

Defense. It is the Federal Government itself.

We cannot evade that responsibility by just putting up fences and pretending that it does not exist. And by going faster and being more efficient, what we have done is not only lower the per unit cost, we eliminate long-term responsibilities.

If we do not pollute the aquifers in suburban Maryland that threaten the Chesapeake Bay or Martha's Vineyard, we are going to save the Federal Government a huge bill in the future.

Once we decontaminate that land, we are creating value. Right now these abandoned bases, the contaminated areas, are a liability. We spend money trying to keep people away. The trail in West Virginia that has a sign on it that says stay on the path, it is safe on the path. If you go off, they warn of explosions. Or the grade school children in Hope, Arkansas who take home flyers every year describing to children what the potential military waste looks like and that they should not touch it.

We are spending a lot of money now trying to keep people away from these destructive forces. If we are able to return the land to productive use, we are going to strengthen the environment. We are going to improve wildlife habitat. We will have more recreational opportunities in communities around the country where open space is a premium. We see unplanned growth and sprawl, and being able to turn these facilities back to the public, back to local government, back to park and recreational districts, which add value and quality of life.

Many of these facilities, abandoned bases and bombing ranges and military maneuvers, when they are returned have opportunities to be turned into commercial and housing uses, but they must be safe. Once we certify it is safe and we can turn it over, there are opportunities for colleges to be built and airports to be constructed, for parks and recreation, opportunities for commercial activities. These have tremendous, tremendous value.

In a nutshell, we will be adding value to communities, saving money and meeting our responsibilities for the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the American public is often ahead of the Federal Government and Members of this Chamber. In the energy debate of late it is interesting to note despite some of what I think is misleading information which has been presented by some in the Federal Government, the American public has a pretty good idea of what they want to have happen as far as energy is concerned. They want wise stewardship. They want conservation. They want us to have more fuel-efficient vehicles. The last thing they want to do is spoil the environment, drill in the Arctic Refuge and build massive numbers of power plants.

The same way when it comes to making our communities livable. Citizens

would like us to do our job for the Federal Government to be a better partner with them. In over 500 referenda on the State and local level across America, the public has voted at the ballot box to purchase open space, to clean up contamination, to protect watersheds, to provide more transportation choices, to fight against sprawl.

The Federal Government has an opportunity to work with the citizens to kind of run to catch up with them, maybe not lead the charge, but to be a full partner. There is nothing that the Federal Government can do that will make more of a difference for improving the livability back home than for us to take these sites, whether it is Spring Valley near the American University campus here in Washington, D.C., Camp Bonneville near Portland, Oregon, the Massachusetts Military Reservation, or any of the other 1,000 sites across the country, clean up after ourselves and enter into a partnership with the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful during this session of Congress we will no longer be missing in action. We will put the structure in place so somebody is in charge. We will put more money into research so we can do this job better. We will fund adequately over a specific period of time so the private sector can do its job, and we can make it easier to promote the livability of America's communities and make our families safe, healthy and more economically secure.

#### FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, the subject I want to address tonight is one that has been in the news a lot lately, and a lot of people are confused and many Members of Congress are confused. I want to review some of the basics, and that is about the faith-based initiative or the so-called Community Solutions Act that will be marked up presumably next week in the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as hopefully brought to the House floor right after the July 4th break.

This is an area that has, as I said, a lot of controversy in it, a lot of conflict in it, and at the same time is so basic to how we are going to deliver social services and how we might address the problems of the United States that it is absolutely essential.

I would like to go into a little bit of overview as to what all of the fuss is about and why so many people are talking about faith. One would think from some of the media coverage this is a brand new idea discovered by President Bush and it was never talked about before in American history. In fact, it has been part of the United States from the very beginning. It has

just been in recent years that we have tended to deny this.

The Pilgrims came here because they wanted to practice freedom of their faith. The Catholics in Maryland came because they wanted freedom for their faith.

The Quakers in Pennsylvania came to the United States because they wanted freedom to practice their faith. We have seen multiple revivals in American history, when George Whitfield came through and it swept through America right through the American Revolution, the Wesley brothers came and settled in south Georgia and then moved up the United States, and there was another evangelical revival.

On Monday on the House floor there is a proposal to build a memorial to John Adams and John Quincy Adams and Abigail Adams, but particularly focusing on John Adams.

The current second best-selling book in the United States by David McCullough, if you read that book, at the very beginning, it talks about how John Adams was raised in a religious family, and his father was a minister, and how John Adams initially started as a schoolteacher, and his dad wanted to be a minister. And it was only after deciding to become an attorney that he decided not to become a minister himself.

At the very end of that book when John Adams is giving advice, he says, "Walk humbly and serve God." John Adams, from the beginning, the middle, and the end was a very religious man.

But it was not just John Adams. John Quincy Adams' son who died in Statutory Hall, which used to be the old House Chamber, his last words were that he was ready to meet his maker and he was ready to go to heaven. He wrote a special book for his son giving him advice from the Bible and telling him how to avoid all of the perils of the European culture when he was over in Europe.

□ 2045

But it was not just the Adams family. Even those who were the least religious in the founding of our American Republic, arguably Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson was concerned enough about it that he did his own, in my belief, a phony Bible; but he took many of the teachings of the Bible with it because he believed it was a historic and important document for America's faith.

Ben Franklin repeatedly called on Congress at the very time when we were supposedly debating about the separation of church and state, right after they passed the religious liberty amendment Ben Franklin was among those who called and passed a resolution saying Jesus Christ was the one and only son of God and was the saviour of mankind.

Ben Franklin also had George Whitfield, probably the greatest evangelist ever to come to America, at his

home; and Ben Franklin was not, in my terms, a particularly religious man, but he understood the power and importance of faith to America and how it was so integrated in our culture, and he at least understood the power of faith.

We also saw that evolve. If Jefferson and Franklin were kind of the least religious of our Founding Fathers, we had the founders of the America Bible Society in our early Continental Congress, in our early Congresses. Most of the people in those Congresses were divinity school graduates.

Even when you look here in the House Chambers, and it will not be able to be seen on C-SPAN, but there are lawgivers all around this Chamber from Rome, from Greece and so on. All their heads on this side are turned that direction. On this side, they are turned that direction. There is only one facing towards Congress. It is Moses, Moses of Bible fame, who looks straight down on the chairman. Behind the chairman, it says, "In God We Trust."

So when we talk about separation of church and state, let us do not get too cute here. We have Moses looking down on us every time we debate this, with "In God We Trust" behind us.

What does this have to do with what we are talking about in public? It is because we have increasingly in America tried to deny this heritage and separate and act as though somehow we are not rooted in that and the people are not rooted in that, whereas the people in America are still a religious people; but the government has in effect tried to impose a secular alternative on this.

Let me look at the role of faith in social services. In fact, if religious organizations had not stepped in in the education field, all of our major universities were religious universities to begin with. They are not now, but Harvard and Princeton and Yale, all of these universities were founded as religious universities. All the major social organizations, hospitals, child abuse, juvenile centers, all of these things in America were religiously founded.

The book "Tragedy of American Compassion," by Dr. Marvin Olasky, is a brilliant exposition of how we went from a basic religious-based provider of social services to the government taking over most of those options.

Now we had a terrible Depression. There were other things that were occurring as well, but he highlights how some of it has been a substitution of character mixing with private charity and helping others to a government takeover of social services initiatives.

I commend all of Dr. Olasky's books to us. He has a great book on compassionate conservatism that is probably the best single book out on that subject right now. He has several books on leadership and some of the American heritage to understand the mixing of how faith was so important in our country.

Going back to the social service providers, what has happened is govern-

ment has taken over more of the social service providing. They do not have the character mix. I am not saying government employees are not committed, but they are not going to stay there in the evening. They often will move back to their suburbs rather than live and work in the communities where the problems actually are. It is a different type of commitment. It is not leveraged with private funds.

On top of that, what it has done it has absolved the rest of us from our obligations to help those who are hurting and those who have problems. We say now it is the government's business. It is partly because our Tax Code is high and partly because we see all of these billions of dollars being spent in the social programs; therefore we do not have to do it. But let us not kid ourselves. Part of this is an excuse. It covers our selfishness, and we have allowed the government to step in and provide social services that are really our responsibility as well.

I am not saying there is not a government role. Obviously, a safety net is needed; but it can be a supplemental role. President Bush is not proposing to have government replaced. He is proposing to have an additional add-on and to add the hearts and compassion of the America people on top of our tax money that is going to this. That is what we are trying to do with this, is to expand the base of how we do social services.

I want to read a couple of examples from World Magazine of which Dr. Olasky, who I referred to earlier, was one of the original founders. World Magazine is probably the best of the evangelical publications now. It is kind of like a Time Magazine for Christians, for lack of a better word. This week's issue, June 16, has a feature on compassionate conservatism and particularly looking at a lot of things related to this initiative of President Bush.

One of the articles is on Teen Challenge, and let me read a little bit about this. Then I am going to relate these into the larger question of how faith-based organizations and community solutions work. Quote, "Just tell them it is a spiritual bootcamp," responds the man who runs the Teen Challenge. It is a 4-month induction phase to the 12-month Teen Challenge program. The New Orleans center serves as the ground level, weed-out program that grabs drug users off the street and incubates them in Biblical teaching. Those who stay off drugs and complete daily Bible lessons receive gold stamp certificates and a bus ticket to another 8-month training center that offers intensive Bible study and job skill training. Only 20 percent of the residents who enter the Teen Challenge program graduate after 12 months. Of those graduates, 86 percent remain drug-free 7 years after graduation, according to a study done by the National Institute of Drug Abuse in 1975 and later confirmed by university studies in 1994 and 1999.

"At this place, we deal with the problem of sin, not its effects," says Mr.

Pallitta. The only way to change sin is through the deliverance power of Jesus Christ.

We had Teen Challenge at one of our committee hearings. They are one of the only programs that have been steadily audited by different groups who cannot believe their success rate because we are told, you mean clean for 7 years? That is amazing compared to our drug programs.

It is a difficult question because it is clearly an overtly Christian program. How do we deal with that in this Community Solutions Act and the faith-based initiative? That is part of what I am going to talk about as I develop tonight's Special Order.

Now here is another story. This one is in Dallas, a crime-infested area in Dallas. It says, "We use Biblical principles to help children develop leadership skills," he said, explaining that there are no neighborhoods or parks in the area; just 10,000 apartment units that often host drug gangs and prostitution rings. These children are exposed to so much. Everything you would not want your child to see is right outside in the parking lot. It says that these children participate in community service programs, in a youth choir that performs at local nursing homes and malls. David Pruessner, a 45-year-old lawyer volunteer who teaches chess, quote, "You have to learn to develop a strategy and think ahead." During the summer, he gives group lessons to 20 students at a time using ten game boards and hand-made wall charts but teaching about God is at the center of the program, for Mr. Gaddis states that the gospel is the only thing that really changes lives.

Now here is another story in this same issue of World Magazine on the Good Samaritan Center, actually Good Samaritan House in Orlando, or actually Sarasota, Florida. It says, at the Good Samaritan House, "The right direction begins with a set of simple, nonnegotiable rules." Residents must remain alcohol and drug free and accompany Mr. Cooley to church and Bible study weekly. They must secure a full-time job or work as day laborers at a local temporary agency until they find permanent employment.

GSH residents must pay rent, \$6 a night after their fifth free night of shelter. While they may spend a little money on personal needs, the men must save much of their earnings with the goal of becoming economically independent of this house. The rules include in bed by 10:00; no foul language; no fighting; and no women, presumably at least outside of marriage.

I wanted to illustrate some of these examples because you can see that many of these groups are effective. How does this relate to the government and how do we work through this question of religious liberty in America, because it is illegal to use taxpayer dollars to do proselytization or to do direct, overt funding of Christian activities or any other religious activities

with taxpayer dollars. It is unconstitutional.

So how do we work through these? What would you think, from many people's criticism of this program, is that this is the type of thing that we are directly funding and we are directly funding the proselytization, but that is not the case.

Let me walk through a little bit first some of the legal questions. David Ackerman at the Congressional Research Service has probably done the most work on this subject. His most recent is April 18, 2001, analyzing this charitable choice part of the debate. There are three parts to this that I want to illustrate in this section.

The first is what is happening now. As he says in this document, that in the past, because contrary to public impression many faith-based organizations, hundreds and thousands of them, currently are involved in government. So what is this debate about? Well, the debate is that, as he says, these organizations have in the past generally required programs operated by religious organizations that receive public funding in the form of grants or contracts to be essentially secular in nature, essentially secular in nature. That means, for example, religious symbols and art had to be removed; religious worship instruction and proselytizing have been forbidden. Therefore, they are not really when they are doing these religious organizations anymore. So many religious organizations do not even apply to do social service work in any government grant program because they basically have to become, as is stated here, essentially secular in nature.

So what is the President proposing to do, and what are we going to look at here in the House? People think of it as just this charitable choice, but it is to help States set up their own versions of faith-based and community initiatives. It is to help implement the charitable choice measures. It is to help pilot programs in this, but it is also a whole series of tax initiatives including giving nonitemizers the right to claim charitable deductions; to permit tax-free withdrawals from IRAs; to have individual development accounts; to encourage States to adopt charitable gift tax credits; to increase the charitable donation from corporations to 10 to 15 percent. It is a series of tax incentives as well, and then also technical assistance to small community and faith-based organizations.

So are those things unconstitutional?

Now what David Ackerman writes, and this is the fundamental kind of guts of the argument, he says, more particularly, the Supreme Court now appears to interpret the establishment clause in a manner that does not automatically disqualify pervasively sectarian institutions from participating in direct aid programs and perceives them as able to honor restrictions to secular use even without intrusive government monitoring. But the court's

revised interpretation still requires that direct aid be limited to secular use by recipient organizations and the court has left open the possibility that other limitations may apply as well. Moreover, all of the justices have expressed doubt that direct money grants to pervasively religious entities can pass constitutional muster.

The standards governing indirect aid, however, do not appear to have changed. Some aspects of the charitable choice proposals that have been enacted seem to satisfy these requirements. The provisions do not give religious institutions any special entitlement public aid but simply require that they be considered eligible on the same basis as nonreligious institutions.

In addition, they all bar the use of public aid for sectarian worship, instruction and proselytization; i.e. they require that the aid be used only for secular purposes. Then it is constitutional.

What we have been working through the last week in particular is some concerns regarding the original drafting of the bill and whether it met these constitutional questions.

Now let me illustrate some of the types of things that we are working with. To give you an example, there was a report that an official of the Department of Housing and Urban Development wrote to the bishop in charge of the St. Vincent de Paul Housing Center in San Francisco asking them to rename the building the Mr. Vincent de Paul Center because they got a government grant. That is how ridiculous some of this is getting.

In another case that was reported in the Washington Post January 28, 2001, in a George Will column, a city agency notified the local branch of the Salvation Army that it could be awarded a contract to help the homeless only on the condition that the organization remove the word "salvation" from its name.

Now those are extreme cases, but more generally the problem has become, as Dr. Amy Sherman has said, charitable choice, most important effect thus far, is that it made the collaboration plausible for those within government and the faith community who had previously assumed such partnering was somehow outside the bounds of constitutionality under their misguided interpretation of the first amendment.

In other words, much of this has not been unconstitutional. It is that people did not realize it was constitutional. So that was kind of attempting to address some of the constitutional questions.

Now let me explain and review again this mix of what we are trying to do with the Community Solutions Act.

First, and this is first because it is the most dollars and the most important, it is not government. It is the private sector.

Secondly, it is tax incentives, because the best way to help the private

sector is to encourage more charitable giving. Then we do not have the debate about whether or not government is involved or not, and there are more dollars than the government will have in it.

□ 2100

Thirdly, it is technical assistance for small communities and churches. There are lots of Hispanic and black churches in urban American that have 15 to 50 people in them. They do not have CPAs and accountants in their churches. They do not know how and when the government grants are coming. They need technical assistance, so, one, they do not get sued, and, secondly, so they can figure out how to be eligible for the grants.

Then we come to charitable choice. Let me go through each of those a little bit in particular here. First let me deal with the question of corporate philanthropy. This has become highlighted because of a speech that President Bush gave at the University of Notre Dame, as a graduate I would have to say arguably the best university in the United States.

But he chose that to address the question of why corporations have not been allowing, they do not allow their corporations to give to faith-based. In other words, we can complain about government, but Dr. Michael Joyce, who has been a leader in a lot of these things, Michael Joyce was with the Bradley Foundation and is now working with the Capital Research Center and other groups, and he is the person who called this to the attention of President Bush.

Listen to some of our biggest corporations in America and their standard for corporate giving, and then we can talk about the problem of faith-based, but let us first look at what is happening in the private sector. When the government starts to separate faith, but it is even the private sector that separates.

General Motors, number one in corporate giving, declares contributions are "generally not provided to religious organizations."

The Ford Motor Company fund, the number three corporation, "as a general policy does not support the following religious or sectarian programs for religious purposes. That is in the same undesirable category as animal rights organizations or beauty or talent contests."

So Ford and General Motors do not allow their funding to go to faith-based organizations.

The fourth largest, Exxon-Mobil, explains, "we do not provide funds for political or religious causes." That is not exactly true, since the company touts its support of environmentalists, advocacy groups for women and groups performing "public research." But no money for faith-based organizations.

But IBM, the number six corporation, "does not make corporate donations or grants from corporate philanthropic

fund to individuals, political, labor religious or fraternal organizations or sports groups," and many faith-based groups also have trouble with the last two words of IBM's ban which says that they will not give any money to organizations that discriminate, for example, on gender and sexual orientation, which means faith-based organizations like the Catholic church that do not allow female priests or any religion, which is most major religions, including Christianity, traditional orthodox Judaism, Muslims, on homosexuality. So they are ruled out because they have "discrimination."

So we have General Motors, Ford, Exxon-Mobil, IBM, saying no donations to faith-based groups. No wonder we are having a problem with faith-based groups getting funded. As Michael Joyce told the President, according to this article, "I said the President is both the President of the government, but also President of the Nation. There is a huge private sector that spends billions emulating what the government does." So our lack and kind of our trying to separate ourselves from faith has resulted in the private sector also separating themselves from faith.

Now one of our colleagues here, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), has developed legislation which I am thrilled to cosponsor, and I praise him for his initiative, to try to have Congress go on record saying this is wrong out of the private sector. We need the private sector and the corporate sector leading in the effort to try to get more money to the people who are effective at the grassroots or actually changing people's lives.

Now, the second part of this is the tax incentives. I was in an earlier life in the eighties the Republican staff director of the House Committee on Children, Youth and Families, when Dan Coats was the ranking member, former Congressman and Senator.

We came to the conclusion after looking at so many of the problems in the United States that there was going to be a limitation on how far the Federal Government and even state governments and local governments are going to be able to go in assisting in solving our tremendous problems in this country, and that the best way to achieve this was going to be through faith-based organizations and the best way to achieve that was going to be through assisting in the Tax Code.

Let me give you an illustration. It does not matter whether the state has a Republican Governor or a Democratic Governor or who controls this Congress. We have not increased funds outside of education for most of the social problems in America to keep up with the problems of child abuse, with run-aways.

There is not a probation department in America that does not realize that their caseload per probation officer is increasing. In Indiana, we are now entering, I think it is our 13th year of Democratic governors, and we have

seen more money for education, but not for rehabilitation, not for a lot of the family services, not for child abuse, not for how we deal with the people when they are in prisons and try to help them; that no matter which party you are at the state level, we are a little slow here in Washington, you are saying the only way we are going to be able to address these problems is if we can extend the government dollars and get the faith-based groups involved.

The most direct way to do that, I have an act that we call the Give Act to try to increase the value of the charitable deduction. When I worked for Senator Coats, we developed the charitable tax credit. Senator SANTORUM and Senator LIEBERMAN in the Senate have introduced this Community Solutions Act as a tax bill, and as I mentioned earlier, it is part of our Community Solutions Act in the House. Arguably the most important.

Now, I am disappointed that we have cut back the President's proposal so much than the non-itemizers, but I understand we are under tremendous budget pressures. I am still enthusiastic about the bill. I will take whatever we can get.

But I am disappointed that we were able to come up with tax cuts for other groups, but not where we really need it in a lot of the social programs where the people are hurting the most, and I hope we can continue to increase that over the number of years, and I hope the President will keep the pressure on in the Senate, and in the next few years to increase that if our surplus continues to come in the way it is.

But the tax incentives and the private sector philanthropy, plus the efforts of Steve Goldsmith and now Les Linkowsky in a lot of everything, from AmeriCorps to a lot of the other public service things, in addition to the President's proposals in each department to see if the departments can look at how they can extend staff to help on faith-based, those are actually the biggest part and the most important part of the Community Solutions Act.

The next part is this technical assistance question. We have \$25 million I believe in the bill to go to HHS. The President is also, I believe next week, having mayors in to talk about what they can do at the local level. We are encouraging states to set up initiatives.

It does not all have to come out of Washington. Most of the best execution and the better ideas do not come out of Washington, they come up towards Washington. Part of this is how are we going to help? The fundamental thing we are trying to address here really is how do we help those who need the help most and what is the gap?

One of the gaps is that we see at the grassroots level, even in the worst cases, as my friend Bob Woodson always points out, all you guys down there seem to do is focus on the failures. Why do you not focus on the successes?

When you look at the successes, in the worst places, I got challenged once by Bob when I first came in as a staff director and he said, "Don't be a typical white guy who sits on your duff and pronounces what is wrong in our urban centers. Go in and talk to people who are successful and figure out what is working."

When I have been into Harlem and Brooklyn and inner-city L.A. and in Detroit and Washington and Baltimore and most of the major cities of the United States over the last 15 years as a staffer and Member and talked to people, in the worst places possible, there is always a success story there. There is always somebody who is not failing, who is succeeding. At least 40 percent, even in the worst cases, are succeeding.

I remember one study by, I think it was David Farrington out of England, that if your parents are not married, one of them is gone from your home, they both have been in prison, they are both abusing drugs, neither are employed, and the chances of that child getting caught up in the juvenile delinquency system are only 33 percent. What happened to the other 67 percent?

Well, usually they got involved in some sort of a mentoring and faith-based hook. The fact is that success stories are when there are two parents involved, or when there a faith-based mentor involved, or a church involved, and there is work. We know what the keys to success are. We have to build on those successes, rather than trying to reinforce the failures.

Now, part of this is how do we help those little organizations? Pastor River's organization in Boston, they talk about how they have helped reduce the number of killings on the streets and so on, and you hear all these government programs bragging about it. But most government programs abandon that area and their neighborhoods in downtown Boston and the inner-city areas about 5:30 or 5 o'clock, maybe even at 4:30. The people who are left there are the people in the community and the churches.

But they do not get the grants. How do they know between June 15 and June 30 there is a grant on juvenile delinquency? How do they have the time or knowledge to write out the grant proposals? What we do in small business? For example, when I was in my 2-year MBA program at Notre Dame, one of the things we did in small business was we went out as students, and part of our requirement was to go out and help people prepare the grant requests.

We have microenterprise centers to help small businesses and start-up businesses get started in a lot of these communities to do that. Why do not we have that in social services? That is partly what the President is talking about in his compassion fund. That is partly what the President is talking about when he says the agencies need to help that.

We need to have the creativity and the entrepreneurship and the reinforcement in the social areas if we are really serious about addressing the problems, like we do in trying to provide jobs for people. The two things go hand-in-hand. Part of the solutions are economic and part of them are in here.

Broken families, you cannot educate somebody or you cannot educate a child if they are being beaten at home. If they are worried about whether their parents are going to get divorced, if they do not know where they are going to get their evening meal, it is pretty tough to educate them. It is a social problem and an economic problem, and we have to address both of themselves.

I hope our universities, one of my dreams is that some of the universities would say, look, we are going to work with some tech centers, we are going to have our students spend some volunteer times in the communities helping these small groups figure out how to apply for some of the grants, how to raise the private money from the philanthropic groups as they become more sensitive to the need for faith-based organizations.

So that is the technical assistance questions, because we have to come up with some creative ways to address that.

Now let me move to the most controversial part, which is charitable choice. So the basic question is, if someone chooses to attend a faith-based program, why should that be denied? That is really the fundamental question here. If you want to go in a drug treatment program and go to a faith-based program, why should that be denied?

For example, if you want to go to Salvation Army center for the homeless, why should you be denied that, if you want to go to the rescue mission. If you have a child care program and you want to go to a Catholic sponsored child care center, this include a hospice for the elderly, respite care, housing for people dying or trying to recover from AIDS, programs for juvenile delinquents.

If you want to go to a faith-based programs, why should you not be able to go to a faith-based program? Faith is a big part of most American's lives, whether it is Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, whatever it is, why should you be denied, particularly at the time of your greatest crisis, any access to faith if you so desire?

Let me go through some of the difficulties with this. As I said before, one of the questions is, can you use my money, for example, I am a committed evangelical Christian, can you use my money to fund a Muslim program? Quite frankly, I do not want to fund the teaching of the Koran, but the money cannot be used for proselytization, and if we are trying to figure out how to help somebody who is dying from AIDS and provide a hospice shelter for them or recovery center when other people will not care for them,

and they are Muslim and they want to go to a faith-based organization, and I am not being forced into that, and they cannot use my money for proselytization, why should I care, if that is what is going to be most effective and what that person wants?

Now, a key part of that, which is one of the things we have been battling about in this bill, is you have to have a choice. Let me give you a couple of illustrations with this.

I have a son, Zachary, who is 7th grade moving into 8th grade. Let us say his junior high has an after-school program, and so many of us are used to thinking of it in a different way, so let me phrase it this way. Let us say that the group that wins the bid for the after-school program is Muslim.

He comes home at night and tells me, hey, after we got started with the program we bowed down to Allah and had a prayer to Allah, and then a little later we had a study on the Koran.

I call up the school and say, what in the world are you doing, putting my son in an after-school program where they are bowing down to Allah and studying the Koran? They say, oh, that part was done with private money, not with Federal money.

Ha, I do not care. My son was in the middle of the program. You mean, he would have had to step out and have a big mess so he did not get up and embarrass himself in front of his friends? Look, if this is an after-school program and everybody is in there, you cannot mix it that way.

But now what if there were two after-school programs? What if he had the option of which one he wanted to go to, and there was a secular option, why should not those kids who wanted a Muslim program be able to go to a Muslim program? Not really a very good reason why they cannot, but you do have to have the option or clearly it is unconstitutional in my opinion.

Let me give you another illustration. A nutrition site, say, in Fort Wayne Indiana, not one of the more international cities of the world, but changing like the rest of the country. We have had a lot of influx of immigrants. Most people think, oh, Mexican and Central American Spanish-speaking people.

No, we have a problem, because in some of our areas, a problem in the sense the fire department talked to me about language problems, but it was not about the Spanish language. It was about the fact we have had the largest population of dissident Burmese in the United States in Fort Wayne, and one of the housing complexes on the north side of town is about half Burmese. Interestingly, what Chief Davey was talking to me about was the other half roughly of this complex, which are Bosnian.

□ 2115

Now, if we put a nutrition site in Fort Wayne, Indiana; admittedly, a mostly Anglo, mostly Protestant and

Catholic city, but in that area, if you do a nutrition site and it was faith-based it would probably either be Buddhist or Muslim. Now let us say you are a Christian in that neighborhood and the only nutrition site is either Buddhist or Muslim, you have a problem. But if you have a choice, which is critical to the faith-based option here, it is not a problem. If the Bosnians who come to Fort Wayne organize themselves, and I am not saying they do, but if they organize themselves around a Muslim church, or if the Buddhists are more comfortable with their faith in having something, say a respite care center that teaches the pacifistic and relaxing attributes of Buddhism and that is what they want for hospice care, and there is an alternative for the other people in the neighborhood, why is that wrong? It is part of their institutional strength of what a community builds upon. Faith cannot be separated from life for most people, regardless of what their faith is, somewhere around 80 to 90 percent of Americans of all types and all heritages and all religions.

So one of the things is we clearly have to have a choice, but we have to understand, those of us who are in the majority, that we are not always going to be in the majority in a given neighborhood and that religious liberty means religious liberty. Now, one problem that some conservatives are having with this is that say, what do you mean a Buddhist group can be funded? Hey, that is what religious liberty is. If this organization is the best to address the problems of that community and people want to choose that, that means it can be Buddhist or Muslim. It does not just mean that Christian organizations are going to be funded in this bill; it means that any religious organization, as long as there is another provider, has the flexibility to do that, because faith means faith. It does not mean one kind of sectarian faith over another kind of sectarian faith. It has to be balanced. There has to be equal opportunity. And that goes in both directions.

If I am saying that if you want to have a Christian program or a Jewish program or a Muslim program or a Buddhist program, and you have to have a secular alternative, you ought to also have the opportunity, if there is a secular program, to be able to opt out and choose a faith-based program. It goes in both directions. We keep hearing here how you cannot have people forced into a faith-based program. Well, they should not be forced into a secular program either if they want to opt out and take that choice, for example, in drug treatment.

Now, one other thing that we have been debating here, and this is another very ticklish situation, is should the grants go directly to the church or should we set up 501(c)(3)s, meaning an independent entity much like Catholic charities or Catholic social services, Lutheran social services. Those are big

churches, big denominational setups. Okay. Now, let us take an African American church in inner city Philadelphia like one of our witnesses was that is small, maybe 70 people. How do they set up a 501(c)(3)? That is our technical assistance question, and this is a very difficult question, because we need to help them set up a 501(c)(3), and what I have become aware of as I have worked more with this issue and I have carried charitable choice bills to the floor now about four times, is we have to be very careful we do not suck the church into a very ill-defined and increasingly changing court decision-making process on what constitutes the flexibility of religious freedom.

Now, for example, the bottom line is I do not want to sink the church in the name of faith, and that could happen here if we are not careful, because there are very difficult questions. Would the church be covered by minimum wage laws? Some say of course it should be covered by minimum wage laws, but what does that mean? We have run into this with a number of religious children's homes. What it means is you get paid for 40 hours and if there is a problem at your home and the kids need help and your 40 hours is up and the church does not have more money to pay you, you have to leave, regardless of what the problem is, because you are not allowed to volunteer. That was meant to protect workers in the United States from corporations taking advantage of them and saying, okay, your 40 hours is done, now I need you to stay a little bit of overtime and we are not going to count it because we are not going to pay you. It was meant to protect workers, but it has never applied to churches, because many people in the churches are volunteers and working for the church. Probably there are very few church secretaries, very few church staffers who do not both get paid for a certain number of hours and then volunteer when there is a revival, volunteer to take kids to an amusement park. You cannot do that if you lose your religious exemption.

Another tough question. As I mentioned earlier, some religions, some major religions, both in Protestant and in Catholic faiths and big parishes and churches believe in a very tough thing to say today, but in sex discrimination, they believe that in certain positions, there should not be male nuns, for example, and do they have the right to maintain their religious freedom. If the church gets sucked into that and gets government money, this is a tough, tough question.

One of the most hotly debated subjects in America today is homosexuality, and many, many, if not most faiths, still believe that that is morally wrong. They have the right in America as a church to have that view. If we put government money directly into the church, we endanger them, depending on where the court moves, on this subject, if they have a 501(c)(3) as a separate entity that receives it. The clarity

is still being sorted through, but the church mission itself will not be at risk.

Now, the closer the 501(c)(3) is to a direct faith initiative; for example, Catholic schools basically are exempt also for the most part because of the religious exemption, because the mission of the school is very faith based. But the degree you move, for example, to an exercise class or if a church moves to say a Pepsi bottling plant, the farther they move away from their basic mission, the more they are covered by sex discrimination laws, minimum wage laws, and a very difficult one, hate crimes laws, because how we define that in America has become increasingly flexible and puts those who have strong views on certain moral issues in potential risk. These are crucial matters of religious freedom and how we draft this bill and move through is very important, because we do not want to destroy the church.

Now, a fundamental question here is, and I would suspect that many churches will not apply. Nobody has to apply for a government grant. If any church is fearful that they could be drawn in, then do not apply. It is very simple. You do not have to get caught up in this. But I believe, as in multiple votes here generally speaking with a margin of about 290 Members supporting, it has ranged from probably 240 to 300 and some, have supported charitable choice, because we believe that ultimately, it is going to be impossible to address the problems in this country without the help of faith-based initiatives, and I commend the President for his Community Solutions Act.

Let me finish with two things. One is a further quote from Michael Joyce. It is an article about him, and I will insert the full article from World Magazine into the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Joyce says, "Ordinary people understand this really well. We take human nature into account. We understand humans as they were wrought by God. These people wish to remake them," he means the government, "and rearrange them. It is like that line in a Bob Marley song: 'Don't let them rearrange you. That is why they fail.'"

They are not accounting for the basic human emotions and needs and beliefs of the American people in many of these government programs.

One of the most moving things that I have had happen to me in my life was the first time I visited Freddie Garcia and Juan Rivera at the Victory Life Temple program for drug addicts that they operate in San Antonio and now throughout Texas. Admittedly, this illustrates several things. This program would not be eligible for a direct government grant, period, because it is overtly faith. They would benefit from corporate philanthropy, they would benefit from the tax exemptions, but this is why so many of us feel that faith-based things have to be involved in any programs.

I have just visited Johns Hopkins where they told me you could not go off crack cocaine without tremendous effort. I met in one day at least 150 former addicts who went cold turkey because they gave their lives to Jesus Christ. I met them in housing complexes. I met them in churches. I met them in neighborhoods. It was extraordinary. They told me over and over, we were dealers. Generally speaking, when I would come into the different housing complexes or places where they were, they would say, can we get you a drink of water, and I would say either yes or no, depending on if it was a hot day in San Antonio, and they would say, can I tell you how I met Jesus Christ? I was lost and he turned my life around. They do not operate a drug treatment program, they operate a turn-your-life-around program which gets people off drugs. Nobody disputes that they have the best success record.

Later that evening, after having met, like I say, 150 to 200 people, I was with Juan Rivera who was telling me his story, how he went cold turkey, and we were in this little building with the sandy streets around it, he talked about this tree where he first read the Bible and he was in his backyard, at the backyard of that, and I pictured kind of a woods and it was just one barren tree with sand everywhere, a little different than the Midwest, and he said how he just is so thankful because he was on multiple drugs, how his life was a mess, like many of the others had told me, and he said, I was going to be a dead man. He said, now my life has changed. And I said, I am really embarrassed, because I have had a great life and I am not thankful enough. And he said, you should be ashamed and I said, well, I really am ashamed. He said, my dream is that some day my kids can have the opportunity that you have.

When we see people who are hurting in drug abuse and we see people who do not have opportunities; part of the reason we started government programs was in the area of AIDS because many people would not help people with AIDS because they thought they could catch it and only the churches went out because they were confident of their souls, so they were willing to take the risk, so they reached out, and that is partly how the government got involved in faith-based organizations, because only the Christians and the Buddhists were early on too, in the area of AIDS.

Then in the area of the homeless. We do not have enough dollars for the homeless. Organizations like the Salvation Army and the rescue missions and churches reached out to the homeless. We are going to tell these people, because faith is mixed in, you do not even get the option of going to faith based?

This has been a tragedy to watch how America went from Founding Fathers, from Congresses where we put Moses there and "In God We Trust" behind us, to the point where our major corporations in America will not even let



their contributions go to faith based; where we have to fight about the Tax Code, where we have to try to get help for faith based and people object. If there is a guarantee you have another option, and if there is a protection, that people would still oppose faith-based groups getting in. You either care about people and want to help them in every way possible.

Mr. Speaker, I support the government programs that try to reach people, but we also need to strengthen our private sector. I hope that we can pass soon, and I am thrilled that President Bush has made this such a key part of his agenda, and I hope the House and Senate will have the courage to move forward with this.

[From World, June 16, 2001]

#### FRONT-LINE REPORTS

(By Marvin Olasky)

One journalism newsletter complained recently that reporters have overquoted me during this year's debate about President Bush's faith-based initiative. I agree. Reporters shouldn't be basing their stories on what Barry Lynn of Americans United for Separation of Church and State says. They shouldn't be basing their stories on what I say. They should be going out into the field and talking with people fighting poverty at the front lines.

That's what WORLD is trying to do this year with stories of four kinds—and over the next 22 pages you'll see examples of each. The first kind illuminates the debates going on within religious anti-poverty groups as they think through how to respond to the faith-based initiative. As the following story about Teen Challenge shows, evangelicals are not easily led, and the questioning is intense and good.

The second kind documents the perseverance of some social entrepreneurs. Journalists not familiar with their activities sometimes assume that the poor must wait on the lords of government. The articles beginning on p. 76 show how individuals—Mo Leverett in New Orleans, Ray and Carolyn Cooley in Sarasota, and Vincent Gaddis in Dallas—have created programs that inspire both those in need and volunteers willing to help.

The third variety extends the boundaries of compassionate conservatism to areas sometimes seem as apart from it. The day-to-day work of crisis pregnancy centers is probably the clearest example of compassionate conservatism around: Counselors suffer with individuals in need, working to save bodies and souls. Our story on p. 84 tells more about the major technological boost those counselors are now receiving.

While we roam the countryside we try through a fourth kind of story to cover the debate inside the Beltway, but even there we want to go beyond the usual suspect themes. In that vein we conclude this section with a look at visionary Mike Joyce's battle to get corporate and foundation givers to drop their frequent discrimination against religious groups.

[From World, June 16, 2001]

#### TEEN CHALLENGE'S NEWEST CHALLENGE

(By Candi Cushman)

"If all you're looking for is an oil change, this isn't the place. Because the oil will get dirty again," says dark-haired Enzo Pallitta, speaking with a thick New Jersey accent and dramatic hand mannerisms. "Listen closely," he says, leaning over his desk and staring at his listener. "This is not just about getting clean. This is about changing your lifestyle."

Mr. Pallitta isn't selling cars. But as an ex-heroin addict turned Christian counselor, he doesn't mind high-pressuring the addicts who walk through his door. "I don't like to give them time. I've seen so many guys walk out the door, get shot, or pop a pill and overdose. I'm trying to reach them before the cycle begins again."

After drifting through six secular treatment centers, Mr. Pallitta broke his own cycle in 1995 by checking into Teen Challenge, a Christian drug-rehabilitation program. Founded 40 years ago by a Pentecostal minister, Teen Challenge has over 300 worldwide affiliates, including 147 U.S. chapters. At the New Orleans affiliate, Mr. Pallitta and six other ex-addicts run a street-front operation in the heart of the Ninth Ward ghetto. Their office—a weathered, two-story clapboard home—faces a grungy concrete bar called Paradise Lounge and rows of dilapidated wooden homes whose occupants sit in metal chairs beneath brightly striped awnings.

This morning's walk-in—a thin blond man in his late 20s with long sideburns and bleary eyes—slumps in a chair across from Mr. Pallitta and stares at the wall. He can't seem to kick his six-year heroin habit, he says, and his parents don't know how to help him. "I stayed away from it for five days, but I crashed this weekend. . . . I need help, but I'm worried my dad won't like this place. He wanted me to go to a boot camp."

"Just tell him it's a spiritual boot camp," responds Mr. Pallitta. As the four-month "induction phase" to the 12-month Teen Challenge program, the New Orleans center serves as a ground-level, weed-out program that grabs drug users off the street and incubates them in biblical teaching. Those who stay off drugs and complete daily Bible lessons receive gold-stamped certificates and a bus ticket to another eight-month "training center" that offers intensive Bible study and job-skills training.

Only 20 percent of residents who enter the Teen Challenge program graduate after 12 months. Of those graduates, 86 percent remain drug free seven years after graduation, according to a study done by the National Institute of Drug Abuse in 1975 and later confirmed by university studies in 1994 and 1999. "At this place we deal with the problem—sin—not its effect," says Mr. Pallitta. "And the only way to change sin is through the deliverance power of Jesus Christ."

Drug addicts aren't the only ones undergoing change at Teen Challenge. As a poster child for President Bush's faith-based initiative, the organization has received unprecedented media attention in recent months, and as name recognition increases so does scrutiny. Critics note that many staff members are ex-addicts whose only degree is a Teen Challenge certificate. That, worries the liberal group People for the American Way, "could nullify state regulations for substance abuse professionals by requiring states to recognize religious education as equivalent to any secular course work."

The complaint marks the latest round of volleys fired at President Bush's efforts to allow faith-based social-service programs to compete for federal funding. At first, left-wing groups argued that putting Chris-drenched programs like Teen Challenge on a level playing field with secular programs amounted to state-funded "proselytism." John Dilulio, head of the White House faith-based office, placated them in February and March by guaranteeing that programs like Teen Challenge wouldn't be eligible for grants. But after conservative pressure forced him to reverse that policy, opponents discovered another buzzword, quality control. At issue is how much oversight Uncle Sam should have over Christian groups that accept funding.

As a preemptive strike, Teen Challenge leaders have pushed voucher-style funding and prodded their own centers to adopt higher standards. The question is, can Teen Challenge accept more regulations without diminishing the grassroots flavor that makes it so effective?

All Teen Challenge affiliates currently follow 80 standards outlined in a 28-page manual published by the organization's national office in Missouri. Affiliates must keep written job descriptions and evaluations of each staff member, maintain student files for at least five years, and record each discipline "incident" and individual counseling session. They must also adhere to their own states' health and safety codes and pay for annual independent audits. To guarantee adherence, the national office collects monthly financial reports and conducts on-site inspections every four years.

This self-regulation is burdensome enough without adding onerous oversight from Uncle Sam, says Greg Dill, the New Orleans director. "I'm already struggling to pay for the audit, which costs me \$3,000 each year," he said. "If they throw in another 10 regulations, that would be fine. But if they throw another manual on the table, that's another matter."

Mr. Dill's center is cramped but clean. A tiny reception area doubles as a dining room filled with plastic round tables, fish tanks, and maroon couches. At the door, two parakeets greet visitors with cat calls they learned from the residents. Upstairs, 14 men wait in line for three showers and share three bedrooms, but each has his own bunk and closet space. Residents begin their day at 7:00 a.m. with group prayer, breakfast, and household chores followed by eight hours of mandatory Bible study, chapel, and choir practice, even if they can't sing. ("They have to learn to praise God instead of just asking Him to fix their problems," says one employee.)

At 8:30 a.m., they squeeze around an upstairs conference table covered with Bibles and spiral notebooks. Behind a small wooden podium stands Brother David Sampson, a 6-foot-2, 220-pounder with lots of gold rings on his fingers and a heavy silver cross hanging from his neck. "Some of you guys figure, OK, this is Christian and that's good as long as I'm getting out of jail," says Brother Sampson. "But the real jail is not a place; it's your mind. And if your spirit doesn't change, then your mind won't change." Brother Sampson ends his lesson with a commentary on the book of Romans: "That guy Paul, he knew something," he concludes. "He knew that no one becomes a Christian by accident. God never tricked a person into becoming his follower. This isn't a Burger King, 'have-it-your-way' religion."

As the on-site "dean of students," Brother Sampson teaches and counsels drug addicts eight hours a day. But he doesn't have a college degree. His qualifications are 15 years of street experience as a homeless crack addict and three years of Bible classes. After graduating from Florida's Teen Challenge training institute in 1995, he became a certified teacher making \$50 a week. ("It's not that we're opposed to hiring MSWs [master of social work], it's just that most MSWs didn't go to school to make \$50 a week," said Mr. Dill, who also graduated from the program. "This is a ministry, not an occupation.")

Mr. Dill and his colleagues are what national Teen Challenge leaders call "street fighters"—ground troops working on the front lines to rescue prisoners from enemy territory. Street fighters aren't concerned with national strategy or whether the battalions are appropriately equipped; they simply want to save lives at any cost. "Without them this organization would just be another

institution. They are the only ones who can reach the people we want to reach," said Dave Scotch, the Teen Challenge accreditator. Problem is, most feisty street fighters tend to resist outside mandates. "We're still trying to resist outside mandates. 'We're still trying to get them to wear our national logo,'" sighed Mr. Scotch.

And now he wants to convince them to accept more regulations so Teen Challenge can compete for faith-based funding. Texas became the first testing ground recently as some 40 Teen Challenge directors met for a southwest regional conference at the gleaming white Calvary Temple building in Irving, a Dallas suburb. "If Teen Challenge is going to climb the mountain, we've got to learn to live with change," insisted Teen Challenge's president, John Castellini: "Say, change." Some 40 directors mumbled, "Change."

A balding minister with bushy eyebrows and round cheeks, Mr. Castellini was trying to unite the independent-minded street fighters in a willingness to apply for government funds in order to expand their programs. He started out treading lightly, first telling a few introductory jokes about his grandchildren and reading a news article about how hotels earn five-star ratings. Then he levied the final punchline: "You just think you've been inspected now. But just wait until this faith-based initiative takes off," he said, adding that some centers might need the pressure: "The parents are the real inspectors. Can I be very honest? I would not drop off my son or daughter at some Teen Challenge."

That comment irritated some directors, who still have fresh memories of their less-than-glamorous beginnings. "When we first started, our place was dirty and run down, and all of our staff were wearing 15 different hats. But you know what? People got saved, delivered, and set free," argued Jim Heurich, director of the San Antonio affiliate. "My concern is that we are going to be so evaluated that we are evaluated out of business." "Go Jim," whispered someone across the room. Mr. Castellini remained unfazed. "We should treat the government like any other private donor and be accountable," he said. "The government consists of taxpayers." Mr. Castellini believes the extra funding and added legal protection provided by faith-based legislation will outweigh the cost of conformance to regulations as long as those regulations don't change the Christian emphasis. But local affiliates remain skeptical.

Mr. Heurich has good reason to feel skittish. In 1995, state officials tried to shut down his San Antonio center, even though it was not state licensed, did not receive government funding, and defined itself as a "discipleship program." After a much-publicized rally at the Alamo (see WORLD, July 29, 1995), then-Gov. Bush came to the rescue, pushing through a state law exempting faith-based social programs from state interference. That was the beginning of his compassionate conservative campaign.

So far, that campaign hasn't helped other Teen Challenge centers. Florida director Jerry Nance received food stamps for 17 centers and 650 residents every year until officials suddenly withdrew assistance in 1999, announcing that unlicensed facilities no longer qualified. Here's the catch: To obtain the license, Mr. Nance had to replace Bible lessons with group psychotherapy sessions and hire state-approved counselors. Explaining that his program was a "discipleship model, not a medical model," he refused and lost \$100,000.

"Does this make sense to you?" Mr. Nance asked a White House drug abuse committee last year. "Individuals can live in the streets, use drugs, rob people, and still get food stamps. But if they decide to get help

and come into a faith-based program, they lose their stamps."

At the heart of the dilemma is a difference in diagnosis: State-funded groups treat drug addiction as a disease, prescribing medical treatments and psychotherapy. But Teen Challenge says the disease began with a condition of the heart and prescribes a relationship with Jesus Christ. That difference threatens some people: "This [faith-based funding] will roll us back 60 years, right back to when people thought you were an alcoholic merely because you didn't accept Jesus as your personal savior," fretted Bill McColl, spokesman for the National Association of Drug and Alcohol Counselors.

But Mr. Castellini says he just wants the right to offer his solution alongside others: "We're not asking for a handout. We just want a level playing field so we can take care of people's basic needs." With that in mind, he is also offering his own ground troops a compromise: In exchange for federal vouchers for food stamps, emergency medical assistance, and lodging, Teen Challenge will accept reasonable government safety, health, and accountability standards. ("Just because you're saying the name Jesus doesn't mean you should build fire traps," he said.)

Mr. Castellini, however, emphasized that Teen Challenge will not accept extra regulations—like teacher education requirements or required psychotherapy sessions—that ultimately undercut faith-based initiative by eliminating differences between religious and secular entities. Ultimately, he said, the street fighters will have the final say: "We will only lead those who want to be led."

[From World, June 16, 2001]

#### LEADING YOUNG LEADERS

(By Candi Cushman)

Crowded with nondescript business buildings, dingy low-income apartments, and well-lit liquor stores, the northeast Dallas business district hardly seems a place for children. But every day at 3:30 p.m., backpack-laden children fill the sidewalks and weave their way through condemned apartment buildings and asphalt parking lots.

Like an urban deliverer, 42-year-old Vincent Gaddis stands on a street corner welcoming them into the tree-lined courtyard of the Fellowship Bible Church of Dallas. Wearing a navy cap and matching dress slacks, he escorts them into an office decorated with red and green round tables and wooden bookshelves full of Bible videos and Dr. Seuss books. Through his Youth Believing in Change ministry, Mr. Gaddis provides tutoring, Bible studies, and free meals for some 150 inner-city kids a year.

"We use biblical principles to help these children develop leadership skills," he said, explaining that there are no neighborhoods or parks in the area—just 10,000 apartment units that often host drug gangs and prostitution rings. "These children are exposed to so much. Everything you wouldn't want your child to see is right outside in the parking lot."

Mr. Gaddis, who is black, works with Hispanic children in a predominantly white church. But God was the original Deliverer, he insists—and he first heard the tune 12 years ago while pointing a revolver to his head. Mr. Gaddis at first made the Dean's List every semester at his college in Tennessee, but then his mother unexpectedly died of a brain hemorrhage during his second year there. Grieving and angry with God, he turned to drugs as an escape. Nine years later, a long-time drug dealer, he planned his final act of rebellion—suicide. But as he cocked the trigger, a Bible verse floated through his mind: What does it profit a man,

if he shall gain the whole world but lose his own soul? His mother had taught him that.

"In spite of everything I had done, all of the Scriptures I learned as a child were still with me," Mr. Gaddis said, and instead of killing himself, he turned himself into local police. After serving a five-year prison sentence, he came to Dallas as a homeless man, found a church to attend, and earned enough money to attend college and seminary. He graduated from Dallas Theological Seminary in April 2000, with a master's degree in Christian education.

Now he identifies with the children who walk the city sidewalks. "I want them to understand how the Scriptures apply practically to their life, not just memorize them. I didn't have that understanding growing up," said Mr. Gaddis. To accomplish his mission, he recruited the help of Fellowship Bible Church, which supplies free office space and weekly volunteers. With a \$240,000 annual budget, the program is funded by donations from individuals and churches.

Three nights a week, volunteers donate their time tutoring children, who mostly come from single-parent families that speak little or no English. Tonight's tutoring session begins with cheese cracker snacks and peer-led singing. The children hold hands in a circle as a fourth-grade boy named Bryan stands in the middle and loudly recites several Bible verses. With his hands raised in the air, he then leads his playmates in a boisterous chorus of "Lord, I Lift Your Name on High." Afterward, the children go to their assigned tutors, including a college librarian in a starched yellow dress shirt, a bilingual businessman wearing khaki shorts and Birkenstock sandals, and a housewife in a long flowing brown skirt.

During the summers, YBC takes the place of the public school, providing free lunches for poor children and a refuge for latchkey kids stuck in crime-ridden apartments. Children who attend regularly can go to a river-side Bible camp in the Ozarks.

YBC children participate in community service projects and a youth choir that performs at local nursing homes and malls. Volunteer David Pruessner, a 45-year-old lawyer, teaches chess, where "you have to learn to develop a strategy and think ahead." During the summer, he gives group lessons to 20 students at a time using 10 game boards and handmade wall charts. But teaching about God is at the center of the program, for Mr. Gaddis states that, "The gospel is the only thing that really changes lives. When I sat in the car with a gun to my head and when I went to prison, I already had a good education. But that didn't help me. What really changed my life was the word of God. And that's what's going to save these kids."

[From World, June 16, 2001]

#### THE GOOD SARASOTAN

(By Barbara Souders)

"The nerve!" huffed Carolyn Cooley, hurstling her two young daughters past the unkempt man who lay surrounded by beer cans, sprawled against a palm tree on church property. A battered hat shielded the man's eyes, but holes in the soles of his shoes seemed to watch church-goers' reactions. Mrs. Cooley's indignation dissolved into tears when, within the hour, she learned the man's identity. The "bum" was actually her pastor, Neville E. Gritt. He'd stationed himself outside the church that Sunday morning to awaken his congregation to needs he'd seen while driving through Sarasota, Fla.

Heartsick, Ray and Carolyn Cooley prayed that day in 1985 that they could begin to show Christ's love to such people. Feeling God's call, they spent the evening pruning their tight budget and gauging their financial ability to rent a house that would serve



homeless men. They followed through, and during the past 16 years almost 2,000 men have found refuge at Good Samaritan House (GSH), honored this year with a Florida "Points of Light" award—and some have found hope. The home provides emergency housing for homeless men recovering from traumas (such as surgery, a mental breakdown, or a prison term) and a longer transitional program for those ready to try to get back on their feet.

Andrew Cunningham is one of the people helped. At age 22, he was on and off drugs, on and off the streets, and on and off in his relationship with God. Initial stints at Good Samaritan House and a Sarasota Salvation Army shelter didn't change him. But a stay in an abandoned house where he and a friend stayed "strung out on crack cocaine" convinced him to return to GSH. At 25, he emerged clean and sober. Now 13 years after that emergence, Mr. Cunningham is married with twin daughters, works as a certified nursing assistant, owns a home, and is an active church member. "Ray set my feet in the right direction," he says.

At GSH, the right direction begins with a set of simple, nonnegotiable rules: Residents must remain alcohol- and drug-free, and accompany Mr. Cooley to church and Bible study weekly. They must secure a full-time job, or work as day laborers at a local temporary agency until they find permanent employment. GSH residents must pay rent: six dollars per night after their fifth free night of shelter. While they may spend a little money on personal needs, the men must save much of their earnings, with the goal of becoming economically independent of GSH. The rules include: In bed by 10:00 p.m., no foul language, no fighting, and no women.

The rules echo those of 19th-century Christian workhouses. While neighbors and church members in American towns generally cared for people made suddenly poor by calamity or death, townspeople built workhouses for men made poor by alcoholism or sloth. Residents of such homes were expected both to work and pursue virtue in exchange for their keep. At the Chelmsford workhouse in Massachusetts, for example, the "master" of the house could at his discretion reward faithful and industrious men, while punishing "the idle, stubborn, disorderly and disobedient." Use of "spirituous liquors" was prohibited, and house rules demanded every man "diligently to work and labor."

Although the Cooley's efforts at GSH were grounded in such history, and in Scripture, many Sarasota Christians didn't support their efforts to help homeless individuals in the area.

The house in which the Cooleys launched GSH stood on the property of a small Sarasota church; the church's leadership agreed to let the Cooleys rent it and start the shelter there. "But the church became upset with what we were doing," Mrs. Cooley said, "and the numerous needy and homeless [on the property] giving the church a bad image." After 11 months, the church asked the Cooleys to leave. That's when they bought the 1920s-era home that is now Good Samaritan House.

The Cooleys don't hold fundraisers. Today, two churches regularly donate money and in-kind gifts to support GSH, but from the beginning, the couple financed—and still finance—the shelter largely with their own cash. That means Mr. Cooley, 61, continues to work five days a week as a zone technician for Verizon Wireless. After work he goes home to spend time with his family; at about 8 p.m., he heads for GSH. There, he spends most evenings talking and watching television with the men who pile in after their own day's work to sink into sofas and chairs

that crowd the paneled living room. Mornings, the aroma of brewing coffee lures residents downstairs to grab a cup before biking or busing to work. Mr. Cooley also leaves, going home to his family (if his wife and son—his daughters are grown—haven't spent the night at GSH) before heading off to his day job again.

Mr. Cooley himself had struggled with alcoholism until a pastor's life inspired him to change. Today, he says his aim is "to live his faith in front of the men, to plant seeds." During each man's stay at GSH, Mr. Cooley guides him through a substance-abuse recovery program that emphasizes Christ as the basis of healing and renewal. Mrs. Cooley supports her husband, spending time at the house with him and the men, attending church with them. Wednesday and Sunday evenings, and distributing free clothing to GSH residents and other Sarasota homeless people.

The Cooleys say they rarely hear again from men who leave GSH: "They're embarrassed and don't want to be reminded" of things like job loss, mental illness, or substance abuse that led them there in the first place. But some, like Everett Reid, 36, maintain contact. He learned of GSH through Sarasota agencies that appreciate the Cooleys' no-nonsense biblical approach to helping homeless men become self-sufficient. "It's a good place for them to go. They have rules to follow," said Robert P. Kyllonen, executive director of Resurrection House, a day resource center for the homeless. Eleven months after showing up on GSH's oak-shaded front porch and starting to follow the rules, Mr. Reid moved to Jacksonville. He has completed the first year of a four-year sheet-metal apprenticeship.

In February, the Community Foundation of Sarasota County recognized GSH with its Unsung Hero Award and commended the Cooley for funding the program themselves, rather than waiting for outside assistance. With George W. Bush's offer to make faith-based programs eligible for federal grants, will the Cooleys now seek outside help? Mr. Cooley thinks not. He fears the Feds might tamper with GSH's staunchly biblical program. Still, he may seek funding for the Clothes Closet, a GSH clothing-distribution program that he sees as less vulnerable to government strings.

[From World, June 16, 2001]

A DAY IN THE LIFE . . .

(By Candi Cushman)

Richard Scarry has won fame for children's books with titles like *What Do People Do All Day?* Few people understand what New Orleans minister Mo Leverett does all day, and what he has done most days for the past 10 years. As founder of Desire Street Ministries (DSM), an outreach program that uses Christian principles to disciple youth and foster economic renewal, he is a white man who has dedicated his life to mentoring black kids in New Orleans' worst ghetto. Here's what he and two people he has inspired do on a typical day:

10 A.M. On a rainy summer morning, Mr. Leverett winds his car through narrow New Orleans streets named *Pleasure* and *Abundance*, showing a reporter the gutted warehouses, crumbling brick housing projects, and razor-wire fences of his neighborhood. On *Desire Street*, three miles north of the French Quarter, rows of graffiti-covered housing projects sit amid piles of dirt and broken glass. Behind thick metal doors, project residents stare like frightened prisoners through rectangular window slats.

This is the Ninth Ward, an area whose daily drug shoot-outs garnered it a reputation as "New Orleans' murder capital." With

10,000 units in the center of the ward, the *Desire* projects gained notoriety during the 1950s as the second-largest (and one of the most dangerous) housing projects in the nation. Although city officials recently demolished most of the units, some 1,000 people still live inside the rat-infested rubble. Over half are children under the age of 17 whose single mothers live below the poverty level.

In 1991, Mr. Leverett moved into a tiny duplex home near the projects, his family of four becoming the only white family in the Ninth Ward. For the next nine years, he volunteered as an assistant football coach at the public high school and led locker-room Bible studies. He remembers how his passion for cross-cultural outreach began during high school years in Macon, Ga., where he felt forced to live a double life: Friday nights on the football field, with white and black teammate pursuing victory together, and Sunday mornings at all-white churches where racial jokes brought laughs.

"On the football field there were two cultures working together toward a common goal," he says, but at other times "I had the heart-wrenching experience of discovering that the people who most resisted the struggle for freedom were white evangelical Southern men like me." After a broken hip dashed his dreams of a football career, he enrolled in Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, Miss., studied faith-based models for urban renewal, and became an ordained minister within the theologically conservative Presbyterian Church in America.

11 A.M. Wearing tube socks, khaki shorts, and a navy polo shirt, Mr. Leverett is standing before an office blackboard in the \$3 million outreach center he opened last year across from the housing projects. With a slickly polished gymnasium, 10 classrooms, and 13 new computers, the 36,000-square-foot building built with private donations, doubles as a youth recreation center and a church.

Today he is training three of his 20 full-time employees. Like a coach explaining play-by-play strategy, he draws lots of little arrows and circles. But the game plan starts with a phrase: "incarnational ministry." Mr. Leverett tells his students, "Like Christ, you have to enter into their lives and suffer redemptively for them. Part of that suffering is just demonstrating a willingness, a willingness to hear gun shots at night, to feel insecure, unsafe, and exposed."

In addition to offering weekly tutoring, Bible studies, and sports leagues, Mr. Leverett helps students start for-profit businesses, including the "Brothers Realty" housing renovation program. He's also planning for next year, when the outreach center will host the area's first private school—*Desire Street Academy*.

2 P.M. While Mr. Leverett does more mentoring, staff members like 25-year-old Heather Holdsworth are working the neighborhood. As DSM education director, Miss Holdsworth every afternoon visits Carver Washington High School, located three blocks from the projects and with the look of a giant warehouse. Outside are gray bricks and chain-link fences. Inside, the classroom doors have deadlocks, and the hallways are bare except for signs touting the school health clinic and day-care center.

Sporting tattooed arms and baseball caps turned backwards, the students have crowded into a small gymnasium for a school basketball game. Miss Holdsworth is there, sitting amid hundreds of shouting students in the gymnasium bleachers, greeting them and inviting them to after-school tutoring. When she first arrived three years ago, none of the students would speak to her. Even local police officers stopped her, asking if she had come to buy drugs. "She was a white girl

who came out of nowhere. So it took me a good three months to speak to her," said Dwana, a 17-year-old student.

Now, though, Dwana prays twice a week with Heather and attends DSM Bible studies and tutoring classes. Carrying a pink diaper bag, she leaves the basketball game at 3 p.m. to retrieve her 8-month-old baby. This June, Dwana will marry the baby's 18-year-old father inside the Desire Street Ministries building. "I want my baby to grow up reading the Bible and doing the right things," she said.

Each year, Miss Holdsworth helps some 30 students like Dwana pass their ACT college admission tests and apply for financial aid. That's a noteworthy accomplishment considering that Carver students average a dismal 14 out of a possible 36 points on the ACT test. The welfare mentality that pervades the projects provides a formidable obstacle to her efforts, says Miss Holdsworth. While tutoring seniors, for instance, she discovered that several parents allowed their kids to apply for disability certificates instead of diplomas so the family could receive federal aid. That decision automatically disqualified them from college scholarships.

3:30 p.m. Mo Leverett is doing his best to break the underachieving mentality by emphasizing the second part of his game plan: indigenous leadership. Inside the DSM classrooms, students peruse books including the Westminster Confession of Faith. They are pupils in Mr. Leverett's first Urban Theological Institute, a school designed to create indigenous spiritual leaders.

Institute student Richard Johnson, one of Mr. Leverett's first disciples, says a lesson on the "Noetic principle" (man's blindness to sin) caught his attention: "The principle applies to the projects: There's no family foundation for children to see here. All we had were guys and women just having sex and selling drugs. That's all our kids see and they don't see any wrong in it. In our community you are respected if you are a great athlete, a big drug dealer, or a murderer."

During high school, Mr. Johnson says, he respected his older cousin, a drug user who eventually shot his mother seven times. Mr. Johnson believes he was destined for similar destruction until "Coach Mo" became his new role model: "When he first walked on the field, we were like, man, somebody's going to jail. Because a lot of the guys on the team were selling drugs and we thought he was a cop. Coach Mo wasn't just another fly-by-night white dude. He stood firm and he coached, he preached and he loved."

6 P.M. Dressed in baggy jean shorts and a black jacket, Mr. Johnson stands behind a wooden podium as some 100 high-school students file into the gym for a Tuesday night Bible study. Boys with spray-painted nylons tied around their heads and girls wearing lots of gold jewelry chat noisily. But the audience grows quiet as Mr. Johnson explains the concepts of original sin and undeserved grace.

"We can't overcome sin on our own because there is nothing in us that is spiritual," he tells them. "If you are watching porno flicks or doing drugs, the only way to overcome those things is to let Christ rule in your heart." Later, Mr. Johnson confides that he feels a sense of urgency at every Bible study. Too often, unresponsive students walk out the door only to become victims of drive-by shootings or drug overdoses: "Sometimes I feel like they aren't listening, but I keep preaching anyway. Knowing that Christ paid a debt I couldn't repay keeps me going."

As Mr. Johnson teaches Bible study, "Coach Mo" squeezes in some family time at his 9-year-old daughter's softball game. Watching her play, he remembers other chil-

dren he watched today, especially those who came to the Bible study to escape the drugs or physical abuse that pervade their own homes. "I feel many different emotions as I think about that," says Mr. Leverett. "I want to shelter my own children, but I also want to teach them the heart of Christ." Although his children attend a school outside the ward, Mr. Leverett encourages them to interact with playmates from the housing projects during after-school programs and Sunday school.

Some people have called Mr. Leverett's decision to move his family into the ghetto a foolhardy sacrifice. But sacrifice is just his point, he says: "I want my children to see the incarnate gospel."

[From World, June 16, 2001]

#### WHEN A PICTURE IS WORTH 1,000 LIVES

(By Leah Driggers)

Amber, 17, sits on a chair in an ultrasound room swinging sneaker-clad feet back and forth. Nearby, an embroidered pink quilt hangs on the wall proclaiming: "God's love always forgives." A door swings open and ultrasound nurse Kay Morton strides in, white lab coat fluttering.

"How are you doing?" asks Mrs. Morton, 50, smiling over multicolored reading glasses as she pages through the girl's medical file. The answer is sad: "My fiancé just passed away," says Amber, her hands trembling. Amber's boyfriend hanged himself two weeks before, and Amber found the body, dangling. Now she is faced with a crisis pregnancy, and is in the process of choosing whether to carry or abort her child. The Dallas Pregnancy Resource Center is offering a free sonogram to help Amber decide.

"OK, just lie back," Mrs. Morton says in a soothing voice, laying a white blanket across Amber's legs. Amber holds her cotton T-shirt in place and pulls down black overalls to reveal a slightly rounded belly. Mrs. Morton squeezes a bottle that spits clear, blue gel on Amber's stomach. "Oh!" laughs Amber: "That's cold!" The room grows dim, and the jittery high-school senior freezes as Mrs. Morton presses a handheld transducer into her abdomen. A few feet from Amber's wide eyes, an image jumps on a small computer screen.

"See that flickering spot?" Mrs. Morton asks, using a mouse to point a virtual arrow at a light that pulsates on-screen. "That's your baby's heartbeat." A huge grim spreads across Amber's face. Mrs. Morton clicks the mouse again and an electronic line appears that she uses to measure the tiny image from head to toe. "It looks like your baby's about seven weeks," she tells Amber. The girl nods slowly, eyes glued on the black-and-white monitor, her body stone-still. Mrs. Morton points out the baby's legs, arms, and the head; Amber clutches the top of her T-shirt, motionless.

Mrs. Morton types and two words appear on the screen: "HI, MOM!" The image shakes as Amber giggles. "Isn't it incredible that your baby already has developed brain waves, a heartbeat, and individual fingers?" Mrs. Morton asks. "When I was in college studying to be a nurse, I didn't believe in God. But when I studied the development of the embryo, that's when I said there must be a God. Isn't your baby amazing?" Amber nods, still staring at her sleeping child. Mrs. Morton prints a still shot from the sonogram while Amber wipes tears from her eyes. "I can't wait for my Mom to see this," she murmurs, fingering the photo. "Now it is real."

Amber chose to keep her unborn baby alive, and many more moms are making similar decisions as crisis pregnancy centers (CPCs) and support organizations nationwide discover the power of ultrasound to affect

hearts and minds. Heartbeat International, one of the largest national CPC organizations, recently surveyed 114 CPCs that use ultrasound. CPC directors reported that 60 to 90 percent of abortion-minded clients decide to keep their babies after seeing live pictures of them.

"Ultrasound connects a woman with reality—what she's actually carrying in the womb," said Tom Glessner, president of the National Institute of Family and Life Advocates. "It's no longer a 'condition' when the mother sees her moving child. A bonding takes place."

Ultrasound also helps other people in a pregnant woman's life see a problem pregnancy as a person. Often, women choose abortion because of unsupportive boyfriends or parents. So centers strongly encourage clients to return with doubting friends and family. Technicians nationwide relate stories of bored boyfriends who shuffle in with arms crossed, but later break down in tears or exclaim something like, "My son! That's my son!" Grandparents, too, point at the screen in shock, demanding, "Are you kidding me? Is that what's going on in her? Is that my granddaughter?"

The military first used ultrasound to locate submarines. But it wasn't until the early 1980s—at least a decade after *Roe v. Wade* opened the abortion floodgates in 1973—that CPCs began using ultrasound in their clinics. At least 200 CPCs nationwide now provide the service, and other among the estimated 3,000 CPCs across the country are converting themselves into medical clinics that offer ultrasound and other diagnostic pregnancy-related services. CPC directors say medical clinics draw more clients—especially abortion-minded ones—than non-medical counseling centers.

Too bad ultrasound is so expensive: A machine costs about \$30,000. But some manufacturers offer discounts for pro-life organizations, cutting the price tag to around \$18,000. Support supplies like gloves, gel, and film run around \$1,000 annually, but medical professionals are the major cost. Some CPCs that can't afford to buy a machine or employ a technician are networking with other ultrasound clinics. Such links save lives: When a counselor at a non-CPC clinic senses that her client will choose abortion, she can call a local ultrasound-CPC for an emergency visit.

To broaden the reach of ultrasound, some sonographers independently contract services with local CPCs, toting their own machines from center to center. Some OB/GYN doctors also offer ultrasound services in their offices. Dr. Wendell Ashby has offered sonography in his Amarillo, Texas, office for the past nine years. "We are a visual society," he said. "[Mothers] can't handle their conscience saying, 'You're killing your baby.' When they see little arms and legs kicking and moving, a heart beating, a brain, stomach, bladder, spine, and babies sucking their thumbs, it's no longer just tissue. [These women] say they had no idea—they thought it was just a little tadpole in there."

Shari Richards believes it's never too early to detonate the tadpole myth. The founder of Sound Wave Images, an international ultrasound education group in West Bloomfield, Mich., has turned her attention to the next generation by developing an ultrasound video shown in over 5,000 classrooms worldwide. Schools using the ultrasound video as part of abstinence curricula report declines in teen pregnancy of up to 25 percent, Ms. Richards said.

After seeing the Sound Wave video, one student wrote, "I've always thought abortion was a choice each woman should make. But after seeing the babies, I know that abortion is wrong."

[From World, June 16, 2001]

# MY BABY WOULDN'T BE HERE

(By Leah Driggers)

Tessa Malaspina was 22 years old when the cheap pregnancy test she bought turned positive. "I was going to have an abortion," remembers Ms. Malaspina, a blonde club dancer who once was heavily into drinking and drugs: "I was having way too much fun partying." When her mom convinced Ms. Malaspina to stop by the Dallas Pregnancy Resource Center, Ms. Malaspina warned her: "It will not change my mind." She'd already had one abortion; three months pregnant, she climbed the stairs to the CPC's ultrasound room, determined to have another one.

"I didn't want to see it, but at the same time I didn't think it would matter," she says of the pending sonogram. "But once I saw it was a moving person with a heartbeat, I couldn't do it," Ms. Malaspina told WORLD. "I couldn't even think about [abortion] again. I never realized how advanced they were so early. . . . They give you information in school and stuff, but never enough. If I hadn't have seen it, I wouldn't have changed my mind. I don't know how anyone could go through with an abortion after seeing an ultrasound."

The day she decided to keep her second child, she quit dancing, smoking, and taking drugs. "It totally changed my life around," she says, pausing to tend blue-eyed son Riley, 6 months old. Ms. Malaspina, who now works full-time as a bill collector, says her mom helps her with the baby: "It's hard," she says of being a single mom, "but I wouldn't have it any other way."

Beverly Wright, 29, was five months pregnant when she stepped through the glass door to Dallas Pregnancy Resource Center, seeking a free pregnancy test "to make sure." She had just lost her job and her car, and was also behind on her rent. "I had an option to pay my rent or get an abortion," she remembers. After the pregnancy test confirmed her pregnancy, Ms. Wright's CPC counselor asked if she would also like an ultrasound. "I didn't know what to expect," Ms. Wright confesses. "But my No. 1 choice was abortion, so I wasn't scared."

When the picture popped up on the screen, Ms. Wright began crying. "I was shocked," she says. "They were all telling me, 'Look at her move! She's so pretty! Do you see the hand?' That's what did it. I saw what it really was—my baby. It gave me a change of heart."

Ms. Wright took home the black-and-white sonogram photos and kept them on her dresser in a white envelope marked simply "Baby."

"It made me accept that I had her. And it made me fall in love with her," says Ms. Wright, now the proud mother of smiling 14-month-old Tia. "I still have those pictures. If I had never seen the ultrasound, my baby wouldn't be here," she says, shuddering. "From the bottom of my heart, she's the best thing that ever happened to me."

Now Ms. Wright spends every day with Tia working as a live-in employee in a health care home. What would she say to other abortion-minded clients? "Come get a sonogram, and see what you've got inside. It'll change everything."

[From World, June 16, 2001]

## SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND BUSINESS

(By Tim Graham)

The White House faith-based initiative is opening up a new front, and some of its guns are aimed squarely at big business.

"Faith-based organizations receive only a tiny percentage of overall corporate giving,"

President Bush announced late last month. "Currently, six of the 10 largest corporate givers in America explicitly rule out or restrict donations to faith-based groups, regardless of their effectiveness. The federal government will not discriminate against faith-based organizations, and neither should corporate America."

The president's numbers came from a study soon to be released by the Washington-based Capital Research Center, which has issued an annual guide to "Patterns of Corporate Philanthropy" since the mid-1980s. CRC's Christopher Yablonski has noted that policies posted on the websites of these top corporate givers often include rules to discriminate against charities that see a connection between material problems and spiritual problems. For instance:

General Motors (No. 1 in corporate giving) declares contributions "are generally not provided to . . . religious organizations."

The Ford Motor Company Fund (No. 3), "as a general policy, does not support the following: religious or sectarian programs for religious purposes." That's in the same undesirable category as "animal rights organizations" and "beauty or talent contests."

ExxonMobil (No. 4) explains, "We do not provide funds for political or religious causes." That's not exactly true, since the company also touts its support of environmentalists, advocacy groups for women and minorities, and groups performing "public research."

IBM (No. 6) "does not make equipment donations or grants from corporate philanthropic funds to . . . individuals, political, labor, religious, or fraternal organizations or sports groups." Many faith-based groups might also have trouble with the last two words of IBM's ban on "organizations that discriminate in any way against race, gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation."

The Citigroup Foundation (No. 7) declares: "It is not our policy to make grants to . . . religious, veteran, or fraternal organizations, unless they are engaged in a significant project benefiting the entire community."

AT&T (No. 8) will only fund groups that are "nonsectarian and nondenominational."

Wal-Mart, the No. 2 corporate benefactor, was the main contrarian. Mr. Yablonski said the company awards a lot of small grants, and on previous donation lists, it looked like "every other grant" was to a faith-based charity. And the other companies' policies don't always completely bar donations to religious groups. CRC found that in contributions of \$10,000 or more, some bans were complete (IBM zero percent, AT&T 0.06 percent), but some let a little sunshine in (GM 2.2 percent, Ford 3.2 percent, Citigroup 3.9 percent). One top-10 giver without an explicit ban, Boeing McDonnell, still only gave 4.6 percent of its grant money to faith-based organizations.

Corporations today often view their contributions as a business expense. The CRC regularly finds liberal women's and minority groups at the top of the corporate donation list, which is a handy inoculation device against discrimination lawsuits. But faith-based groups barely register on the typical corporate radar screen. "I was on a panel with a corporate officer who said the First Amendment didn't allow them to give to religious groups," said conservative philanthropy executive Michael Joyce, commenting on the corporate mindset. "Corporate leaders are working with some intellectual rot, or some pure ignorance."

At a meeting at the White House in late January, Mr. Joyce took his turn to speak about corporate discrimination against faith-based groups: "I said the president is both president of the government, but also

president of the nation. There's huge private sector that spends billions emulating what government does. A few well-placed words from the president could have a profound effect. He could call in top CEOs and ask 'what's going on here?' The president picked up on that right away."

This month, at age 58, Mr. Joyce is stepping down from the helm of the Milwaukee-based Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation to lead two new nonprofit groups at the crossroads of business, politics, and faith-based initiatives. The first, based in Washington, will take on the "short-term game" of lobbying members of Congress and other Washington elites about the virtues of President Bush's plan, as summarized in the "Community Solutions Act" before the House of Representatives. The second, based in Phoenix, is a "larger project, educating the culture, and private donors in particular, for the long haul."

But how will Mr. Joyce's new groups deal with campaign-finance conspiracy theorists and follow-the-money investigative journalists in the major media? They may quickly insinuate that the groups are a clever way for Bush donors to puff up the presidential legacy without any troublesome contribution limits. Mr. Joyce thinks such a brouhaha would be a waste of breath. "Barry Lynn [of Americans United for Separation of Church and State] and his crowd have a lot of resources. It isn't who funds anything. It's what they actually do." He plans on keeping in touch with the White House, but "what we cannot do is carry out their wishes. We will have to operate independently. It's just that simple."

Tom Riley, director of research at the Philanthropy Roundtable (which Mr. Joyce had a major role in creating decades ago) says Mr. Joyce was an atypical foundation executive during his 15 years at Bradley. Most program offices at large foundations are incredibly risk-averse, and since there's no risk of financial ruin, the biggest risk is bad press. Many corporations and foundations try to avoid controversy by avoiding charities that might be unpopular with the press. "Michael Joyce took those risks, and he was strategic rather than reactive. He had a vision, a long-term approach of building a movement, an infrastructure."

Mr. Joyce brings a similarly unorthodox approach to his new calling. Whenever the subject is the success of conservative philanthropy, Mr. Joyce sees no big secret. "Ordinary people understand this really well," he said. "We take human nature into account. We understand humans as they were wrought by God. These people wish to remake them and rearrange them. It's like that line in a Bob Marley song, 'don't let them rearrange you.' That's why they fail."

## BRADLEY'S FIGHTING VEHICLE

Neal Freeman of the Foundation Management Institute called Michael Joyce "the chief operating officer of the conservative movement. . . . Over the period of his Bradley service, it's difficult to recall a single, serious thrust against incumbent liberalism that did not begin or end with Mike Joyce."

From his perch at the top of the John Olin Foundation, another conservative heavyweight, Mr. Joyce took over the brand-new Bradley Foundation in 1985 when it began with \$280 million from the sale of Milwaukee electronics giant Allen-Bradley to Rockwell. Despite giving away almost \$300 million in grants, Mr. Joyce is turning over the keys to a foundation that now lists assets of \$700 million. It's the 68th largest foundation in America, and Mr. Joyce oversaw \$44 million in grants last year.

"I had no immediate offers or opportunities" upon retirement, he said, but "I did

place my trust in providence." Just then along came Paul Fleming, the Phoenix magnate of P.F. Chang's Chinese Bistro, a 25-state restaurant chain. "From his many years seeing faith heal in the center city of Phoenix, he was enriched in his own faith by what can be done." Together, they decided to form a tax-deductible group to educate corporations on faith-based charities. "I talked him out of putting it in Washington," Mr. Joyce said. "I visit Washington often, but when I leave, I always say, 'I'm going back to America.' I told him, be proud of your city."

Mr. Joyce continues to apply his vision of keeping the country from becoming a "prisoner to a hopeless progressivism" with his new enterprise. "At the end of the 19th century, liberals considered themselves the new Founding Fathers," he said. "They had their 100 years, and they made a mess of things. At the start of a new millennium, they are out gas."

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mrs. CUBIN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCHUGH, for 5 minutes, on June 28.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRUCCI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, on June 25.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REHBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2617. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-P-7602] received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2618. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7763] received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2619. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2620. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Tobacco Control Activities in the United States, 1994–1999: Report to Congress," in accordance with Section 3(c) of the Comprehensive Smoking Education Act of 1984, Public Law 98-474; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2621. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Defense, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability for United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. 01-0B), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2622. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-76, "DNA Sample Collection Act of 2001" received June 21, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2623. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2624. A letter from the Personnel Management Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2625. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Kentucky Regulatory Program [KY-230-FOR] received June 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2626. A letter from the Division Chief, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Construction and Operation Of Offshore Oil and Gas Facilities in the Beaufort Sea [Docket No. 990901241-0116-02; I.D. 123198B] (RIN: 0648-AM09) received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2627. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS); NOAA Information Collection Requirements; Regulatory Adjustments [Docket

et No. 010530142-1142-01; I.D. 040601J] (RIN: 0648-AP23) received June 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2628. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Tuna Fisheries; Regulatory Adjustments [Docket No. 010523137-1137-01; I.D. 051501C] (RIN: 0648-AP29) received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2629. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures for the Groundfish Fisheries off Alaska [Docket No. 010112013-1139-04; I.D. 011101B] (RIN: 0648-AO82) received June 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2630. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Black Sea Bass Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Quarter 2 Period [Docket No. 001121328-1041-02; I.D. 060501A] received June 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2631. A letter from the Acting, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 060801A] received June 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 2263. A bill to require that ten percent of the motor vehicles purchased by Executive agencies be hybrid electric vehicles or high-efficiency vehicles; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. COYNE, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the expensing of environmental remediation costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 2265. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow consumers greater access to information regarding the health benefits of foods and dietary supplements; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself and Mr. BALDACCIO):

H.R. 2266. A bill to reduce the risk of the accidental release of mercury into the environment by providing for the temporary storage of private sector supplies of mercury at facilities of the Department of Defense currently used for mercury storage, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to appoint a task force to develop a plan for the safe disposal of mercury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in