avoid the high physical, emotional, and monetary costs it can bring.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from Minnesota. I understand her feelings about not being allowed to have an amendment placed in order on the floor. I have been in that situation myself several times.

I would simply point out that the particular amendment to which the gentlewoman refers was offered in the committee itself and was defeated on a bipartisan vote in that committee. It was one of the concepts that we thought was not necessary to replow all old ground over and over again, and that is probably one of the reasons why this particular amendment was not placed in order by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), my good friend and a leader in the fight for education and for veterans and other affairs in this Congress.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, as the father of two young sons, I am a strong supporter of the Head Start program because I want every child in America to have a chance to reach his or her highest God-given potential. As a person of faith, I believe in the important role of faith-based organizations in addressing society's needs, including the education needs of children. But also as a person of faith, someone who has revered my religious freedom under the Constitution, I am deeply disappointed and offended that the Republican leadership of this House has allowed an amendment on the floor today that would deny potentially hundreds of thousands of American citizens a government-funded job simply because of their religious faith.

How ironic and disappointing it is that just at the very same time that we are preaching to the Iraqis that they should adopt a constitution that protects religious freedom, the Republican leadership of this House is willing to deny that freedom, that religious freedom to American citizens.

I wonder how the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), who is the floor manager on the Republican side of this rule, would feel, Mr. Speaker, if right now I asked him to answer my 20-point religious test. I hope he would be offended that I would ask him 20 specific questions about his personal religious faith. Yet that gentleman and others who support this rule and the Boustany amendment would allow faith-based groups, using tax dollars to give every individual applying for a job to teach children how to have a better life in the world, allow them to give a personal detailed religious test.

And then they can say, you know what, even though you have a Ph.D. in education and 30 years of experience in helping young children get a better education, we are going to deny you, Mr. Jones or Mrs. Smith, this federally funded Head Start job because you did not pass our personal religious test. No American citizen should have to choose between his or her religious faith and a job, a job paid for by American taxpayers.

What is wrong with this, the Boustany amendment, is that it would allow religious discrimination, period. Call it what you want, it would allow religious discrimination. Number two, it is worse than that. It actually uses taxpayers' money to subsidize religious discrimination and bigotry.

Next, I think it is inconsistent with article VI of the Constitution. We have heard a lot of debate about strict construction of the Constitution. Article VI, the only reference to religion in the original Constitution before the amendments were passed, said basically that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. The spirit of that article is that you should not have to pass a religious test to get a publicly funded taxpayer-paid-for job.

Talk about strict interpretation of the Constitution. If having to choose between my religious faith and getting a Head Start tax-funded job is not restricting my religious freedom, then what is?

Let me tell you what could happen under the Boustany amendment, which the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) said he supported, because it is pretty ugly.

I could get a Federal million dollar taxpayer job grant and put out a sign that says ''No Jews or Catholics need apply here to this federally funded job.'' Another group might put out a sign that says ''No Baptists or Methodists need apply here for a federally funded job.'' Another group might put out a sign that says ''No Mormons need apply here for a federally funded job.'' Despite the fact they are qualified to help children have a better life, have a Ph.D. in early childhood education or even special education, simply because of their religious faith they are denied the right to have that job to help children.

That is morally wrong. Shame on the Republican leadership for endorsing and subsidizing religious discrimination.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my classmate, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Education Reform, the subcommittee of relevant jurisdiction for this legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. The Committee on Education and the Workforce voted for this Head Start bill unanimously, 48 to 0. But many of our Republican colleagues today would destroy this bill, making it partisan by allowing religious discrimination in hiring while using Federal funds, using taxpayer dollars.

Most Democrats were not allowed to bring their amendments here to the floor for debate, although a bill was allowed that would add religious discrimination to this Head Start bill. It is a poison pill.

I offered an amendment with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) to fully fund Head Start and

to increase funding for early Head Start. Even though we are serving fewer than half of eligible children, the first 4 years of the George W. Bush administration included four of the five smallest Head Start funding increases since 1991. And the number of children served by Head Start has increased by less than one-tenth of 1 percent since the end of the Clinton administration.

In a country as wealthy as ours, this is not acceptable. It is also not acceptable that while denying Democrats a debate on expanding access for children, we will debate an amendment from the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) to allow some providers to divert public funds to private profit.

Opponents of my amendment will say that they would like to increase funding for Head Start, but that they just cannot because budget constraints make it impossible. But this is authorizing legislation, Mr. Speaker, and authorizing legislation should tell appropriators what we need to accomplish our goals. If appropriators do not have the resources to do this, it is only because the administration and this Congress choose more tax cuts for the wealthiest among us over help for our children.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, once again I share the frustration and understand the gentlewoman from California, as to her amendment not being made in order here. But I once again would point out that the amendment was presented in the committee and was rejected by the committee. And once again, it is not necessary to replow old ground every time the bill appears before the group again. So I appreciate that consideration very much.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), a man of the cloth, a reverend representative.

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and my goal here is to make a point, not to make an enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in strong opposition to the Boustany amendment and to add my name to the chorus of religious individuals and organizations that oppose this ill-conceived and harmful amendment.

As an ordained minister of the United Methodist Church, I recognize the important role faith-based organizations play in providing educational, health, and social support services to low-income children and their parents. The faith-based community has long played an active role in operating Head Start programs and has done so while upholding the Constitution and civil rights standards. By the faith community, we have been able to provide all kinds of services. In fact, my first job after college was working in Catholic Charities, which received tens of millions of Federal dollars to run programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is not only bad policy; this is bad theology. In my religious tradition, we give great recognition to the Apostle Paul, who said: ''There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free,'' and it goes on to say: ''Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, tender mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering.'' That is not in this amendment.

Proponents of this amendment claim it is necessary to protect religious freedom. I will tell you now, as a pastor, that I take offense at that claim. How is religious freedom served when we force a teacher to choose between her faith and her job? How is it religious freedom when we tell children that they can lose their teacher because she or he is from the wrong faith? How is it religious freedom when we frustrate the laws of the land?

And make no mistake, should this amendment pass, the children served by Head Start, those most at risk, would be the ones who suffer. Tens of thousands of children currently in Head Start could lose their teachers to whom they have bonded.

□ 1100

And their parents could be denied the chance to climb out of poverty by moving from Head Start, discriminating against current and potential teachers because of religion, causing children to lose one of the most important adults in their lives, denying parents the chance to elevate themselves out of poverty.

There is no doubt in my mind that these things are not only harmful, they are immoral. This is not good for America. This body has no business undoing prohibitions against bigotry.

Churches have been seen historically as a citadel for justice, a place of peace, a place of racial harmony. This can be seen as a subterfuge for bigotry. When someone comes to the St. James United Methodist Church, which I pastor, they know that they are going to be considered for employment based on their qualifications and there is no subterfuge for bigotry.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is a time and place for everything we do. If this rule is passed, there will be a 30-minute time and place to discuss the details of the specific amendment which has been referred to several times. I hope saying there is a time and place for that, and I apologize since I am paraphrasing from a faith-based piece of literature, and if it would be more profitable I could say I am paraphrasing from a popular song of the counterculture of the 1960s, and I am sure that would absolve anyone with 9th and 10th Circuit concerns. But let me say just one particular word, and I appreciate the comments that have been made so far.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is the rule on if an amendment should be debated, which is far different than actually debating the amendment itself.

Since the minority has jumped over that line and tried to go into the amendment itself, let me say a couple of things about it, and I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Texas.

I served as a missionary from my church for a couple of years. I am used to people asking me those questions, so if the gentleman has got more, he should. Although when you put the discrimination, if the gentleman put my religion first instead of the end of the line, it would have been nicer.

I also was a school teacher, and I realize in the article the gentleman quoted from the Constitution I was an officer of public office and trust.

What we are talking about here is simply whether a church who is organized should be able to hire Members of their church to work for their church. That is a concept which has been upheld in statute by this body. It is a concept which has been upheld by the courts. Should the State be able to compel a church to hire somebody outside of that church to work for that church: That is the question. Then the issue is once you have decided that, and it has been decided by both the courts and the legislature, can we allow those people to help kids?

What we are talking about is if we can help kids and how best we can help kids. The entire purpose of this act is to try and focus academic efforts to try and make sure that kids are prepared to enter the school system, and are there groups that can help kids. We should not put some kind of artificial barrier in front of groups that can help kids from actually doing that, especially when they are functioning under the rules that we have established and have been upheld by the courts.

This debate is going to be extremely lively during its proper time and place during the debate on the floor when the amendment is presented.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My distinguished friend on the Committee on Rules never ceases to amaze me, but he has done it again. The gentleman says we are going to have a time and place to debate this. It will be for 30 minutes; 435 Members of this body are going to have 30 minutes to debate this. For the gentleman's information, the Boustany amendment has been made in order. And yes, we are discussing it and this is the time and this is the place to make sure that we do not discriminate with Federal dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule on the basis of an exclusion of some very pertinent amendments, but I have to respond to what I just heard. It is not the church that hires the individual, it is the Federal Government's money that is being utilized. You are missing this point. Do not, and I warn everyone about this, do not place one party against the other. We support faith-based, but taxpayers should not have their money taken so that one church can say you are not of this religion so you cannot work for me. That is discrimination and it will never stand up with the Constitution.

How dare anyone say on this floor that we are allowed to separate with Federal money, with Federal money, the horror of tens of thousands of desperately poor Americans trapped in an environment of extreme neglect, abandoned by its government, left behind to fend for themselves without the most basic resources to survive? We witnessed that in the last 3 weeks. We witnessed the aftermath and we witnessed a wake-up call to America.

I am proud that Americans have opened their hearts in the wake of this tragedy to lend a helping hand that the government at first refused. America believes in giving all of its citizens the resources and opportunities to make a decent life for themselves and their families. America believes in bringing the buses in on time so everyone gets out, not just the wealthiest among us.

Head Start is that helping hand. Head Start is bringing the buses in before the floodwaters of poverty trap people in a desperate life of illiteracy, unemployment, crumbling homes, dangerous streets, drug addiction, and no hope.

If we did not know it before, the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina has reaffirmed that a Head Start is the very least we owe each other; so I am pleased that there is bipartisan efforts to put this reauthorization bill together. It protects the basic structure of the program. I commend the gentleman for that. But do not separate those of us in this room in saying those are for values and these are not for values. We are talking about a very narrow scope of debate here. Head Start programs continue to address the many needs of low-income children and their families.

In the words of Cecile Dickey, the former executive director of Head Start in Paterson, New Jersey, my home town, and a personal hero of mine, she was there when we started Head Start in this Nation, and she said, ''You cannot do anything for the kids without doing something for their parents, too. That is why we have programs designed to help them improve themselves through education and job training, as well as opportunities for them to be involved in planning activities involving their children. We serve the entire family unit.''

Cecile is a perfect example of how Head Start can turn a family's life around. A struggling young mother with two children working in a daycare center, she was recruited by Head Start as a teacher, trained at New York University. Through Head Start, Cecile learned that looking out for her kids meant looking out for her community, and she became a tremendous advocate for her sons.

A struggling young mother with two children working in a day care center, she was recruited by Head Start as a teacher and trained at New York University.

Through Head Start, Cecile learned that looking out for her kids meant looking out for her community, and she became a tremendous advocate for her sons, and for the children of Paterson.

Cecile's four sons, two of whom were Head Start children, have grown up to be surgeons, engineers, and teachers.

Cecile and other Head Start advocates argue that the only problem with the program is that not enough eligible children can be served.

Nationwide, nearly 50 percent of three and four year olds who qualify by their parents' income have been denied this opportunity in the last few years. In Paterson alone, over 2,000 eligible children are on the waiting list.

A study by Rutgers University has reported that high quality pre-school more than pays for itself.

When children are enrolled in pre-school programs, mothers are better equipped to find stable, paying jobs. After these children leave school, they earn $143,000 more over their lifetimes and are less likely to need special education than other children.

This program has had tremendous success at improving educational and social outcomes for children, and is a good deal for the country: It costs American taxpayers a little more than $6 billion a year, or one third of one percent of the national budget.

I hope that the House today will vote for this good bipartisan bill, and will vote down any poison pill amendment that will allow hiring and firing on the basis of religious affiliation. This is anti-American.

It will be a shame if all the bipartisan hard work that has gone into crafting this worthy legislation was scuttled by the cynical attempts of a few to codify discrimination into our national laws.

No rule for more amendments should have been in order. I urge my colleagues in the House to continue to expand its support of a program that every American can be proud of.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). I have always enjoyed his comments in the Committee on Rules, and I have oftentimes agreed with his comments in the Committee on Rules.

I do disagree here about the concept of time and place and when this amendment should be discussed. I would point out that contrary to what we sometimes hear on the floor, the minority's first approach on this particular amendment was to try to ban it and take it off the table so it would not be discussed. That did not pass, and there will be a time for discussion. I am sure when the amendment is actually before us, it will be a remarkable discussion based on what we have had right now on the rule on if we discuss the amendment. But I appreciate very much the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the sponsor of this piece of legislation; not the rule, but the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to say a couple of things. I will speak more when the bill is on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we worked very hard to make this a piece of legislation that could be supported by all of us, and I think we succeeded on that, as was shown by the unanimous vote coming out of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

There are a lot of issues. It is not quite as easy as it sounds. I thank the staff on both sides who had a great deal to do with that.

I also would like to say that I think the Committee on Rules has been extremely fair. I would hope that this is a rule that all Members could support. We may disagree, and in fact I disagree with a couple of the amendments, but I agree with most of them on both sides. I think there are some very good, positive suggestions, and I know sometimes we complain about closed rules, whatever, but this is certainly a rule that is not closed, that is going to allow a lot of opportunity for debate.

I have listened to part of the debate here on the faith-based that is going to go on all day, I suppose. There is disagreement with respect to that, which is unfortunate because it detracts from what is a piece of legislation that otherwise we could all support. But on the other hand, there are strong views on that and I think they have a right to be recognized, and a vote needs to be taken on that, too.

I would like to say that things have changed a great deal with how we look at Head Start. In fact, in some ways it was a poverty program when it began. It was basically a social service program to a great degree. We are now diverting it to more of an academic program. There is no question about that, and I think that is good. We need to get all of these kids up to the starting line, equal. That is what it is all about. If a child is 3 or 4, we need to give them that opportunity.

I think this legislation does that. I think we are all in that together. I think everybody in this building would agree that we need to do that. So I hope we keep that in mind as we look at our amendments and the legislation, and hopefully when the day is over we can move forward in helping these young people.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my classmate and good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule because it allows the Boustany amendment. Let us be clear. First of all, faith-based organizations sponsor Head Start programs now. They have and they will continue to. My own church hosted a Head Start program. They sponsor the programs, just like everybody else, on a level playing field. They have to use the money for Head Start and they cannot discriminate in employment.

Any organization that can sponsor a Head Start program under that amendment can do it anyway if they agree not to discriminate. We are talking just about discrimination. We are not talking about allowing groups to sponsor Head Start programs. We are talking about allowing them to discriminate in employment with the Federal money.

Now they can still discriminate with the church money, just not with the Federal money. This discussion really represents a profound change in civil rights discussions, because there was a time traditionally if an employer had a problem with somebody's religion, the employer has a problem because the weight of the Federal Government would come down supporting the victim. Now we are talking about what rights the group has to discriminate against the victim.

If we are talking about religion, we are also talking about race because if you can discriminate based on religion, some religions are virtually all white, others virtually all black. So if you can discriminate based on religion, you can discriminate based on race. Where is your moral authority to tell somebody with their private money what they can do and cannot do, if you are going to turn around and allow people to discriminate with Federal money?

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong and a rule that allows that is wrong. There used to be a time when parents would have to describe to their children why they could not eat at the lunch counter, why they had to sit in the back of the bus, why they could not get a job at certain firms. And now we are going to have to have parents tell children why they could not get a job at the Head Start program while their neighbors could get a job at the Head Start program.

I want to remind Members that any organization can sponsor the federally funded Head Start program now if they agree not to discriminate. We do not need to turn the clock back, and we also do not need a rule that allows this to ruin the Head Start program.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. Fortuño).

Mr. FORTUNO. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 explicitly protects the rights of faith-based organizations to exercise their civil liberties and take religion into account in their hiring practices.

Actually, when faith-based groups hire employees on a religious basis, they are actually exercising their civil liberties. Faith-based organizations cannot be expected to sustain their religion mission without the ability to employ individuals who share the tenets and practices of their faith, because it is that faith that motivates them to serve their neighbors in trouble.

□ 1115

I can tell the Members about this. In my home district of Puerto Rico, I see this all the time. Actually, on the Head Start program in the San Juan metropolitan area, it has been run for years by the Catholic Church. Are we going to tell the Catholic Church whom they can hire and not hire for the good job they are doing? That is exactly what we are trying to do here. Actually, it will make it very difficult, make them liable for hiring practices when, in fact, what they are doing is that they are giving back to society in the way that no government entity can actually give back in the way that these religious organizations are giving back.

So essentially going back to my basic argument, since 1964 we have recognized this right of the religious organizations that are involved in these faith-based activities. We cannot turn back actually from what we did in 1964 by trying to impose new rules that will simply impair their capacity to handle what they are handling today in such an able way.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

These arguments are well rehearsed. We seem to go through these on a regular basis, and I certainly admire the tenacity with which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and others defend their position.

However, as has already been stated, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, I believe, does explicitly protect the rights of faith-based organizations to exercise their civil liberties and take religion into account in their hiring practices, and I do not know why we seem to continually have trouble assimilating that into our collective body of knowledge here.

When faith-based groups hire employees on a religious basis, they are exercising their civil liberties. The Civil Rights Act made clear when faith-based groups hire employees on a religious basis, it is an exercise of the groups' civil liberties. It does not constitute discrimination under Federal law.

I believe one of the major issues here is that faith-based organizations are allowed to maintain and sustain their mission. It does not mean that the people that they hire are discriminated against on the basis of what religion they have, what their ethnicity might be; but rather simply the ability to hire people who share their common beliefs, who share their sense of mission.

We certainly saw this in the recent rescue mission and aid issues down with Hurricane Katrina, where a great number of faith-based groups were the most efficient groups that we saw on the ground there. And, certainly, they should have the right to bring those people in who share their beliefs, even though they may have been receiving in some ways Federal dollars.

The same thing is true with Head Start. People must be hired in a way that they do share a common sense of mission, a common sense of purpose. Otherwise, these organizations would be totally disrupted in what they are trying to get done.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the rule, I want to speak on some important amendments that are going to come up to provide important protections for religious organizations. If we do not insert these important protections for these organizations, we will be dictating to them whom they can or cannot hire. We must maintain the integrity of religious entities.

The Constitution of the United States explicitly states that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. Not allowing our churches, mosques, and synagogues to hire people of like mind and similar beliefs is not only an affront to their very core but contrary to this great Nation's Constitution.

I am proud to be an American for so many reasons, first among them because I am able to think, speak, and believe whatever I want freely, as stated in the first amendment to our Constitution. Denying religious organizations the ability to hire an employee because of his or her beliefs is to take away that employee's right to think, speak, and believe as he or she so chooses.

We are not talking about allowing religious organizations to brainwash children to think as they do. We are talking about allowing religious organizations simply to be able to provide the same services and programs as nonreligious organizations. Our children deserve the very best education; and if a religious organization is going to provide that education better, then we must not stand in the way.

Are we going to deny many of the poorest and less fortunate children the opportunity to learn in these early childhood education programs simply because it is a church that is administering it? This is about our children,

and denying them exemplary services just because the organization providing them happens to be a religious one is just cruel.

I think we all know firsthand the impact that our churches have and how much they contribute to our communities across the Nation. And we all know how much they give back to their communities.

This Nation is second to none in charitable giving and at helping others in need. This is not just a religious tenet, but an American principle. We need to support this rule.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the rule, but most especially in support of the rule allowing for the offering of the amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY). This amendment is clearly dominating a lot of the discussion this morning regarding the rule. It is the one that protects faith-based Head Start providers, and it is so important for us to be very sensitive about this issue as we look to those who are willing to provide some very difficult services and ones that certainly the providers must be very interested in as far as the well-being of the student, the well-being of the families involved in these programs. Certainly, faith-based organizations are first in mind when it comes to providing the services that require the most care, and we would be remiss in not providing an opportunity for this amendment to be adopted. This rule does allow that, and this rule is very well crafted. And I support it for that very reason.

We the Congress have specified in several statutes that religious organizations that receive Federal funds in the form of grants or contracts must not lose their Title VII exemption. In fact, former President Bill Clinton signed four laws that explicitly allow faith-based groups to staff on a religious basis when they receive Federal funds. They should not be discriminated against. If we tell faith-based groups they cannot hire on a faith basis in order to receive Federal funds, then we will force those organizations out of providing these services.

Some examples of laws that we have passed that allow for faith-based groups to continue to hire on their continued basis are the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act, or Welfare Reform of 1996; the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Act of 1998; the Community Service Block Grant Act, which everyone has been very supportive of; as well as the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000.

We have had debates before regarding faith-based groups being involved in government contracting. It would be a huge error for us to exempt the most caring, conscious, and helpful organizations, especially from Head Start contracts. Those groups should not be forced to hire anybody off the street simply because they have a Federal contract. They should hire the best people and the ones who are most capable of carrying out their mission. The very reason why many of these organizations will win the contracts is because they have the best track record of service and results. What more important place is there for us to care about results than in Head Start?

I think it is important for us, as Members of the United States House of Representatives, to be very careful as we move forward on this bill. The Committee on Education and the Workforce has worked very hard to craft it. They are very concerned about making sure that students get every advantage at that early age. We need to contract with the organizations that can best provide the service.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HART. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentlewoman's views, but let me ask her this question: What is right about letting a group take her or my tax dollars and put out a sign that says ''Jews nor Catholics need not apply here for this Head Start job''? What is right about that?

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman, again, is trying to inflame what I think is really an unreasonable discussion in this conversation.

The point of faith-based providers is that they are mostly obviously church people who have a mission. They want to provide a service. They are not discriminating against others. They are encouraging service within their church, and we should allow them to provide that service because we know that they have the best track record of success.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

When I was a child, my grandmomma took me to churches. She played piano for all of the churches in town, four in Altamonte Springs. Sometimes I did not know whether I was going to be sprinkled and be baptized here or repent and be baptized. It was very difficult, but all of the children in that town went to all of the churches.

For 41 years Head Start has existed, and it is the most empirically collected database organization supporting the children of the United States of America. And for all of those 41 years, all of these faith-based organizations have been involved in receiving contracts to do business. What we are saying is they cannot do it with Federal dollars. They have to do it with their own money.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we conclude the debate on this rule, I would remind people that the underlying bill provides for the Head Start program in many different areas. It provides for academic refocusing on class readiness and to close the class readiness gap. It provides for competition to improve the quality and to meet questions of mismanagement of financial abilities. It provides for a closer tie to State curricula and to local ties which will improve it, and it also provides, if the amendment is adopted, for faith-based institutions to actually help kids.

We have an opportunity to discuss 12 amendments plus the underlying bill, and we have an opportunity to hit a home run for kids. That is the goal that we still have.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good and balanced rule, and I urge the Members to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 455 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 189, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Coble	Gilchrest
Akin	Cole (OK)	Gillmor
Alexander	Conaway	Gingrey
Bachus	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Baker	Cubin	Goode
Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Goodlatte
Bartlett (MD)	Cunningham	Granger
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Graves
Bass	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (WI)
Beauprez	Davis, Tom	Gutknecht
Biggert	Deal (GA)	Hall
Bilirakis	Dent	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hart
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hastings (WA)
Blunt	Drake	Hayes
Boehlert	Dreier	Hayworth
Boehner	Duncan	Hensarling
Bonilla	Ehlers	Herger
Bonner	Emerson	Hobson
Bono	English (PA)	Hoekstra
Boozman	Everett	Hostettler
Bradley (NH)	Feeney	Hulshof
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Hunter
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Hyde
Burgess	Flake	Inglis (SC)
Burton (IN)	Foley	Issa
Buyer	Forbes	Istook
Calvert	Fortenberry	Jenkins
Cannon	Fossella	Jindal
Cantor	Foxx	Johnson (CT)
Capito	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (IL)
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Gallegly	Jones (NC)
Chabot	Garrett (NJ)	Keller
Chocola	Gerlach	Kelly
	Gibbons	Kennedy (MN)

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—23

Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Camp
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeLay
Doolittle
Fattah
Green, Gene
Hefley
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
McMorris
Millender-McDonald
Murtha
Ortiz
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Rush
Sabo
Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote) (Mr. LATHAM). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1151

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, SCOTT of Virginia, RANGEL, and MOLLOHAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Miss. McMORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 486 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 346, nays 59, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

YEAS—346

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—59

Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berry
Brady (PA)
Capito
Capuano
Chandler
Costello
DeFazio
English (PA)
Evans
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Fossella
Graves
Gutknecht
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Hulshof
Johnson, E. B.
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LoBiondo
Marshall
Matheson
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Olver