

denying the American people the knowledge of the sacrifices and accomplishments of the merchant marines. Unknown to many Americans, these courageous seamen suffered incredible losses in moving heavy equipment, troops, arms, ammunition, and fuel across thousands of miles of hostile seas.

Today, House Concurrent Resolution 327 will finally honor their dedication and sacrifice by recognizing their utter devotion to duty.

Congress has acted in the past regarding the merchant marine. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 officially established the merchant marine as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national security. Furthermore, in 1988, merchant marines who sailed on ocean-going vessels from December 7, 1941, through August 15 of 1945 were granted veteran status.

Today the men and women of the merchant marine continue to serve with honor. As Members of Congress, we need to continue to educate the American people about the importance and the achievements of the merchant marine. House Concurrent Resolution 327 serves this purpose.

I urge all Members to support this important legislation in an effort to ensure that our merchant marines receive the recognition and honor they deserve for sacrificing so much to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, having read the remarks of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), I would also say that the best way we can honor our merchant marines is to continue to have a strong American merchant marine. The way we can do that is to continue to protect the Jones Act, continue to emphasize American shipbuilding, and to continue to, when possible, give priority to American-made products that help in our national defense.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for doing this. Again, I want to apologize for the absence of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), but there was a family emergency.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are entering an era of great peace which we have been in for the last few years, and we have a large contingent of our veterans, in this case merchant marines, who have never been properly recognized. Their job was secret, in many cases, particularly the loss of their lives and the ships they sailed in during World War II, so the important role they played was even more removed from the public.

Now, as they in great numbers begin to fade away, their importance has by no means faded. We still need that mer-

chant fleet. We still need merchant seamen trained to run civilian ships to haul our materiel wherever it needs to be hauled in support of our Nation's activities.

Part of the greatness of a nation is how we recognize those who give of themselves in its defense and in its pursuits around the world. In this case, this group has been overlooked too long, and it should be recognized.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes to recognize the merchant marines for their actions from the inception of our Nation to today.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a co-sponsor of H. Con. Res. 327 and as one who appreciates the vital contribution that merchant mariners have made to the security and well-being of our sea-faring nation.

Since 1775, the Merchant Marine has linked the United States in commerce with trading partners all over the world. In wartime, merchant seamen have served with valor and distinction. During World War II, 6,000 merchant mariners, including 142 Kings Point cadets, made the ultimate sacrifice. Despite this terrible cost, the Merchant Marine never faltered in its mission.

Today's merchant mariners continue their predecessors' legacy of dedication and patriotism. Many of these great Americans begin their careers at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, New York.

Since 1938, Kings Point has prepared cadets to serve as officers in the Merchant Marine. Recognized as leaders in the maritime industry, Kings Point graduates represent every state and territory in the union. Rear Admiral Joe Stewart and his staff are to be commended for continuing the tradition of excellence at Kings Point.

After World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "Mariners have . . . delivered the goods when and where needed . . . across every ocean in the . . . most difficult and dangerous job ever undertaken." I urge my colleagues to honor the contribution of the Merchant Marine by voting "yes" on H. Con. Res. 327.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 327.

The question was taken.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LITERACY INVOLVES FAMILIES TOGETHER ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3222) to amend the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve literacy through family literacy projects, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Literacy Involves Families Together Act".

TITLE I—FAMILY LITERACY

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1002(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6302(b)) is amended by striking "\$118,000,000 for fiscal year 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years." and inserting "\$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2001."

SEC. 102. IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

Section 1111(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(7) the State educational agency will encourage local educational agencies and individual schools participating in a program assisted under this part to offer family literacy services (using funds under this part), if the agency or school determines that a substantial number of students served under this part by the agency or school have parents who do not have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent or who have low levels of literacy."

SEC. 103. EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS.

(a) PART HEADING.—The part heading for part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6361 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"PART B—WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS".

(b) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—Section 1201 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6361) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "high quality" after "build on"; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) promote the academic achievement of children and adults;";

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) use instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research (as defined in section 2252) and the prevention of reading difficulties for children and, to the extent such research is available, scientifically based reading research (as so defined) for adults."

(c) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) RESERVATION FOR MIGRANT PROGRAMS, OUTLYING AREAS, AND INDIAN TRIBES.—Section 1202(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "(or, if such appropriated amount exceeds \$200,000,000, 6 percent of such amount)" after "1002(b)";

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "If the amount of funds made available under this

subsection exceeds \$4,600,000," and inserting "After the date of the enactment of the Literacy Involves Families Together Act,"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS.—The Secretary shall ensure that programs under paragraph (1)(C) are coordinated with family literacy programs operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in order to avoid duplication and to encourage the dissemination of information on high quality family literacy programs serving American Indians."

(2) RESERVATION FOR FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 1202(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) RESERVATION FOR FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) EVALUATION, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, AND REPLICATION ACTIVITIES.—From amounts appropriated under section 1002(b), the Secretary may reserve not more than 3 percent of such amounts for purposes of—

"(A) carrying out the evaluation required by section 1209; and

"(B) providing, through grants or contracts with eligible organizations, technical assistance, program improvement, and replication activities.

"(2) RESEARCH.—In the case of fiscal years 2001 through 2004, if the amounts appropriated under section 1002(b) for any of such years exceed such amounts appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve from such excess amount \$2,000,000 or 50 percent, whichever is less, to carry out section 1211(b)."

(d) RESERVATION FOR GRANTS.—Section 1202(c)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "From funds reserved under section 2260(b)(3), the Secretary shall award grants," and inserting "For any fiscal year for which at least one State applies and qualifies and for which the amount appropriated under section 1002(b) exceeds the amount appropriated under such section for the preceding fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve, from the amount of such excess remaining after the application of subsection (b)(2), the amount of such remainder or \$1,000,000, whichever is less, to award grants,"; and

(2) by adding at the end "No State may receive more than one grant under this subsection."

(e) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 1202(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(d)(2)) is amended by striking "that section" and inserting "that part".

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1202(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "or" after "higher education," and inserting "a religious organization, or"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "nonprofit organization" and inserting "nonprofit organization, including a religious organization,".

(g) SUBGRANTS FOR LOCAL PROGRAMS.—Section 1203(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6363(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) MINIMUM SUBGRANT AMOUNTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no State shall award a subgrant under paragraph (1) in an amount less than \$75,000.

"(B) SUBGRANTEES IN NINTH AND SUCCEEDING YEARS.—No State shall award a

subgrant under paragraph (1) in an amount less than \$52,500 to an eligible entity for a fiscal year to carry out an Even Start program that is receiving assistance under this part or its predecessor authority for the ninth (or any subsequent) fiscal year.

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR SINGLE SUBGRANT.—A State may award one subgrant in each fiscal year of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective in an amount less than \$75,000 if, after awarding subgrants under paragraph (1) for such fiscal year in accordance with subparagraphs (A) and (B), less than \$75,000 is available to the State to award such subgrants."

(h) USES OF FUNDS.—Section 1204 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6364) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "family-centered education programs" and inserting "family literacy services"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) USE OF FUNDS FOR FAMILY LITERACY SERVICES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—States may use a portion of funds received under this part to assist eligible entities receiving a subgrant under section 1203(b) in improving the quality of family literacy services provided under Even Start programs under this part, except that in no case may a State's use of funds for this purpose for a fiscal year result in a decrease from the level of activities and services provided to program participants in the preceding year.

"(2) PRIORITY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), a State shall give priority to programs that were of low quality, as evaluated based on the indicators of program quality developed by the State under section 1210.

"(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO HELP LOCAL PROGRAMS RAISE ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), a State may use the funds referred to in such paragraph to provide technical assistance to help local programs of demonstrated effectiveness to access and leverage additional funds for the purpose of expanding services and reducing waiting lists.

"(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Assistance under paragraph (1) shall be in the form of technical assistance and training, provided by a State through a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement with an entity that has experience in offering high quality training and technical assistance to family literacy providers."

(i) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Section 1205 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6365) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as paragraphs (13) and (14), respectively;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (6) through (9), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) with respect to the qualifications of staff the cost of whose salaries are paid, in whole or in part, with Federal funds provided under this part, ensure that—

"(A) not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Literacy Involves Families Together Act—

"(i) a majority of the individuals providing academic instruction—

"(I) shall have obtained an associate's, bachelor's, or graduate degree in a field related to early childhood education, elementary school education, or adult education; or

"(II) shall meet qualifications established by the State for early childhood education, elementary school education, or adult education provided as part of an Even Start program or another family literacy program;

"(ii) the individual responsible for administration of family literacy services under this part has received training in the operation of a family literacy program; and

"(iii) paraprofessionals who provide support for academic instruction have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent; and

"(B) beginning on the date of the enactment of the Literacy Involves Families Together Act, all new personnel hired to provide academic instruction—

"(i) have obtained an associate's, bachelor's, or graduate degree in a field related to early childhood education, elementary school education, or adult education; or

"(ii) meet qualifications established by the State for early childhood education, elementary school education, or adult education provided as part of an Even Start program or another family literacy program";

(4) by inserting after paragraph (9) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

"(10) use instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research (as defined in section 2252) for children and, to the extent such research is available, for adults;

"(11) encourage participating families to attend regularly and to remain in the program a sufficient time to meet their program goals;

"(12) include reading readiness activities for preschool children based on scientifically based reading research (as defined in section 2252) to ensure children enter school ready to learn to read"; and

(5) in paragraph (14) (as so redesignated), by striking "program." and inserting "program to be used for program improvement."

(j) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—Section 1206 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6366) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(B) by striking "part;" and inserting "part, or who are attending secondary school,"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

"(3) CHILDREN 8 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.—If an Even Start program assisted under this part collaborates with a program under part A, and funds received under such part A program contribute to paying the cost of providing programs under this part to children 8 years of age or older, the Even Start program, notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), may permit the participation of children 8 years of age or older."

(k) PLAN.—Section 1207(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6367(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "and continuous improvement" after "plan of operation";

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking "goals;" and inserting "objectives, strategies to meet such objectives, and how they are consistent with the program indicators established by the State;";

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking "and" at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) by striking "Act, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act," and inserting "Act"; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(E) by adding at the end the following: " (G) a description of how the plan provides for rigorous and objective evaluation of progress toward the program objectives described in subparagraph (A) and for continuing use of evaluation data for program improvement."; and

(2) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “(1)(A)” and inserting “(1)”.

(1) AWARD OF SUBGRANTS.—Section 1208 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6368) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking “including a high” and inserting “such as a high”; and

(ii) by striking “part A;” and inserting “part A, a high number or percentage of parents who have been victims of domestic violence, or a high number or percentage of parents who are receiving assistance under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(F), by striking “Federal” and inserting “non-Federal”;

(C) in paragraph (1)(H), by inserting “family literacy projects and other” before “local educational agencies”; and

(D) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “one or more of the following individuals:” and inserting “one individual with expertise in family literacy programs, and may include other individuals, such as one or more of the following:”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—In awarding subgrant funds to continue a program under this part after the first year, the State educational agency shall review the progress of each eligible entity in meeting the objectives of the program referred to in section 1207(c)(1)(A) and shall evaluate the program based on the indicators of program quality developed by the State under section 1210.”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (5)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) The Federal share of any subgrant renewed under subparagraph (A) shall be limited in accordance with section 1204(b).”.

(m) RESEARCH.—Section 1211 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6369b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsections (a) and (b)”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH ON FAMILY LITERACY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts reserved under section 1202(b)(2), the National Institute for Literacy shall carry out research that—

“(A) is scientifically based reading research (as defined in section 2252); and

“(B) determines—

“(i) the most effective ways of improving the literacy skills of adults with reading difficulties; and

“(ii) how family literacy services can best provide parents with the knowledge and skills they need to support their children’s literacy development.

“(2) USE OF EXPERT ENTITY.—The National Institute for Literacy shall carry out the research under paragraph (1) through an entity, including a Federal agency, that has expertise in carrying out longitudinal studies of the development of literacy skills in children and has developed effective interventions to help children with reading difficulties.”.

(n) TREATMENT OF RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS.—Part B of title I of the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6361 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1213. RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS INCLUDED AS PARTNERSHIP PARTICIPANTS.—In carrying out this part, the Secretary, and any grantee or subgrantee receiving assistance under this part, shall treat religious organizations the same as other nongovernmental organizations, so long as this part is implemented in a manner consistent with the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution. The Secretary, and any grantee or subgrantee receiving assistance under this part, shall not discriminate against an organization that participates in a partnership that is an eligible entity receiving assistance under this part, or an organization that participates in a partnership that is applying to receive such assistance, on the basis that the organization has a religious character.

“(b) RELIGIOUS CHARACTER AND INDEPENDENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A religious organization that participates in a partnership that is an eligible entity receiving assistance under this part, or that participates in a partnership that is applying to receive such assistance, shall retain its religious character and control over the definition, development, practice, and expression of its religious beliefs.

“(2) ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS.—Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government shall require a religious organization—

“(A) to alter its form of internal governance; or

“(B) to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols;

in order to be eligible to participate in a partnership that is an eligible entity receiving assistance under this part or to participate in a partnership that is applying to receive such assistance.

“(3) EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—A religious organization’s exemption provided under section 702 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-1) regarding employment practices shall not be affected by its participation in, or receipt of funds from, a program under this part.

“(c) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—No funds provided to a religious organization under this part or section 1002(b) shall be expended for sectarian worship or instruction or proselytization.

“(d) PROHIBITION ON SERVING AS FISCAL AGENT.—A religious organization may not serve as a fiscal agent for a partnership that is an eligible entity receiving a subgrant under this part.

“(e) NONDISCRIMINATION AGAINST BENEFACTARIES.—A religious organization shall not discriminate against an individual, in regard to rendering services under this part, on the basis of religion, a religious belief, or refusal actively to participate in a religious practice.

“(f) FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—For purposes of any Federal, State, or local law, receipt of financial assistance under this part or section 1002(b) shall constitute receipt of Federal financial assistance or aid.

“(g) FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any religious organization providing services under this part shall be subject to the same regulations as other entities providing services under this part to account in accord with generally accepted auditing principles.

“(2) LIMITED AUDIT.—If such organization segregates Federal funds provided under this part into a separate account or accounts, then only the Federal funds used to provide services shall be subject to audit.

“(h) TREATMENT OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity may not subject a participant in an Even Start program assisted under this part, during such program, to sectarian worship or instruction or proselytization.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to affect any program that is not an Even Start program (regardless of whether it is carried out before, after, or at the same time as an Even Start program).

“SEC. 1214. PROHIBITION ON VOUCHERS OR CERTIFICATES.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no services under this part may be provided through voucher or certificate.”.

SEC. 104. EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN.

Section 1304(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6394(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) a description of how the State will encourage programs and projects assisted under this part to offer family literacy services if the program or project serves a substantial number of migratory children who have parents who do not have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent or who have low levels of literacy.”.

SEC. 105. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (29) as paragraphs (16) through (30), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

“(15) FAMILY LITERACY SERVICES.—The term ‘family literacy services’ means services provided to participants on a voluntary basis that are of sufficient intensity in terms of hours, and of sufficient duration, to make sustainable changes in a family, and that integrate all of the following activities:

“(A) Interactive literacy activities between parents and their children.

“(B) Training for parents regarding how to be the primary teacher for their children and full partners in the education of their children.

“(C) Parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency.

“(D) An age-appropriate education to prepare children for success in school and life experiences.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS.—Section 1202(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6362(e)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(2) READING AND LITERACY GRANTS.—Section 2252 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6661a) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively.

SEC. 106. INDIAN EDUCATION.

(a) EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—Section 1143 of the Education

Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2023) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “(f)” and inserting “(g)”;

(B) by striking “(e)” and inserting “(f)”;

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) family literacy services.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “(f),” and inserting “(g),”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) Family literacy programs operated under this section, and other family literacy programs operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, shall be coordinated with family literacy programs for American Indian children under part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to avoid duplication and to encourage the dissemination of information on quality family literacy programs serving American Indians.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1146 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2026) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (8) through (15), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the term ‘family literacy services’ has the meaning given such term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801);”.

TITLE II—INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM FOR READING MOTIVATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 10501(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8131(a)) is amended by striking “books to students, that motivate children to read.” and inserting “books to young and school-aged children that motivate them to read.”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF CONTRACT.—Section 10501(b)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8131(b)(4)) is amended by inserting “training and” before “technical assistance”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10501(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8131(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$10,300,000 for fiscal year 1995” and inserting “\$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2000”; and

(2) by striking “four” and inserting “five”.

(d) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—Section 10501 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8131) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (c) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after the section heading the following:

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this program is to establish and implement a model partnership between a governmental entity and a private entity, to help prepare young children for reading, and motivate older children to read, through the distribution of in-

expensive books. Local reading motivation programs assisted under this section shall use such assistance to provide books, training for volunteers, motivational activities, and other essential literacy resources, and shall assign the highest priority to serving the youngest and neediest children in the United States.”.

(e) NEW PROVISIONS.—Section 10501 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8131) is amended by inserting before subsection (g) (as so redesignated by subsection (d)) the following:

“(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN SUBCONTRACTORS.—

“(1) FUNDS FROM OTHER FEDERAL SOURCES.—Subcontractors operating programs under this section in low-income communities with a substantial number or percentage of children with special needs, as described in subsection (c)(3), may use funds from other Federal sources to pay the non-Federal share of the cost of the program, if those funds do not comprise more than 50 percent of the non-Federal share of the funds used for the cost of acquiring and distributing books.

“(2) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the contractor may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement in subsection (c)(1) for a subcontractor, if the subcontractor demonstrates that it would otherwise not be able to participate in the program, and enters into an agreement with the contractor with respect to the amount of the non-Federal share to which the waiver will apply. In a case in which such a waiver is granted, the requirement in subsection (c)(2) shall not apply.

“(f) MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS.—The contractor may enter into a multi-year subcontract under this section, if—

“(1) the contractor believes that such subcontract will provide the subcontractor with additional leverage in seeking local commitments; and

“(2) the subcontract does not undermine the finances of the national program.”.

SEC. 202. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 201 shall take effect on October 1, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KUYKENDALL) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) 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 H.R. 3222.

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, the greatest problem facing the Nation, in my estimation and that of many, is the fact that we have close to 100 million people in the United States at the present time who are functioning on either Level I or Level II literacy skills. Level I literacy skill will ensure that they will never receive a piece of the American dream.

With Level II, it will be very, very difficult in the 21st century, in the high-tech century, to ever be able to compete.

That is a real tragedy. That is a tragedy that in my estimation will destroy this Nation. All nations generally fall from within. There are many reasons why this one could fall from within, but none, in my estimation, more likely to cause that downfall than the fact that we do have close to 100 million people who are having a very difficult time surviving in this 21st century.

At the same time, of course, we are being asked to bring in hundreds of thousands of people from other countries in order to fill our \$40,000, \$50,000, and \$60,000 jobs, and all of those we have, of course, cannot rise to any level where they would begin to think about \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 jobs.

So we have had Even Start working for quite a few years. It has been working well. The reason we are here tonight is because I do not want to wait, as we did with Head Start. In Head Start I tried to say for 10 or 12 years that the program, so well-intended, was not working, and all the studies would show that it was not working. It was not working because no one was paying any attention to whether there were quality programs or not, so it became a poverty jobs program, it became a baby-sitting program, but it was supposed to be a reading readiness program for preschoolers. It was supposed to be a program to make sure children were ready to learn by the time they came to first grade.

The reason we are here tonight is to make sure we do not fall into that trap, but that as a matter of fact we improve a piece of legislation that has been doing well.

These are just some of the results that we have from programs and evaluations, which are meaningful evaluations because they were done as technical evaluations by those who are qualified to do such.

A high percentage of adults get their GED or their high school certification. Sixty-two percent of those seeking certification from the program have received those certifications. A significant percentage obtain and keep employment, a 50 percent increase. Parents continue to seek employment and enroll in education and training programs. Families reduce their reliance on public assistance, and 45 percent reduced it dramatically or are completely off.

Even Start helps children. Eighty percent are rated at class average or above after they leave an Even Start program and go on to kindergarten. Children continue to perform average or better in their classes, as judged by their teachers. In third grade, 75 percent of children perform well on formal assessments, 60 percent at average or better in reading, 80 percent in language, and 73 percent in math.

What we have done in the Even Start program is something that we should have done years and years ago. If we are going to break the cycle of illiteracy, we do not just deal with children or adults, we have to deal with the family.

Of course, this was not a new idea of mine when I arrived here and introduced it. We began it in Spring Grove School District when I was superintendent there, when I asked our early childhood specialists, what is it we can do to break the cycle? We know every parent that did not graduate from high school that now has children in the school. We know every older brother and sister that did not graduate. Is there not some way to break the cycle?

She said, yes, we will go out into the homes with 3- and 4-year-olds and we will work with the parents and the 3- and 4-year-olds. We will show the parents what it is we can do to help children to become reading-ready and school ready. We will improve the literacy skills of the parent so they can become the child's first and most important teacher.

□ 2130

We will help prepare those 3- and 4-year olds so they do not have a failing experience when they arrive in first grade.

It has been a successful program but we want to make sure it is even more successful. So we strengthen the accountability in this reauthorization. States will review the progress of local programs to make sure that they are meeting the goals of helping parents to read, helping children to learn, and training parents on how to be good teachers for their children.

We have quality improvement so that the States use a portion of their Federal money to provide training and Federal assistance to Even Start instructors to make sure they are at the highest level. We have the scientific research standards, additional money in there, because we have a lot of research on how children learn to read. We have very little research on how adults learn to read.

We have family literacy in Title I and the migrant programs where it is most needed. And then we have qualifications for instructional personnel so that, as a matter of fact, they are of the highest caliber.

These are just some of the things that we have done. We have also included the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program, the RIF program, and we add a new title extending and amending the reauthorization for this program.

These are some of the things that we are trying to do to make sure that, as a matter of fact, we do not fail from within simply because we have a growing number of people who cannot compete in a 21st century high-tech society.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by first thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) for his wisdom and guidance as the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. It has been a pleasure working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I know that I speak for the entire House of Representatives when I wish him all the happiness and health in his retirement. I use that word loosely because we have already had some conversation, so I do not really think he will be retiring, he will just be starting on a new journey. But he will be missed here in the House.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3222 to express my support for the Literacy Involves Families Together Act. This bill strengthens Even Start in the focus of family literacy in Title I and our Native American Education Programs.

This legislation will also define staff qualifications, which we know is so important for programs using Federal funds to support instructional staff. The bill will require that academic instructors have a post-secondary degree or meet State qualifications. By requiring a higher level of qualifications, we are ensuring the highest returns for our Even Start children and families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill levels the playing field for our neediest families who often need special services to provide basic education to their children. Finally, this bill will strengthen the accountability of Even Start programs by ensuring that program performance is measured by local goals tied to State performance indicators.

While I do support this program, Mr. Speaker, I do have some concerns about two changes that have been made to this bill. Both the amount of money that we are authorizing and the length of time we are authorizing this program have been reduced significantly.

Mr. Speaker, just last year in Nassau County, part of my district, BOCES, which is as an educational school, served over 100 families. Can my colleagues imagine how many more families we could serve with the full reauthorization of this bill? I find in my district alone that more and more families are looking for services like this.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) has said, if we help educate the parent, certainly the children are only going to do better.

It is my sincere hope that we can work out these issues in conference. Until then, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I will try to do this in 2 minutes, but I do not know if I will make it. We are here to talk about something that is probably worth more than 2 minutes to spend on, and that is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman himself.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3222, the Literacy Involves Families Together Act. This important legislation extends and improves the Even Start Family Literacy Program and the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program, better known as Reading is Fundamental.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one that deserves more credit for bringing the attention to the problem of illiteracy in this country than the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and author of the Even Start Family Literacy Program.

Since his election to the House of Representatives almost 26 years ago, and, yes, it has been that long, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has fought to ensure that every child and adult has the literacy skills they need to succeed in school and the workplace and in their local communities.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) has worked diligently to improve the quality of adult education programs. Through his efforts, those with the lowest levels of literacy have been able to overcome obstacles, obtain gainful employment, and share in the opportunities of this great Nation.

In 1991, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) was the driving force behind the enactment of the National Literacy Act which established the National Institute for Literacy. The Institute coordinates literacy efforts among the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services and Labor. In addition, the National Institute for Literacy works with States as well as local providers to provide them with the latest information on quality adult education and family literacy programs.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has also pioneered legislation to change the way children are taught to read. Through the development and enactment of the Reading Excellence Act of 1988, the gentleman from Pennsylvania helped ensure that teachers are taught to teach reading using instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research. This has marked a major change in the way reading is taught in schools. Instead of fly-by-night fad programs, this legislation helps ensure our Nation's children are receiving the best possible reading instruction.

However, the greatest contribution to combatting illiteracy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) was the enactment of the Even Start Family Literacy Program. Back in 1988, at a time when Republicans were the minority party in the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) successfully pursued the enactment of this legislation.

Based on his experiences as an educator, he strongly believed that illiteracy can most successfully be eliminated by working with families. He knew that, unless we first empowered parents with poor reading skills to be their child's first and most important teacher, that their ability to help their children succeed in school would be greatly diminished.

Mr. Speaker, family illiteracy programs such as Even Start are one of the most effective methods of breaking the cycle of illiteracy in families, and we have the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to thank. I am, therefore, immensely pleased that the committee has included in H.R. 3222 my amendment to renaming the program the "William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Program."

I am sure families and family literacy providers throughout the United States join me in thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for all of his contributions to combatting illiteracy in this country. I encourage my colleagues to join me in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) for all of his contributions to creating a literate society. I also urge support of H.R. 3222, the Literacy Involves Families Together Act.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today's floor action represents another portion of the work of the Committee on Education and the Workforce on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Even Start has been, as we all know here, the result of the love and the hard work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), my chairman and my friend.

I have had the privilege of serving with my colleague for 24 years on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. He was here before I got here. He has been here 26 years, I believe, Mr. Speaker.

The work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has touched the lives of so many children during his career, providing many of them with the means to better themselves.

Indeed, I find myself a better person because of the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. GOODLING). He is a great friend and a very, very helpful mentor. His retirement at the end of this Congress is a great loss to this institution and the children of our country.

He has always been dedicated to quality and results for our Nation's children and our families. That is one thing he has taught me over and over again, we have to look at results.

This reauthorization of Even Start very much reflects these principles, his principles. It is extremely fitting that we honor the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) by renaming Even Start after him through this legislation.

The bill before us today strengthens Even Start in the focus of family literacy in Title I and Indian Education Programs. In addition, this substitute would increase the set-aside for migrant and Indian Even Start programs from 5 to 6 percent when the total appropriation reaches \$200 million. I believe this provision is especially important in increasing funding to Native Americans, a population that can greatly benefit from family literacy services.

In closing, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) for successfully getting this legislation to the floor despite the many roadblocks placed in his way. He was very, very persistent; and we owe him a deep debt of gratitude for that. His hard work on this program deserves the admiration of every Member of this House and the people of this country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3222, the Literacy Involves Families Together Act. However, I would like to first say a couple things about the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING). In all my years in Congress, I sincerely believe that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is the most knowledgeable person on the issue of education. Before coming to Congress, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a teacher, a principal, and superintendent. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) knows education. We in Congress have been fortunate to have him.

It is safe to say that we will miss the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING), his bipartisan spirit, and his passion for better education of all Americans. I think the respect for his leadership is shown by the number of the committee members that are here tonight at this late hour.

Back in 1988, when we served together on the Committee on Education and the Workforce as minority Members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) worked tirelessly to enact the Even Start Family Literacy Program. Even Start is based on his experience as an educator and his belief that illiteracy can most successfully be eliminated by working with families.

Even Start works with the adults without a GED and high school diploma and their children to break the cycles of illiteracy. This program has been successful in motivating and providing parents with the skills they need to play an active role in their children's education.

Today we have an opportunity to enhance this act and substantially increase the funding authorization to \$250 million for fiscal year 2001. This is a program that works. Not only does it increase literacy and active participation by parents in their children's education, but it provides enhanced opportunities for parents as well.

The bill epitomizes everything that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) has represented during his tenure in Congress. It increases charitable choice, strengthens accountability, ensures instruction is based on scientifically based research, it prevents waste, and actively increases parental involvement in education. This is a program that helps everyone who is involved.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3222 and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) in his efforts on behalf of American families.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), also from the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 3222, the Literacy Involves Families Together Act.

Before I go into the purpose of my opposition, I would like to take a moment to thank and honor the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) for his service to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) cares about education passionately, and many would say that he is an educator before he is a legislator. Today it is fitting that we honor the Even Start program, a program that he authored, with his name.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, however, in reluctant opposition to the bill because it contains a provision known as charitable choice. Charitable choice permits religious organizations to participate in various grant programs but allows them to discriminate on the basis of religion in their hiring with public funds.

□ 2145

Even Start is an excellent program that attacks education problems at the

most fundamental level: The family. Family literacy programs such as Even Start are particularly important for my own congressional district because adults in the Third Congressional District of Virginia have the lowest level of literacy skills in the State, but I will not support a program that turns the clock back on civil rights laws by allowing publicly funded employment discrimination as charitable choice does in this bill, and several other bills.

The majority accommodated several of my concerns about the original charitable choice provisions in order to provide better protection for beneficiaries and to ensure that no proselytization would occur during the federally funded program. However, the bill still affords religious organizations participating in the Even Start program the right to discriminate in their hiring with public funds.

Now let me make it clear that I am not suggesting that we take away a religious organization's ability to discriminate in their hiring with their private funds, as protected under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and as protected by the First Amendment. Here we are talking about discriminating and hiring on the basis of religion when using public funds. That is wrong.

It is important to note that this marks the first time the charitable choice has been added to an elementary and secondary education program.

Mr. Speaker, public education programs ought to be the last place that we should tolerate religious discrimination. Even the original author of the charitable choice in his legislative proposals to expand charitable choice provisions to other programs specifically carved out education programs.

Mr. Speaker, a number of organizations have expressed opposition to discrimination based on religion with Federal funds, and I would like to read part of a letter which states the charitable choice provision also allows the government to give taxpayer money to religious institutions and then allows those religious institutions to refuse to hire certain taxpayers for taxpayer-funded positions because they are not of the right religion. While allowing religious institutions to discriminate on the basis of religion in their privately funded activities is quite appropriate, tax-funded employment discrimination is not.

Mr. Speaker, that letter is signed by the American Association of University Women; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Jewish Committee; the American Jewish Congress; the Americans United for Separation of Church and State; the Anti-Defamation League; the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs; the Central Conference of American Rabbis; the Council of Chief State School Officers; Friends Committee of National Legislation; Hadassah, the Women's Zionist

Organization of America; the National Alliance of Black School Educators; the National Council of Jewish Women; the National Education Association; the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force; the National PTA; the National School Boards Association; People for the American Way; School Social Work Association of America; the Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO; the Union of American Hebrew Congresses; and the Women of Reform Judaism.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the complete text of the letter into the RECORD.

AMERICANS UNITED FOR
SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We, the undersigned religious, civil rights, civil liberties, and education organizations, are writing to urge you to oppose the "charitable choice" section of H.R. 3222, the Literacy Involves Families Together, or "Even Start" bill. We urge you to oppose this section because charitable choice is a frontal assault on the First Amendments guarantee of the separation of church and state.

Attaching "charitable choice" to Even Start represents the first time this controversial proposal has been included in education legislation. Although "charitable choice" was never envisioned to govern education programs, Even Start opens the door to tax funding of religious schools in all education programs in the future.

The charitable choice provision also allows the government to give taxpayer money to religious institutions and then allows those religious institutions to refuse to hire certain taxpayers for tax-funded positions because they are not of the "right" religion. While allowing religious institutions to discriminate on the basis of religion in their privately funded activities is quite appropriate, tax-funded employment discrimination is not.

The charitable choice provision further threatens to excessively entangle the institutions of church and state. Despite the provisions in charitable choice that purport to protect the religious autonomy of institutions that receive tax money, the government will regulate what it funds. This will result in government oversight, accounting and monitoring of houses of worship and other religious institutions.

For these reasons, we strongly urge you to oppose the "charitable choice" section of the "Even Start" bill.

Sincerely,

American Association of University Women
American Federation of Teachers
American Jewish Committee
American Jewish Congress
Americans United for the Separation of Church and State
Anti-Defamation League
Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs
Central Conference of American Rabbis
Council of Chief State School Officers
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America
National Alliance of Black School Educators
National Council of Jewish Women
National Education Association
National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce

National PTA
National School Boards Association
People For the American Way
School Social Work Association of America
Service Employees International Union (SEIU), AFL-CIO
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Women of Reform Judaism
Rachel Joseph, Legislative Associate

Mr. Speaker, family literacy programs are extremely important; and we should not be required to tolerate religious discrimination as a condition for the passage of this bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot support the bill and support the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) in this worthwhile endeavor, although I appreciate his hard work and dedication to education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), another subcommittee chair.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Literacy Involves Families Together bill. This legislation builds on a strong legacy of support for literacy programs by this Congress and in particular our Committee on Education and the Workforce chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). We believe that if children learn to read early their chance for success in school is much greater. At the same time, if the entire family is part of the learning process, all members of the family have the opportunity to reach their full potential.

I have heard it said that the family that prays together stays together, and the family that plays together stays together. I would like to add that the family that reads together progresses together.

With this bill, we will help break the cycle of poverty, unemployment and welfare that is often a result of illiteracy. This legislation accomplishes these goals through strengthened services under the Even Start literacy program. Specifically, H.R. 3222 provides more resources to train Even Start instructors. The need for more training is acute. For example, last year during a hearing on teacher preparation, we heard from a young African American teacher who was given a third grade class and told to teach them how to read. He had never had any training on teaching how to read.

He was simply told, you know how to read; teach them how to read.

He was frustrated. His students were not learning; and he was ready to quit. It was not until he received some additional training that he was able to really connect with and teach the children in his class and reach his full potential as a teacher.

Passage of this bill will give reading instructors the additional help they need.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to share my gratitude, along with my other colleagues, for the work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) on this important bill. As the author of several important literacy initiatives, including the Reading Excellence Act, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) recognized long ago the need for quality reading programs for the entire family. I have had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) on the Committee on Education and the Workforce since coming to Congress in 1993, and I have learned a lot from him on this and other education issues.

This legislation culminates the outstanding work that the chairman has done on literacy and will be a highlight of his legacy when he retires at the end of the 106th Congress. His dedication to the young people of this Nation is extraordinary and should be emulated by all Members of this body. I am sorry to see him go but wish him well in all that he does.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3222.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, a little over 24 hours ago, as a father, I was reading at home in Waco, Texas, my home, to our 3-year-old and 4-year-old sons. As a father who cares deeply about encouraging my children to learn how to read and to enjoy reading and learning, I appreciate deeply the chairman's leadership in literacy programs before this and previous Congresses, but I rise tonight to express the same reservation mentioned by my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

It seems to me to continue on a great program, and the program, the Even Start program is a great program, it is not necessary to use Federal tax dollars to allow organizations to discriminate against American citizens based simply on their own religious faith. It is not necessary to not only allow but to actually subsidize with Federal tax dollars religious discrimination in order to give children an even start in life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, perhaps with the agreement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), if I could ask the chairman perhaps a question. With the chairman's indulgence, if I could just clarify a point by asking him a question, if I could, on page 20 of the bill it talks about treatment of program participants. In fact, if we go back to page 17 it talks about, under section 1213, religious organizations included and partnership participants.

Could I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), so we

can be clear on the definition, when the term religious organizations is mentioned in this language does the chairman intend that that includes directly churches, synagogues and houses of worship or separate entities, perhaps secular separate entities set up by those churches, synagogues and houses of worship?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it could be either, because we do not express in the legislation one or the other.

Mr. EDWARDS. For clarification purposes, it would allow dollars to go either directly from the Secretary or from one of the partners directly not to Catholic charities but to St. Mary's Catholic Church and communities somewhere in our country. I appreciate that.

One of the concerns that I have had about charitable choice in so many other bills is that what that then does is either require the Federal Government to not be accountable for how those dollars are spent or to actually have the Federal Government go in and audit the books of churches and synagogues and houses of worship.

I see in the gentleman's bill actually language in there saying that if the church actually or house of worship separates the funds, then the Federal Government can only audit that particular account. Does that then mean if a church that gets this money directly under this program does not separate that, then the Federal Government will have to come in and perhaps audit all of the books of that church?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. I would like to respond to the gentleman's inquiry. First of all, the church cannot be a fiscal agent. They cannot, in our legislation, be a fiscal agent.

Mr. EDWARDS. They can receive the funds from the fiscal agent?

Mr. GOODLING. Right. Secondly, only the partnership gets the money. The church itself cannot get the money. The partnership that the church is working with gets the money, not the church itself.

Mr. EDWARDS. The church decides who to hire; the church does not get the money directly?

Mr. GOODLING. They cannot get the money directly.

Mr. EDWARDS. In this bill, okay. But I guess the point I would raise is that if the church is involved in hiring people and being responsible for expenditures of Federal tax dollars, it opens up the possibility that in some way or another a church or a house of worship is going to have to be audited

in order to ensure the taxpayers that their monies are being spent for the purpose for which this bill intended.

Mr. Speaker, clearly my greatest objection is not that this is good legislation. It has worked well and could continue to work well, but it is wrong even in the best of legislation to take our Federal tax dollars and give to any organization and say they can take those Federal tax dollars and put out a sign that says, such as a Bob Jones' related church they could say, no Catholic need apply here for a federally funded job.

I understand why the Civil Rights Act says the Methodist church can hire a Methodist pastor, a Jewish synagogue can hire a Jewish rabbi. That is why there was an exception in the Civil Rights Act for that kind of quote/unquote discrimination, but the Civil Rights Act passed in the 1960s never envisioned Federal dollars going directly to pervasively sectarian organizations.

In fact, I found it interesting in this bill it says it has to be consistent with the establishment/separation clause of the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights. The 1988 Kendrick case, Bowen versus Kendrick, basically said clearly one cannot send direct tax dollars to pervasively sectarian organizations.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to indicate that, of course, as I have indicated on Ms. JOHNSON's bill, these organizations who should really be participating when one is dealing with families and are trying to improve family life, would not participate, of course, if they have to give up their Title VII protection. The President, the Vice President, have both indicated very clearly, the President said common sense says that faith and faith-based organizations from all religious backgrounds can play an important role in helping children to reach their fullest potential. I agree with that, and I believe that we have protected everybody in this legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time by 10 minutes, to be divided and controlled between the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), our subcommittee chair.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3222, the Literacy Involves Families Together Act, legislation to

ensure that every child and every adult has literacy skills they need to succeed. I also want to take a moment to commend the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

As some of us may know, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) was the driving force behind the National Literacy Act and he changed the way children learn to read with the enactment of the Reading Excellence Act.

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, once again the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is leading the charge to create a more literate society with the reauthorization of the Even Start Family Illiteracy Program, a bill he helped offer nearly 12 years ago.

Like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), I believe that the literacy skills of America's adults are simply not adequate to encourage individual opportunity, increase worker productivity, or strengthen our country's competitiveness around the world.

According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, approximately 21 percent of the adult population, more than 40 million Americans over the age of 16, has only rudimentary reading and writing skills. An additional 8 million adults were unable to perform the most basic literacy test and a smaller percentage had such limited skills that they were unable to even respond to the survey.

Sadly, studies show that illiteracy is an intergenerational problem, one that follows a parent-child pattern. Students who have not been exposed to reading before they enter school are at a significant disadvantage when compared with students whose parents read to them. In addition, students with illiterate parents are more likely to perform poorly in school, and they are more likely to drop out before graduation.

The bill before us today, the Literacy Involves Family Together Act seeks to remedy these problems by improving the quality of services provided under the Even Start Family Literacy Program.

Specifically, LIFT would require Even Start programs to base reading instruction on scientifically based research. As part of the National Reading Panel, the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development has conducted extensive research on the best way to teach children to read, and I believe it is of utmost importance for our literacy centers to make use of this data.

LIFT would also fund a research project to find the most effective way to improve literacy among parents and reading difficulties and to help parents use their new skills to support their children's redevelopment.

Finally, the LIFT act raises the quality of family literacy programs to allow States to use a portion of their Even Start dollars to provide expert training and technical assistance to Even Start providers and family literacy instructors.

We live in a Nation where both the volume and variety of written information are growing and where increasing numbers of citizens are expected to be able to read, understand, and use these materials.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) for his leadership and wish him a long and enjoyable retirement.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for managing this bill and for the hard work that the gentlewoman has done on this legislation that is so important to us, in particular, gun violence. And I would like to say that I associate myself with her fight to control that.

As it relates to this bill, I would also like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), a gentleman that I have had the opportunity for the past 12 years to work with on the committee that has changed its name several times, the former Education and Labor Committee, now Committee on Education and the Workforce, and I would like to wish him a healthy and a useful retirement.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I had the privilege to chat with him on the elevator today and asked what is the gentleman going to do with all of his time. We know it is going to be used in a very positive way. And so I feel privileged to have served on the committee with the gentleman.

I do, as many may know, for a number of years from around 1990 until about 1995, I introduced a National Literacy Day bill, which at that time under the other rules of the House if we had 218 Members to sign the resolution, it would come to the floor, and for a number of years, we moved the National Literacy Day.

I do recall working very closely with the gentleman when we had White House conferences dealing with the question of literacy when the National Literacy headquarters was conceived and State literacy councils were formed.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very close to this question of literacy, and Literacy Involves Families Together Act is certainly in the right direction. As I have indicated, this has been really one of my pet projects that I have worked with in many years. However, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), as he raised in a bill last week, which was also a very good bill dealing with

welfare reform, but also in that piece of legislation, there was this question about Charitable Choice.

It seems like every piece of legislation that we will see from now on will have this question about Charitable Choice. As we know, Charitable Choice provision allows the government to give taxpayer money to religious institutions and then allows those religious institutions to refuse to hire certain taxpayers for tax-funded positions, because they are not of the right religion. While allowing religious institutions to discriminate on the basis of religion in their privately funded activities is quite appropriate and no one opposes that, tax-funded employment discrimination is wrong.

And as we know, it permits religious institutions that receive Federal funds to discriminate in their employment based on religious. It opens the door to tax funding of religious schools in all educational programs in the future. It harms religion by transforming religious ministries into administrative agencies of government benefits and services requiring them to terminate certain benefits, report on individuals, and otherwise police the system. It undermines the traditional role of religion. For that purpose, too, a bill which I commend, a bill that I feel embodied in what it stands for, because of this provision, which I see raising its ugly head continuously and continuously and continuously, for that purpose, I must oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I once again wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who has done an outstanding work, a good retirement and good health.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), an important member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for yielding the time to me, and I associate myself with all the positive remarks that have been made about his service.

I would observe that in most cases in the twilight of a politician's career, they search desperately for a legacy that is a testimony to that which they have done. Some find it in an edifice or a building, some find it in a last minute grant.

But today we memorialize a legacy that walks all over America and is a tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is young adults and children since 1988 who have learned together the fundamental key to success in life, which is the ability to read. This program supplies materials, sound fundamentals, and breaks the cycle and the stigma that is the biggest problem in adult literacy.

We have learned in education that an adult who otherwise would be stigmatized and not go to learn will relish

the opportunity to learn with their child. That is the legacy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and today's increase in that legacy is a testimony to what he has done.

There are schools all over this country, but there is one in my State called Pitts Elementary, Mr. Chairman, 100 percent poverty, 100 percent free and reduced lunch in the middle of a public housing project. Because of Even Start and the materials, the techniques and using the resources of a community, in Pitts Elementary children without hope and hopeless parents learn to read.

The generational cycle of literacy can only be broken when the child and the parent learn together, thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mrs. MCCARTHY on New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY). He can tell us just how important the program is, as well as the organization that helps support the program.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, and I would like to rise in respect to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), for all the hard work he has done with this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of cofounding the Literacy Council of San Diego County that serves over 3 million people in Southern California. And I must say sincerely that as we discussed opportunities and access for our citizens, there was an interesting term brought up called Charitable Choice. I would just ask all of us to remember what kind of choice this country is giving to the 20 percent of English-speaking learners who do not have a choice of being able to do what we ran into in San Diego County while I was chairman. They could not fill out an application for a job. They could not even find applications to be able to get government services to get training for the job.

A lot of people may think this is an issue of just a child learning to read or an adult learning to read, and that is somebody else's problem, because my family knows how to read. My children are going to good schools. My parents know how to read. My brothers and sisters are literate.

But let me tell my colleagues as someone who operated a system of criminal justice and social welfare that is larger than 32 States of the Union, that I found that 20 percent to 40 percent of the people that were in welfare and were in our criminal justice system were functionally illiterate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would just say if we want to fight crime, if we want to fight unemployment, we need to support bills like the gentleman's, and I

thank him very much for his proactive stance on this project.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate him not only on the bill but for his leadership on education issues over many years, both as Member of the minority and then as chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I also congratulate him on not only having passed the Even Start bill in 1988, but having overseen what has happened under that legislation and bringing us tonight this legislation that improves the effectiveness of the Even Start program and improves the quality of the teaching that will go on under Even Start.

Particularly, I want to commend the gentleman because he has never forgotten that children are the children of parents; that children grow up in families, and if children are not doing well, we need to look at both what the child needs and what their families need.

The holistic approach to learning to read embodied in this bill is the right answer, not just for children, but for families. Research has shown for decades that children do better in school if their parents are interested in their progress in school. Yet, if parents themselves have not felt the power of education in their lives, they cannot transmit to their children a love of learning, a respect for learning, or the excitement that is necessary to motivate children to learn when they are young and accomplish the goals so important in elementary school.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his leadership and thank him for his work over all of these decades here in the Congress.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a very important member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, in the Congress all of us depend on each other in dealing with a multitude of issues that are before us. But without doubt, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) has been Mr. Education to this Congress for many years. All of us have upon one occasion or another gone to him for advice on how to deal with issues regarding education. And I appreciate his efforts here.

In regard to the bill, there are several points I wanted to mention that I think are outstanding. First of all, accountability. We have passed many, many different pieces of legislation dealing with education. Most of them

have had very little accountability, most of them have not accomplished anything near what their potential was, and building accountability into this bill I think is essential.

The gentleman's step toward helping parents and children learn together is a stroke of genius, something we need very badly. But, again, it has to be accountable to make sure that it happens; but it can be a wonderful experience for both parents and child. The emphasis on research standards is important. Much of the research done in education today is superb; much of it, unfortunately, is not very good.

□ 2215

Particularly in the difficulties of reading, the study of dyslexia, there is a great deal of work that needs to be done. Many people, including one of my dear grandsons, suffer from that disease, and it is incredibly difficult.

The final point I would make is that science also can be important in teaching reading, and I have introduced a bill that the committee will shortly consider on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control said time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and also want to commend his leadership on the education issue. As I was a staffer here for 10 years, 6 on the House side and 4 on the Senate, I watched as he moved Even Start through. I watched as he has tried to change Head Start back into a literacy program, to try to reach out to those who are hurting and those who are behind and actually get them up to the academic level with which to compete and to advance in school so that they have the opportunities that the rest of America has.

I simply do not understand, in bill after bill after bill, why some Members on the minority side object to having an opportunity in this mix for faith-based organizations. The faith-based organizations that we are talking about are so narrowly defined by court decisions, they cannot spend taxpayers' dollars for any type of proselytization.

In this bill, because it goes through education, they have to be cleared through the education institutions. We agreed that they have to have a separation of anything else they do, including child care, from this program.

But many of the most innovative leaders in America, particularly in the black and Hispanic and other immigrant communities, are faith based. When they first come to America, in Fort Wayne, Indiana, not a hotbed of immigration, but we do have the largest Burmese immigration in the United States. We have, like many areas, a huge Hispanic immigration. We see areas of Fort Wayne, where the black churches have worked together and are now the agent for the Federal Government in housing partnerships, and as they try to redevelop the Hannah Creighton and work with Head Start and other programs, why if the school system decides they are not the best to do Even Start, what is this opposition so much to faith-based organizations?

It is a shame for the minority leadership in this country, because they need back up at the grassroots level.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of those who, of course, paid tribute to me, but I must say that we have had a wonderful working relationship in areas of education on both sides of the aisle, and could have accomplished very little even as chairman of the committee without that kind of cooperation. The gentlewoman from New York has been a joy to work with.

My friend from Michigan and I have been battling for, he said 24 years. I have been battling for 26, and he has been battling with me for 24. Not battling for ourselves, as none of the committee has been doing that, but what we are trying to do is make sure that every child in this country has an equal opportunity to get a piece of the American dream.

As I indicated when we started, there is no way that can happen if they and their parents are illiterate, or even functionally illiterate in this 21st century. There was a time a parent could get a job, rear a family, and, of course, not let anyone know that he or she could not read, but that time has gone, and is gone forever.

I would hope as we continue, as I have told the committee many times, and as someone mentioned from the other side, I hope my portrait in the room, the lips will move every time they are deliberating, and the lips will say, We want to make sure that we have results, not process; we want to make sure that it is quality, not quantity, because that is the only way, in my estimation, we can be successful in preventing the fall of this great Nation, which I truly believe will happen

if we cannot successfully deal with the literacy issue.

I want to thank the staffs. I have told the staffs over and over again what I will miss most of all when I leave this institution are the wonderful staffers that I have worked with for a long, long time.

Sitting next to me, I want to truly pay tribute to Lynn Selmsler. She has had to put up with me for 19 years. I do not know of anybody that has probably put up with a Member of Congress for 19 years and survived. But when there were literacy issues, she was there; if there were nutrition issues, she was there; if there were Impact Aid issues, she was there helping.

So it has been a wonderful experience in the Congress of the United States. I am not going to say that I am going to miss the rigors of the job. I am surely not missing the campaign that all of you are involved in. In fact, I sit back and smile and say, go to it; I do not have to do that any longer.

But I will miss our efforts that we jointly embarked upon to try to make sure that we do have a literate workforce, that our workforce can perform, that we do not have to rely on other countries to supply our people to do the \$40,000, \$50,000 and \$60,000 jobs.

We have lost a lot of time, because our whole effort from the very beginning was to try to make sure that we close that achievement gap, and we must close it, and I would hope that this legislation will go a long way to do that.

I just hope that, as I leave, I watch the committee still making sure that every parent and every child becomes literate, so that no child goes to the first grade without the ability to learn and without the ability to read, because they will fail, and that will be one more tragedy.

So, again I thank all the members of the committee, and thank all of the staff for the wonderful work that they have done over the years.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close again saying there are many of us that support this amendment. I will also say that I have only been on the committee chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) for 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for him, for the work he has done, and I know he has always put the children first. I support what he is trying to do with this amendment. The gentleman and I agree 100 percent that if our children and parents cannot read, then we cannot lift up everyone.

Again, it has been a pleasure working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). I am sure when I first got there he had no idea what kind of person I was going to be, but he found out I was actually the strong, quiet type, and only spoke when I found it was extremely important. He appreciated that, because I saved him time. We will miss you, Chairman GOODLING, and it has been a pleasure being with you and learning from you over these 4 years.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to explain why Congress should reject the Literacy Involves Families Together (LIFT) Act (House Resolution 3222), which aims to increase "family literacy" by directing money from the American taxpayer to Washington and funneling a small percentage of it back to the states and localities to spend on education programs that meet the specifications of DC-based bureaucrats. While all support the goal of promoting adult literacy, especially among parents with young children, Congress should not endorse supporting the unconstitutional and ineffective means included in this bill. If Congress were serious about meaningful education reform, we would not even be debating bills like H.R. 3222. Rather, we would be discussing the best way to return control over the education dollar to the people so they can develop the education programs that best suit their needs.

Several of my colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee have expressed opposition to the LIFT Act's dramatic increase in authorized expenditures for the Even Start family literacy programs. Of course, I share their opposition to the increased expenditure, however, my opposition to this bill is based not as much on the authorized amount but on the bill's underlying premise: that the American people either cannot or will not provide educational services to those who need them unless they are forced to do so by the federal government.

In contrast to the drafters of the LIFT bill, I do not trust the Congress to develop an education program that can match the needs of every community in the United States. Instead, I trust the American people to provide the type of education system that best suits their needs, and the needs of their fellow citizens, provided Congress gives them back control over the education dollar.

The drafters of the United States Constitution understood that the federal government was incapable of effectively providing services such as education. This is why they carefully limited the federal government's powers to a few narrowly defined areas. This understanding of the proper role of the federal government was reinforced by the tenth amendment which forbids the Federal Government from controlling education, instead leaving authority over education in the hands of states, local communities and parents.

Reinforcing that the scariest words in the English language are "I'm from the federal government and I am here to help you," the American education system has deteriorated in the years since Congress disregarded the constitutional limitations on centralizing education in order to "improve the schools." One

could argue that if the federally-controlled schools did a better job of educating children to read, perhaps there would not be a great demand for "adult literacy programs!"

Of course, family literacy programs do serve a vital purpose in society, but I would suggest that not only would family literacy programs exist, they would better serve those families in need of assistance if they were not controlled by the federal government. Because of the generosity of the American people, the issue is not whether family literacy programs will be funded but who should control the education dollars; the American people or the federal government?

Mr. Speaker, rather than give more control over education to the people, H.R. 3222 actually further centralizes education by attaching new requirements to those communities receiving taxpayer dollars for adult literacy programs. For example, under this bill, federally-funded Even Start programs must use instruction methods based on "scientific research." While none question the value of research into various educational methodologies, it is doubtful that the best way to teach reading can be totally determined through laboratory experiments. Learning to read is a complex process, involving many variables, not the least of which are the skills and abilities of the individual.

Many effective techniques may not be readily supported by "scientific research." Therefore, this program may end up preventing the use of many effective means of reading instruction. The requirement that recipients of federal funds use only those reading techniques based on "scientific research," (which in practice means those methods approved by the federally-funded "experts") ensures that a limited number of reading methodologies will, in essence, be "stamped with federal approval."

In addition to violating the United States Constitution, the LIFT bill raises some serious questions regarding the relationship between the state and the family. Promoting family literacy is a noble goal but programs such as these may promote undue governmental interference in family life. Many people around the country have expressed concern that "parenting improvement" programs have become excuses for the government bureaucrats to intimidate parents into ceding effective control over child-rearing to the government. While none of these complaints are directly related to the Even Start program Even Start does rest on the premise that it is legitimate for the federal government to interfere with the parent-child relationship to "improve" parenting. Once one accepts that premise, it is a short jump to interfering in all aspects of family life in order to promote the federal government's vision of "quality parenting."

In order to give control over education back to the American people, I have introduced several pieces of legislation that improve education by giving the American people control over their education dollar. For instance my Family Education Freedom Act (H.R. 935), provides parents with a \$3,000 per child tax credit for K-12 education expenses incurred in sending their children to public, private, or home school. I have also introduced the Education Improvement Tax Cut Act (H.R. 936),

which provides a tax donation of up to \$3,000 for cash or in-kind donations to public or private schools as well as for donations to elementary and secondary scholarships. I am also cosponsoring legislation (H.R. 969) to increase the tax donations for charitable contributions, as well as several bills to provide tax credits for adult job training and education.

Unleashing the charitable impulses of the American people is the most effective means of ensuring that all Americans have access to the quality education programs they need, and to make sure that those programs are tailored to meet the particular needs of the local communities and the individuals they serve.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to reject the LIFT Act and instead embrace a program of education and charitable tax credits that will give the American people the ability to provide for the education needs of their children and families in the way that best suits the unique circumstances of their own communities.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the former Chairman of the Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education Subcommittee, I was one of the original supporters of the Even Start program at its inception. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3222 The Literacy Involves Families Together Act, and commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his hard work and dedication to our children and their literacy. It is because of his efforts that we have been able to reduce the number of illiterate individuals in our communities, and I find it a fitting tribute that this program will be named after him.

We all realize that to succeed in today's society every person must be able to read and write. It is unacceptable that in a country as advanced as ours that we have millions of people who cannot read or write. H.R. 3222 helps to address this issue in several ways.

First, it would improve the quality of Even Start and other family literacy programs in several areas. It would provide training and technical assistance to local providers while at the same time assuring that the level of assistance does not decrease. It also requires that instructional programs are based on scientifically researched methods of teaching reading, and provides funding for research on teaching of reading to adults in family literacy programs. Finally, it establishes qualifications for instructional staff in Even Start programs whose salaries are paid with Even Start dollars.

Additionally, H.R. 3222 provides for charitable choice by allowing government to consider religious organizations, as part of eligible partnerships on the same basis as other groups receiving funding. Our churches, Synagogues, Mosques, and other religious organizations have a long tradition of helping those in need in our country including helping those who cannot read. This legislation helps them to carry on with that tradition in ensuring every American can read.

Finally, this legislation will help communities implement the inexpensive book distribution program which helps local communities provide books for disadvantaged children.

Once again I urge passage of H.R. 3222, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a very important piece of legislation, H.R.

3222, The Literacy Involves Families Together Act.

Even Start, and other family literacy programs, serve the most vulnerable families in our Nation.

According to the Department of Education, twenty-three percent of American adults were functionally illiterate in 1993.

We cannot expect these adults, and their families to become self-sufficient without literacy skills.

By helping them to break the cycle of illiteracy, family literacy programs help families lift themselves out of poverty and dependency on government programs.

H.R. 3222 ensures that Even Start, and other literacy programs are administered in the most effective way.

This legislation provides technical assistance to local providers, establishes qualifications for teaching staff, and requires that instruction be based on scientifically proven methods.

At the same time, it empowers parents to become involved in their children's education.

As we all know, this is critical to a child's educational success.

Additionally, children whose parents read to them are much better prepared to start school. They perform significantly better than those who have not been exposed to reading at home.

Passing this legislation is the first step in opening up a world of opportunities, not only for children, but their families as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation.

I am encouraged by the bipartisan support for this bill, and I am hopeful that both sides of the aisle can work together for the sake of all of America's families.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3222, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve literacy through family literacy projects and to reauthorize the inexpensive book distribution program."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4205, FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4205.