

2000, it is projected to drop to 15 percent.

We need to make sure that vocational education students have opportunities to prepare for continued education and for high-skill high-wage jobs. For this reason, the agreement places an expanded emphasis on technology.

With the increased emphasis on academics and technology, vocational education students will be better prepared for expanded educational and employment opportunities.

Finally, the agreement not only sends more money to the local level than under current law, but it provides those at the local level with more flexibility in how to spend their money.

Local school districts and post-secondary institutions will be able to decide how to best meet the needs of their students. They will have the ability to create innovative programs to meet their individual local needs.

Under current law, only 75 percent of Federal vocational education dollars are required to go locally. This agreement requires that no less than 85 percent of the Federal education dollars go to local school districts or post-secondary programs.

If we are going to see true change occur in vocational-technical education, it is going to come from the local level, and that is where our money should be.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report. This report represents nearly 4 years of dedicated work by the Members on both sides of the aisle.

During this Congress, we have worked closely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) and our colleagues in the Senate to craft legislation to improve the vocational education system. In addition to extending the authorization of this program for 5 years, the bill improves the structure of our vocational education system.

We continue, under this bill, to target funds on poverty, ensuring that the most needy of school districts receive the assistance.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING), my ranking subcommittee members, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON) for their work on this legislation.

This bill deserves the strong support of all Members of this body.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman JEFFORDS who led the Senate efforts on the legislation, and our House conferees the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) who chairs the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

I would also like to thank staff who have worked very hard in helping us develop this legislation, including Krisann Pearce, Sally Lovejoy, Mary Clagett, Vic Klatt, June Harris, Alex Nock, and Marci Philips.

The conference agreement on H.R. 1853 is based on good public policy. The agreement expands opportunities for vocational education students, placing increased emphasis on academics, technology, and State and local innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your support for this legislation.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 1853, the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Amendments of 1998. The Perkins Act has helped millions of students attain the education and training needed to compete in today's workforce.

In particular, the act has provided access to vocational education to a variety of underserved populations—women, including single mothers and displaced homemakers; individuals with disabilities; and students facing barriers to educational achievement, such as limited English proficiency. The reauthorization legislation before us today, I believe, strengthens the Federal Vocational Education Program.

We merge the best of the House and Senate bills to provide for a system that holds vocational education to high academic standards and accountability. We also reaffirm our commitment to special populations, and ensure that not only are they provided access to vocational education, but that they also are included in the quest for high quality.

I am also pleased that disagreements on the formula have been resolved, striking a balance between providing support for local schools and leveraging resources in leadership activities. Just as importantly, this new formula retains the Federal commitment to target scarce education dollars to the neediest students.

Finally, I would like to express my strong support for the provisions in the legislation that preserve the tech-prep program.

Tech-prep provides comprehensive links between vocational education and training in secondary schools and postsecondary education institutions.

As such, the tech-prep program enhances the Federal commitment to provide vocational education students with the skills and education to pursue a successful future after high school—whether it involves obtaining additional training, pursuing a baccalaureate degree, or entering the workforce.

I thank Chairman GOODLING and Chairman JEFFORDS for their commitment to reaching bi-

partisan, bicameral agreement on vocational education reauthorization.

While these negotiations were lengthy, and often contentious, I believe the final product was worth the effort.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of passage of this conference report.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2206, COATS HUMAN SERVICES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 2206) to amend the Head Start Act, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, and the Community Services Block Grant Act to reauthorize and make improvements to those Acts, to establish demonstration projects that provide an opportunity for persons with limited means to accumulate assets, and for other purposes.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 6, 1998 at page H9680.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2206.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 2206, the Coats Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1998 named after the retiring Senator from Indiana.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Senator DAN COATS, not only for his remarkable efforts on what will be known as the Coats Human Services Act of 1998, but for his years of service and dedication to education and human services issues. He has been a staunch and compassionate advocate for children. We will miss his insight and wisdom that are reflected in dozens of laws that have and will continue to have positive impact on the lives of millions of American families.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to the members of the conference committee for their diligent efforts to resolve the differences between

the House and the Senate bill. This has truly been a bipartisan and bicameral effort.

I want to thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking member of the committee, who have worked so diligently on this bipartisan bill. In addition I would like to recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) who was so very important to the development of the legislation.

Due to them and many others who worked with us in crafting this bill, we have before us today a bipartisan conference agreement, an agreement that will lead to better services for millions of disadvantaged families across the Nation.

The Senate has already passed the conference report. Senators JEFFORDS, COATS, KENNEDY and DODD led the Senate efforts on this legislation and have successfully ushered it through the Senate.

The efforts of all these Members have allowed us to move forward on a very important piece of legislation, to reform our Nation's Head Start, Community Service Block Grant and Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Programs.

The legislation makes important changes to these acts that will result in improved services, increased quality, and more accountability.

Title I of the legislation contains important changes to the Head Start program. This bill firmly establishes quality as the focus of the authorization through a variety of measures that strengthen the education component of Head Start. Namely, the bill ensures that local Head Start agencies will be held accountable for successfully preparing children to enter school ready to read by inserting new educational performance standards and measures by which individual Head Start program performance will be measured. The founder of Head Start said that this is the one area that has disappointed him, and that is the area of preparing children to enter school, and it is basically an education preparation program, and we think that in this bill that it will truly be that all over the country.

The bill requires that at least half of all Head Start teachers possess a college degree in early childhood education or related field by the end of the year 2003. It is an important requirement if we are to ensure that Head Start's education service rival those of the best preschools in the Nation.

The bill strikes the appropriate balance between quality and expansion. This is something I insisted on in our House-Senate conference. It slows the rate of growth of the program and it increases funding for quality in the initial years of the authorization, so that the Head Start program has the time and means to develop greater capacity to provide higher quality services.

Title II of the legislation extends the authorization and makes changes to the Community Service Block Grant Act program.

This bill will better enable States and local communities to eradicate poverty, revitalize high poverty neighborhoods, and empower low-income individuals to become self-sufficient.

As with Head Start, this bill increases program accountability and CSBG. It encourages the development of effective partnerships between government, local communities and charitable organizations, including faith-based organizations, to meet the needs of impoverished individuals, and it encourages innovative community-based approaches to attacking the causes and effects of poverty.

I have been a strong supporter for many years of CSBG and the programs that it supports. I feel that this legislation will result in improvements in CSBG and will further improve services for the poor in each local community.

Title III of our legislation extends the authorization of another important program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. LIHEAP provides heating and cooling assistance to almost 5 million low-income households each year. Individuals and families receiving this vital assistance include the working poor, individuals making the transition from welfare to work, individuals with disabilities, the elderly, and families with young children.

Finally, this legislation establishes a new demonstration program providing funding for individual development accounts, matched saving accounts for low-income individuals for post-secondary education, home purchases and business capitalization.

I commend Senator COATS and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for their insight in the development of this demonstration program.

Finally, I want to give special thanks to numerous staff who have worked for so many weeks, months, years to resolve the various differences on this bill. Their work has culminated in a strong bipartisan bill. Specifically, I would like to thank Sally Lovejoy, Vic Klatt, Mary Clagett, Denzel McGuire and Rich Stombres of our committee staff for their hard work on this bill, as well as Alex Nock and Marci Phillips of the Minority staff.

Let me close by saying that the legislation before us today is truly one of the most important pieces of legislation the 105th Congress will pass this year. It is a bipartisan bill that greatly improves the delivery of services provided under Head Start, CSBG and LIHEAP. It is my belief that many families will benefit from the improvements made under this act. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bipartisan conference report.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation reauthorizes Head Start, Low-Income Home Energy Assistance, and Community Services Block Grant programs. In addition, it establishes a new program, Assets for Independence, which will assist low-income families to achieve economic security.

The programs authorized in this bill are critical to children and to seniors. In addition to reauthorizing expiring programs, this legislation makes several needed improvements. In the Head Start section, the bill increases to 10 percent the setaside for early Head Start, the program providing services to low-income infants and toddlers and their families. This will ensure that thousands of additional infants can experience the benefits gained in this extraordinary program.

This bill reauthorizes the LIHEAP program for 5 years, but also concentrates its weatherization services for low-income individuals with higher energy needs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this legislation institutes important accountability provisions in the Community Services Block Grant program that will enable us to document its great successes.

In closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), our chairman; the ranking subcommittee member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ); the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE); and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for their hard work on this conference agreement. I believe this strong bipartisan measure, which deserves the support of all Members of this Chamber, should be enacted.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who was with Senator COATS for a long time before he came to the Congress of the United States, and who has been very important in putting together parts of this legislation.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership and all of the others on the conference committee.

It is unfortunate that it is this late at night that we have one of the most important pieces of legislation that could possibly be before us. It addresses the most vulnerable Americans in our society, our children, the working poor and the elderly, and it is an innovative compromise that we have been able to work between the parties and between the bodies.

It is of special meaning to me in 3 different ways, and I want to briefly talk about those. One is my relationship to my former employer, Senator DAN COATS. Second is these issues are many of the things that motivated me to particularly run for Congress, and they are issues that as a staff member for 10 years I worked with, and now, to see some of them come to fruition as part of law is indeed a special honor and a privilege.

So let me touch on a couple of these issues together. Senator DAN COATS is retiring this year after many years in the House and Senate, and as a friend of his who worked in his first primary and general election campaign, we worked together with many goals. Part of those goals are very tied to our personal and deep religious commitments and how we as Christians would address issues facing the most vulnerable in our society. He has tried to be one of the more creative leaders on our side in looking at the balance of how do we work through the private sector, how do we work in joint cooperation in public and private, and what is the role of government in helping develop opportunities.

□ 0050

When I served as Republican staff director on the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, we looked at the Head Start program and saw that it was a Federal program that was very effective in at least some areas. And what we have done in this bill is to try to make it even more effective by putting better educational standards in, through targeting better pay for Head Start teachers, and I think that is an example of a Federal program that has worked.

But there are several other things in this bill. Back when I was in the House and when I worked for Senator COATS in the Senate, we were trying to look for creative ways of how to empower private sector organizations, and one of those things is a charitable tax credit.

For the first time, working with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on the minority in our committee, we were able to pass in the 10 percent of the State's community service block grants they can use that money to help offset an expansion of the State charitable tax credit. We have not been able to pass other pieces of legislation at this point with it, but it is an important first step.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) have been leaders in the individual development accounts, the Assets for Independence that DAN COATS has supported for a long time as I have. And this is another innovative way to help those who are less fortunate to develop the assets they need, whether they use them for their own personal expenses or whether it is for homes or housing or to develop a business. It is an important breakthrough.

It is something that we worked out when I was a house staffer for Congressman COATS and as a Senate staffer, and it is a tremendous victory for my fellow and former staffers, Stephanie Monroe and Sharon Soderstrom and Mike Gerson to see many of these dreams actually become part of law.

DAN COATS has been a personal model for me. It is so fitting and appropriate that this bill is named after him, because he is a beacon of light and a personal moral example. An example of

leadership, of how someone in government can be in both their personal and public life a model for young people around the country; a model for legislators as to how to be creative in their legislation, of how to be a conservative and yet have a heart for the poor, a heart for the underprivileged.

It has been a great honor to both work for him and now with him in this United States Congress, and he is going to be deeply missed by me and many others.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Human Services Reauthorization Act. The programs reauthorized by this legislation, Head Start, Community Service Block Grants, and LIHEAP, help our neediest Americans to live learn and grow.

I am particularly pleased that the Community Services Block Grants include reauthorization for a demonstration project to test the effectiveness of Individual Development Accounts, IDAs. IDAs are dedicated savings accounts that can be used for education. They can be used for first home purchase or to start a business. Each deposit made by the low-income account holder is matched by the community organization which sponsors the IDA.

I was able to leave welfare when I was in trouble at one point because I invested in myself. IDAs allow individuals in the same kind of circumstance I was in to invest in themselves. IDAs give low-income individuals a needed chance to invest in themselves and in their futures. Because their deposits are matched, IDA accounts grow and lives are changed for the better.

This country has been helping middle- and upper-income families invest in themselves and their future for years. For example, there are tax deductions for home mortgage. There are tax break for IRAs and tax breaks for other pension accounts. There are no breaks for low-income individuals who try to save. In fact, in some cases there are actually penalties if a low-income person accumulates assets.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Human Services Reauthorization Act will help millions of low-income Americans change their lives and I am proud to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in supporting it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) an important member of the committee.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for yielding me this time, and I will try to be brief because of the hour.

Mr. Speaker, everything that has been said is so significant. And the Head Start program, the Community

Services Block Grant which was heard about, and also the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance program which has struggled politically in this body a lot of times, have gone through strong re-authorizations.

I just would like to focus on the Head Start provisions of this bill for a couple of reasons for a moment. I believe that educational welfare for our children starts well before they even walk into kindergarten. It obviously starts the day kids are born. And some of the most crucial times are their first experiences in structured settings such as in day care or prekindergarten programs.

We are all seeing what is at least viewed as a decline in education in America, at least for some of our students out there today. And I think early intervention is very necessary if we are going to be able to address some of these problems, particularly at the earliest ages. Because that helps, of course, our students attain higher achievements throughout their lives.

What happened in this bill, and it was under the guidance of our chairman, is that we have strengthened the education component programs of Head Start. We are supportive to the whole concept of quality. We put more money into that area; into teacher certification and into making absolutely certain that the Head Start programs that we have would be able to upgrade in that circumstance.

It was a hard fight. It sounds simple, but it was relatively hard because there is a great force that wants more quantity and does not want us to set money aside for quality. We were able to do that working with both sides of the aisle and working with the Senate in order to achieve what I think is in the greater good for kids of this country.

Again, it is a shame that we are debating this bill at 12:55 in the morning as opposed to 2 o'clock in the afternoon. But the bottom line is this is good legislation. It is well thought out. Some excellent staff work went into it, and I hope that we could unanimously endorse it in the House of Representatives and the President could sign it into law soon.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand up today in strong support of the conference report on the Human Services Reauthorization Act and proud to have been able to serve as a conferee on this very important piece of legislation.

The bills that came out of both Houses on Head Start, the Community Services Block Grant, and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Programs were very strong and representative of very bipartisan efforts. During conference, we worked diligently to follow through on that bipartisan spirit and deliver a bill that will provide better assistance to some of our nation's neediest citizens.

As with most pieces of legislation, I realize we have not been able to meet everyone's needs, but I do believe we have made an excellent compromise that addresses a majority of this body's concerns. Throughout the process, I have been particularly concerned with

the Head Start provisions of this bill. As you know, I come to the table with a deep concern for the welfare of our nation's students. I believe that their educational welfare starts well before they walk into kindergarten. It starts the day kids are born and some of the most crucial times are their first experiences in structured settings, such as in day care or pre-kindergarten programs.

In the past few years, as policy makers, we have been faced with the reality that our education system isn't working for many of our students. Among all of the different factors that we need to consider, one of them is those first few years and those first experiences kids have in structured settings. Early intervention is essential. We know this. If we can begin to address the needs of students at the earliest ages, then we have a better chance of helping them attain higher levels of achievement throughout life.

Along with my colleagues on the conference, I was dedicated to strengthening the current Head Start program so that children are getting the skills they need and are truly prepared for the challenges they will face in school. One of the key reforms in this bill is that we strengthen the education components of the program. Now, the purpose of Head Start is to promote school readiness. Make no mistake about it, this program was deliberately named, these kids need a 'head start' in life, and we have attempted to give them that in the conference report.

First, we are supportive of and committed to increasing funding for quality. This makes sense. We need to ensure that the programs our kids are attending are truly beneficial and deserving of their time. We need to be confident in the services Head Start is providing and confident that kids are learning while they are enrolled. One of the things we do with the increased funding for quality in the conference report is increase the percentage of teachers who have a degree in early childhood education. This is sheer logic. In fact, I think this is essential. Our kids need and deserve to have skilled teachers with an intimate knowledge of child development. The combination of increasing teacher certification levels and quality funds provided for in the conference report will go a long way toward addressing the failures we see in the system now.

As the governing body in this nation, we have a responsibility to ensure that the funds we provide States and locals are spent effectively and efficiently. I believe we have accomplished that in the conference report before the House today. This truly is an important bill, which will affect the future of many, many children and their families and in turn the welfare of our country.

Let me also note that this bill reauthorizes the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and the Community Services Block Grant programs, which I support. While I have not focused my comments on those provisions, I do strongly endorse the work of the conferees on both sections.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the hard fought compromises we reached during conference and vote in favor of passage. This legislation takes several great strides for the benefit of our nation's kids and families.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), our ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference agreement reauthorizing Head Start, Community Services Block Grant, and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act. On balance, this bill does many positive things for children and low-income individuals. I am particularly proud of the fact that it contains a provision that I cosponsored with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) which replicates a successful program I sponsored in Virginia, the Neighborhood Assistance Act, which offers tax credits for donations to approved programs fighting poverty.

Unfortunately, the conference agreement also contains a provision I find very troubling, the so-called "charitable choice" provision. This provision has serious constitutional and policy shortcomings. Specifically, the "charitable choice" program allows religious groups to be funded under the Community Services Block Grant, even though they may be pervasively sectarian.

The Community Services Block Grant provision also allows, because it allows pervasively sectarian organizations to be funded, it allows publicly funded employee discrimination. Because Title VII of the Civil Rights Act contains certain provisions exempting religious organizations, it allows faith-based organizations to proselytize to beneficiaries as they receive services. It also allows faith-based organizations to require beneficiaries to participate in religious activities in order to receive services. And it allows beneficiaries to be denied alternative service providers if none are available other than the faith-based organization.

With respect to these constitutional issues, Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter from the Department of Justice specifically outlining the constitutional problems with the "charitable choice" provision.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, September 24, 1998.

Hon. WILLIAM F. GOODLING,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and the  
Workforce, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Senate and the House each recently passed versions of S. 2206, designated in the Senate as the Community Opportunities, Accountability, and Training and Educational Services Act of 1998 and in the House as the Human Services Reauthorization Act. We are informed that a conference committee will this week attempt to resolve differences between the two versions of the bill. S. 2206 would, *inter alia*, amend the Community Services Block Grant Act ("CSBGA"), 42 U.S.C. §9901, *et seq.* We are writing with respect to a proposed new section 679 of the CSBGA, which would be established by section 201 of the Senate-passed bill and by section 202 of the House-passed bill. We are concerned that the Senate version (that is, S. 2206 as passed by the Senate on July 27, 1998) could be construed to permit government funds to be provided to, and used by, pervasively sectarian organizations,

which would violate the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Accordingly, we recommend that the Conference Committee amend the bill to ensure that funds are provided to religious organizations only if they are not pervasively sectarian.

The Act would authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("the Secretary") to establish a program to make federal block grants to states for the purpose of ameliorating the causes of poverty in communities within the states. *See, e.g.*, S. 2206 (as passed by the Senate), §201 (proposing CSBGA §§672(1), 675). The states may, in turn, direct the funds to private, nonprofit organizations to assist in the provision of services. *See, e.g., id.* (proposing CSBGA §§675C(a)(3)(B), 676A(a)(1)(A)).

Proposed CSBGA section 679(a), in both the House and Senate bills, would provide that "the government shall consider, on the same basis as other nongovernmental organizations, faith-based organizations to provide the assistance under the program, so long as the program is implemented in a manner consistent with the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution." Section 679(a) further would provide that "[n]either the Federal Government nor a State or local government receiving funds under this subtitle shall discriminate against an organization that provides assistance under, or applies to provide assistance under, this subtitle, on the basis that the organization has a faith-based character."

Section 679 apparently would reflect "Congress' considered judgment that religious organizations can help solve the problems" to which the proposed statute is addressed *Bowen v. Kendrick*, 487 U.S. 589, 606-07 (1988). *Kendrick* and other cases establish that the fact that an institution has religious affiliations does not mean that it may not participate equally in a neutral government financial aid program that benefits both religious and nonreligious entities. *Id.* at 608-11 (Adolescent Family Life Act grants, available to fairly "wide spectrum of public and private organizations" regardless of religious nature, may be awarded to religious institutions), *see also, e.g., Roemer v. Board of Public Works*, 426 U.S. 736 (1976) (plurality opinion) (upholding grant program for colleges and universities as applied to schools with religious affiliations). Nevertheless, the Establishment Clause does place two significant limitations on this general principle.

First, the Establishment Clause requires that federal financial assistance not be used in a way that would advance religious organizations' religious mission. The Court in *Kendrick* confirmed that, even though religious organizations may participate in government-funded social welfare programs, the government must ensure that government aid is not used to advance "specifically religious activit[ies] in an otherwise substantially secular setting." *Kendrick*, 487 U.S. at 621 (quoting *Hunt v. McNair*, 413 U.S. 734 (1973)), *See Roemer*, 426 U.S. at 755 (plurality opinion). Indeed, in *Kendrick*, all nine Justices accepted the principle that government funding of religious activities would be impermissible.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>487 U.S. at 611-12, 615, 621 (Establishment Clause would be violated if public monies were used to fund "indoctrination into the beliefs of a particular religious faith" or to "advance the religious mission" of the religious institution receiving aid.) (quoting *School Dist. of Grand Rapids v. Ball*, 473 U.S. 373, 385 (1985)). *Id.* at 623 (O'Connor, J., concurring) ("[A]ny use of public funds to promote religious doctrines violates the Establishment clause."). *Id.* at 624 (Kennedy, J., concurring) (reasoning that the Establishment Clause would be violated if funds "are in fact being used to further religion"). *Id.* at 634-48 (Blackmun, J., dissenting) (opining that government aid

In conformity with this constitutional requirement, proposed section 679 of the House bill would provide that "[n]o funds provided to a faith-based organization to provide assistance under any program described in subsection (a) shall be expended for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization."<sup>2</sup>

Second, even where a statute includes (as S. 2206 does) an express condition that the federal aid not be used for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization, the government nevertheless may not provide aid directly to "pervasively sectarian" institutions, defined as institutions in which "religion is so pervasive that a substantial portion of [their] functions are subsumed in the religious mission." *Id.* at 610 (quoting *Hunt*, 413 U.S. at 743); *see also id.* at 621 (holding that, apart from the question whether aid was being used for religious purposes, Establishment Clause would be violated if the plaintiffs could show that aid flowed to grantees that could be considered "pervasively sectarian religious institutions").

As the Court has explained, the reason for the prohibition on direct governmental aid to pervasively sectarian institutions is the unacceptable risk that where—as in a pervasively sectarian organization—secular and religious functions are "inextricably intertwined," government aid, although designated for a secular purpose, in fact will invariably advance the institution's religious mission. *Id.* at 610. Again, it is immaterial to this part of the Court's analysis that the provision of assistance would serve a legitimate secular purpose. *See id.* at 602. What is critical is that the assistance also would have the effect of advancing religion because of the pervasively sectarian character of the recipients. And even if it were possible, as a theoretical matter, for a pervasively sectarian organization to use government assistance exclusively for secular functions in such institutions, the degree and kind of governmental monitoring necessary to ensure compliance with the requisite restrictions would itself create Establishment Clause problems. *Id.* at 616–17.

It is unclear which, if any, of the religious organizations that would receive funding under S. 2206 would be "pervasively sectarian." The boundaries of the "pervasively sectarian" category are not well-defined, and the Supreme Court has used it almost exclusively in connection with primary and secondary educational institutions. The Court has, however, indicated that numerous considerations are relevant in determining whether an institution is pervasively sectarian. Included among those considerations is whether an organization has explicit corporate ties to a particular religious faith, and bylaws or policies that prohibit any deviation from religious doctrine. *Kendrick*, 487 U.S. at 620 n. 16. The Court also has treated the existence of religious qualifications for admission and hiring as a relevant factor in determining whether a school is pervasively sectarian. Compare *Hunt*, 413 U.S. at 743–44 (no religious qualifications for faculty or students) and *Roemer*, 426 U.S. at 757–58 (plurality opinion) (same), with *Committee for Pub. Educ. v. Nyquist*, 413 U.S. 756, 767–68 (1973) (religious restrictions on admissions and faculty appointments) and *School Dist. of*

may not be used to advance religion, even if aid was intended for secular purposes). Notably, *Kendrick* involved a statute—like the proposed bill—in which government resources were granted on a neutral, nondiscriminatory basis, to religious and nonreligious groups alike, for a secular purpose (counseling sexual abstinence).

<sup>2</sup>Proposed §679(c) in the Senate version has a similar prohibition, but limited to "funds through a grant or contract." In order to avoid difficult Establishment Clause questions, we recommend deletion of the "through a grant or contract" limitation.

*Grand Rapids v. Ball*, 473 U.S. 373, 384 n.6 (1985) (preference in attending private school afforded to children belonging to organizational denomination).

Although both the House and Senate versions of proposed §679(a) state that the block grant funds must be disbursed in accordance with the Establishment Clause, certain other provisions in the Senate version of the bill strongly suggest an expectation that state governments would be permitted to provide direct funding to religious organizations that are pervasively sectarian. In particular, the Senate version includes the following three provisions not found in the House version.

(i) Proposed §679(b)(1)<sup>3</sup> would provide that "[a] faith-based organization that provides assistance under a program described in subsection (a) shall retain its faith-based character and control over the definition, development, practice, and expression of its faith-based beliefs."<sup>4</sup>

(ii) Proposed §679(b)(2)(A) would provide, with a minor exception, that "[n]either the Federal Government nor a State or local government shall require a faith-based organization . . . to alter its form of internal governance."

(iii) Proposed §679(b)(3) would provide, *inter alia*, that "[a] faith-based organization that provides assistance under a program described in subsection (a) may require that employees adhere to the religious tenets and teachings of such organization."

These provisions, as well as the bill's repeated references to "faith-based organizations" and recipient organizations' "faith-based character," strongly imply some intent that pervasively sectarian religious organizations would be eligible to receive direct governmental funding. In order to ensure that S.2206 is not construed to permit funding of pervasively sectarian organizations, and that direct governmental funding is not used to support religious activities, we recommend that the Conference Committee not adopt the three quoted provisions (which do not appear in the version of S. 2206 passed by the House). In offering this recommendation, we do not mean to suggest that the government should be able to, for example, "control . . . the definition, development, practice, and expression of . . . beliefs" of a nonpervasively sectarian religious organization that receives CSBGA funds but does not use such funds for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization. Nor should we be understood as suggesting that a government may "require" such an organization "to alter its form of internal governance." We merely wish to ensure that the federal, state and local governments involved in disbursing CSBGA funds may take into account the structure and operations of a religious organization in determining whether such an organization is or is not pervasively sectarian. Where such an organization is pervasively sectarian—i.e., where the secular and religious functions of the organization are so "inextricably intertwined," *Kendrick* 487 U.S. at 610, that it would be impossible (at least

<sup>3</sup>The Senate version of the bill designates this as subsection "(c)," rather than "(b)," but this appears to be a typographical error.

<sup>4</sup>In addition to the constitutional problem discussed in the text, this particular provision would (perhaps inadvertently) raise another Establishment Clause problem, since, read literally, the "shall retain" language would appear to require a recipient organization, as a condition of receiving federal funds, to "retain" a particular religious character and a certain form of "control over the definition, development, practice, and expression of its faith-based beliefs." As a general matter, the government may not, of course, attempt in this manner to control the religious character and organization of a religious organization.

without impermissible entanglement) to ensure that the organization does not use government funds to advance religion, the organization may not receive and use CSBGA funds.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If we may be of additional assistance, we trust that you will not hesitate to call upon us. The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely,

L. ANTHONY SUTIN,

*Acting Assistant Attorney General.*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say a word about the Head Start portion of the bill. During the committee deliberations, this widely supported program was amended and ended up being reported with votes being split right along party lines.

I am delighted to see that the irrelevant, controversial amendments have been removed and that Chairman GOODLING and Ranking Member CLAY have presented essentially the original noncontroversial version of the bill so that reauthorization of this effective educational program can be done with its traditional bipartisan support.

So, on balance, Mr. Speaker, this bill will do much in the long run to expand opportunities for children and low-income individuals; however, the "charitable choice" provision is unfortunate and we will have to wait for the courts to decide its constitutional fate.

□ 0100

However, on balance, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the conference agreement.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my good friend from Virginia realizes, in order to get the bill to the floor, we had to do what we had to do or otherwise we would not have had a Head Start bill here.

I do want to point out that the language is the same as in our welfare reform bill and, therefore, there is some precedent for it. But, also, I want to point out that we clarified that religious organizations may participate in CSBG as long as their program is implemented in a manner consistent with the establishment clause of the Constitution. We also included clarification that no funds provided directly to a religious organization under CSBG can be expended for sectarian worship, instruction or proselytization.

Because religious organizations are such important partners in the fight against poverty, their participation in the CSBG program is encouraged. We think the protections in here will make sure that things are not done in the manner that some may fear that they will be.

I just want to close by saying that in the last hour, from midnight on Thursday until 1 a.m. on Friday morning, we passed three of the most important pieces of legislation we could possibly pass for the benefit of those most in need in this country. And as I said, it is tragic that we are doing that at this

particular hour, but, again, all three pieces are legislation that are going to mean so much to those in this country who are most in need and also going to present us with a far better 21st Century.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I do support this legislation, and I want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), for their great work. This will be a better country, and communities and young people, people of all ages, and particularly children, will live a better life because of this legislation. However, I must rise, even at this time of the morning, with strong reservations that I share with my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, in a major national debate and a vote on the floor of this House, this Congress went clearly on record in defending the first 16 words of the first amendment in the Bill of Rights. Those 16 words are these: "Congress shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These cherished words have served our country well for over two centuries. They are basically the foundation of religious liberty in America, a liberty of religion that is envied across the world.

The provisions of so-called charitable choice were added in this bill unbeknownst to many Members of the House or Senate at a time when we were cluttered with many other issues in Congress. This charitable choice language, in my opinion, and in the opinion of others, could directly undermine the intent of those first 16 words of the Bill of Rights.

Let me quote from the Working Group for Religious Freedom and Social Services, which includes American Baptist Churches USA, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Anti-Defamation League, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, and numerous other religious organizations. They say this: "The primary constitutional problem with the religious provider provisions, the so-called charitable choice provisions, is that they permit and encourage grants to and government contracts with pervasively sectarian organizations, such as churches and other houses of worship."

Mr. Speaker, I have no question that the intent of those who put this language into this bill was positive; to allow religious-based organizations to help communities address their problems. But good intentions are not enough, particularly when they hit at the very core of our constitutionally protected rights of religious freedom.

So what are the specific problems that could be caused by this language? First, it could violate the intent of the establishment clause by funding "pervasively sectarian organizations". It is unclear what the intent of the Senate author was on this particular matter.

Secondly, it could require the Federal Government to have to make a choice as to whether to provide community service block grants to the Heaven's Gate religious organization, an organization that believed it was divinely inspired to commit suicide. If our government officials are bothered by that particular religious view of the Heaven's Gate organization under the charitable choice organization, then our government has been put in the dilemma of having to choose which religious organizations' views are appropriate and acceptable and which ones are not.

The next concern I have is that approximately one-half of our States have constitutions that expressly prohibit public funds going into the coffers of religious organizations. It appears to me that the language of this bill could override that constitutional language of so many States in our Nation.

Next, as pointed out by my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), if I understand this correctly, it appears that under this language we could actually use Federal tax dollars to discriminate based on one's religious faith. I hope that is a misreading of this language, but according to a number of organizations, including the one I just mentioned, representing numerous religious organizations, this would do exactly that. And that is why they are so firmly opposed to this particular language.

According to other organizations, this language could also result in government having to provide financial audits of churches and pervasively sectarian organizations who might possibly be eligible for funds under a charitable choice program. I think it is anathema to all of us who believe that the strength of religion in America is that we have had a 200-year wall of separation between church and State. I think this would cause great concerns for those reasons.

Mr. Speaker, for those and many other reasons that can be discussed in the days and weeks ahead, I hope this Congress will think through very carefully the implications of the language of the so-called charitable choice provisions.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour, I am not going to repeat the arguments or go into them in any depth. Suffice it to say I want to make two points.

One. This is an excellent bill in general. I commend the chairman and the ranking member.

Two. The so-called charitable choice provisions of this bill are clearly viola-

tive of the establishment clause of the first amendment.

It is incredible that we would seek to enact exemptions from the religious discrimination clauses of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which this does. It is incredible that we would allow Federal dollars to be used, for example, by a church and a day care center, even if the church made a condition of receipt of day care services that the parents had to come and attend religious indoctrination or had to attend church services. Clearly violative of the first amendment.

The language the distinguished chairman cited as saying this should not violate the first amendment does not add anything to the first amendment. It simply says what all know: legislation cannot violate the first amendment. We should not be enacting legislation that does so.

I hope that this will not be cited as a precedent, as the welfare bill language is cited as a precedent. I hope we can take this out at some point, or else we will rue the day.

□ 0110

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say that I am so glad that our committee is not infested and infested with attorneys. We would not get anything done. I have to laugh because when they talk about money being spent, if you look at ESEA, if you look at title I and if you look at title II, I will guarantee you money is going into private and parochial schools, boom, boom, boom, one after the other. Our philosophy is, we legislate and we allow the courts to make a decision as to whether we legislated properly or improperly in relationship to the Constitution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 2206, the Community Opportunities and Educational Services Act. I support many of the provisions in this bill which reauthorizes the Head Start, Community Services Block Grant and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Programs. However, I want to focus my remarks on the new demonstration program which will be created if this bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2206 includes the text of H.R. 2849, the Assets for Independence Act which I introduced with Representative JOHN KASICH. The language was added by an amendment offered in the Education and Work Committee by Representatives MARK SOUDER and LYNN WOOLSEY. This legislation authorizes \$25 million for five years for the creation of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) for poor families and individuals. IDAs are dedicated savings accounts, similar in structure to Individual Retirement Accounts, that can be used for purchasing a first home, paying for post-secondary education, or capitalizing a business.

IDAs are managed by community organizations and are held at local financial institutions. Low income individuals make a contribution to

the account which is then matched by private or public funds. Under the legislation, participants can have no more than \$10,000 in assets (excluding their car and home) to qualify for the program. Federal money can only be used to match private money. In this way, the bill would leverage more private money and local involvement. By encouraging asset development, IDAs help families end their own poverty with dignity.

IDAs and other asset-building strategies for the poor appear to be among the most promising poverty-fighting ideas to emerge in the last few decades. It is estimated that 100 communities are running IDA programs in forty-three states. Twenty-five states, including Ohio, have incorporated IDAs into their welfare-to-work plans, as authorized by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The Joyce, Mott, Ford, Levi Strauss, and Fannie Mae Foundations have issued millions of dollars in grants to support IDA demonstration projects. IDAs have come a long way since the Select Committee on Hunger, which I chaired, first held hearings on this important idea in the early 1990's.

This demonstration project, will provide additional fuel to states, localities, and community based nonprofit groups that are looking for creative and enduring strategies to help low-income families move toward self-sufficiency.

Owning assets gives people a stake in the future and a reason to save, dream, and invest time, effort, and resources in creating a future for themselves and their children. Assets empower people to make choices for themselves.

I would urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conference agreement on S. 2206, the Coats Human Services Reauthorization Amendments of 1998.

This legislation reauthorizes three programs that provide assistance to the neediest Americans: Head Start, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), and the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG).

Historically this legislation has received bipartisan support, and today, there is no exception.

The conference agreement represents a compromise that will ensure the integrity and quality of these programs for years to come.

For more than three decades, Head Start has provided comprehensive social, health, and educational services, designed to promote strong, supportive families and provide disadvantaged with solid foundations for a lifetime of learning.

In 1994, we undertook the most ambitious reauthorization of Head Start, in which we initiated a strong quality improvement process.

I am proud of this effort and the direction it established for the future of Head Start.

That is why, earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 3880, which simply called for building upon this investment in quality through stronger linkages between Head Start programs and schools, and increasing our investment in early Head Start.

I am pleased to say that the proposals in my legislation are in the conference agreement before us today.

S. 2206 allows for the continued expansion of Head Start, as well as the Early Head Start program.

With measures in this legislation to strengthen both programs, and provide Congress with detailed reporting on the successes of these initiatives, I believe we can confidently commit ourselves to increased appropriations in the years to come.

Thus, we will be able to offer Head Start to the 60 percent of eligible children currently excluded from the program.

In this conference agreement, we also reaffirm our commitment to LIHEAP.

LIHEAP helps low-income Americans meet the costs of heating, cooling, and other home energy needs, particularly in times of extreme weather, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

With the five year reauthorization in this legislation, we are telling the Nation's elderly, disabled, and low-income families that this assistance will be continued well into the future.

The third program addressed by this legislation is the Community Services Block Grant.

CSBG supports the efforts of the community action network in addressing the causes of poverty and providing a wide array of assistance to Americans in need.

Services that have been traditionally provided include education, job training and placement, housing, nutrition, emergency services, and health.

S. 2206 also authorizes new activities, including literacy services and support for after-school programs.

In addition, this legislation provides for additional accountability and monitoring, which can only serve to strengthen CSBG.

It is also worth mentioning that while this legislation contains language that clarifies that CSBG dollars can flow to religious organizations to provide social services, we reaffirm that all such transactions are ultimately governed by the establishment clause of the Constitution.

In closing, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in support of S. 2206, legislation that strengthens and improves some of our most important services for our neediest Americans.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the Senate bill, S. 2206.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO POTOMAC HIGHLANDS AIRPORT AUTHORITY COMPACT

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 51) granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Highlands Airport Authority Compact entered into between the States of Maryland and West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 51

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT.

Congress hereby consents to the Potomac Highlands Airport Authority Compact entered into between the States of Maryland and West Virginia. The compact reads substantially as follows:

##### "Potomac Highlands Airport Authority Compact

#### "SECTION 1. COUNTY COMMISSIONS EMPOWERED TO ENTER INTO INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS RELATING TO CUMBERLAND MUNICIPAL AIRPORT.

"The county commissions of Mineral County, West Virginia, and of other West Virginia counties contiguous to Mineral County, and the governing bodies of municipal corporations situated in those counties, may enter into intergovernmental agreements with this State, Allegany County, Maryland, other Maryland counties contiguous to Allegany County and Cumberland, Maryland, and other municipal corporations situated in those Maryland counties, and with the Potomac Highlands Airport Authority regarding the operation and use of the Cumberland Municipal Airport situated in Mineral County, West Virginia. The agreements shall be reciprocal in nature and may include, but are not limited to, conditions governing the operation, use, and maintenance of airport facilities, taxation of aircraft owned by Maryland residents and others, and user fees.

#### "SEC. 2. POTOMAC HIGHLANDS AIRPORT AUTHORITY AUTHORIZED.

"The county commissions of Mineral County, West Virginia, and of other West Virginia counties contiguous to Mineral County, and the governing bodies of municipal corporations situated in those counties, or any one or more of them, jointly and severally, may create and establish, with proper governmental units of this State, Allegany County, Maryland, other Maryland counties contiguous to Allegany County, and Cumberland, Maryland, and other municipal corporations situated in those Maryland counties, or any one or more of them, a public agency to be known as the 'Potomac Highlands Airport Authority' in the manner and for the purposes set forth in this Compact.

#### "SEC. 3. AUTHORITY A CORPORATION.

"When created, the Authority and the members of the Authority shall constitute a public corporation and, as such, shall have perpetual succession, may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, and have and use a common seal.

#### "SEC. 4. PURPOSES.

"The Authority may acquire, equip, maintain, and operate an airport or landing field and appurtenant facilities in Mineral County, on the Potomac River near Ridgeley, West Virginia, to serve the area in which it is located.

#### "SEC. 5. MEMBERS OF AUTHORITY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The management and control of the Potomac Highlands Airport Authority, its property, operations, business, and affairs, shall be lodged in a board of seven or more persons who shall be known as members of the Authority and who shall be appointed for terms of three years each by those counties, municipal corporations, or other governmental units situated in West Virginia and Maryland as contribute to the funds of the Authority, in such proportion between those States and counties, municipal corporations, and units, and in whatever manner, as may from time to time be provided in the bylaws adopted by the Authority.

"(b) FIRST BOARD.—The first board shall be appointed as follows:

"(1) The County Commission of Mineral County shall appoint two members for terms of two and three years, respectively.