

needs of teachers, parents and school administrators, rather than political pressure.

Finally, this bill makes technical assistance, including support in carrying out the conditions of No Child Left Behind, "customer-driven" and accountable to school districts, states and regions.

With that in mind, I would like to thank the Chairman of the Education Reform Subcommittee, the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. CASTLE, for his assistance and support of the Southern California Comprehensive Assistance Center (SCCAC). Because of the language included in the bill, regional education agencies like the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), California's largest regional educational agency, which have been critical in providing hands on technical assistance to low-performing schools and districts, will be competitive for grant funding under the technical assistance title.

Under the leadership of the Los Angeles County Office of Education, the SCCAC provides support, training and assistance to local schools and communities in an effort to improve teaching and learning for all children, including those who live in poverty, have limited-English proficiency, are neglected, delinquent, or have disabilities.

As the gentleman is aware, section 203 of the bill ensures that local entities or consortia eligible to receive grants includes regional educational agencies as well. I want to, once again, thank the Chairman for his assistance in ensuring that our local regional entities are eligible. We are very proud of the work done by our eight county comprehensive assistance center and the value it can bring to this new system.

In closing, I urge the House to vote yes on H.R. 5598, a bill that builds on the Administration's plans to reform America's education system—through accountability, flexibility and local control, research-based reform and expanded parental options. I believe that the passage of this bill will significantly ensure that our children have access to the most advanced educational opportunities possible.

# KEEPING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SAFE ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Child Abuse Protection and Treatment Act (CAPTA) is the only federal law that focuses on the prevention of child abuse and neglect and the improvement of child protective services to better address the critical needs of children who have been reported as abused and neglected. I am pleased that we have been able to reauthorize this vital program with several key new features that will help facilitate better prevention and treatment efforts.

There are approximately three million reports of child abuse every year. Of these 3 million, nearly 1 million are substantiated. In 1999, an estimated 1,137 children died as a result of abuse and neglect. Children who are abused and neglected are more likely to suffer mental health problems, such as depression,

delinquency, and suicide. Child abuse is also likely to lead to school failure in adolescence and economic instability as adults. With such serious and life-long consequences from child abuse and neglect, clearly greater attention must be given to effective prevention and intervention services.

Our nation's current system of protecting children is heavily weighted toward protecting children who have been so seriously maltreated they are no longer safe at home and must be placed in foster care or adoptive homes. These are children whose safety is in danger; they demand our immediate attention. Unfortunately, far less attention is directed at preventing harm to these children from happening in the first place, or providing the appropriate services and treatment needed by families and children victimized by abuse or neglect.

CAPTA plays an important role in the federal response to protecting children and preventing child maltreatment. CAPTA provides resources for strengthening child protective services systems, so that children and families can be better protected and served. It provides resources for state grants that provide for prevention and treatment services for abused children and children at risk of abuse.

I strongly support Congress' on-going efforts to reauthorize this important legislation to better meet the needs of children, families and communities.

I am especially pleased that in this reauthorization significant improvements have been made to CAPTA overall and that important provisions have been added to Title 1 that that encourage and support new linkages between child protective services, and health, mental health and developmental services. These linkages will prove critical to ensuring that the youngest, most vulnerable children receive the help they need before problems escalate to tragedy. I would urge grantees in implementing these critical linkages to look to the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) protocol in the Medicaid Program to help ensure that comprehensive services are being delivered.

I also support modifications to Title II of the Act to strengthen state support for community-based child abuse and neglect prevention activities. I am disappointed, however, that while the H.R. 5601 includes respite and home visiting in its definition of community-based child abuse and neglect programs and activities, the modifications do eliminate some of the references to respite care and home visiting. Children with disabilities, whose families rely on respite for support, are nearly four times more likely than children without disabilities to be abused or neglected.

I would also like to register my disagreement with language in the Senate report accompanying the CAPTA bill approved by the Senate HELP committee that singled out respite care by saying that it is too expensive and that states should rely on other funding sources to support it. The Senate report cited no data or information to support this misconception.

In fact, there is ample evidence to suggest that respite is a proven, cost-effective approach to child abuse and neglect prevention. Research overwhelmingly demonstrates that respite and crisis nurseries are directly linked to reductions in abuse and neglect and in avoiding much more costly out-of-home institutional or foster care placements.

One Iowa crisis program found a 13% decrease in the reported incidence of child abuse and neglect in the initial four pilot counties after the program's implementation (Cowen, Perle Slavik, 1992).

In a recent evaluation study of families of children at risk of abuse or neglect who utilized Family Support Services of the Bay Area's Respite Care Program in northern California, over 90% of the families using the service reported reduced stress (93%), improved family relationships (90%), improved positive attitudes toward child (93%), and other significant benefits that can help reduce the risk of abuse (Owens, Sandra, et al, School of Social Welfare, Berkeley, California, 1999).

In April, 1999, the Minnesota Dept. of Human Services, Family and Children's Services Division, reported that crisis nursery clients in 15 crisis nursery programs serving 18 counties showed a 67% reduction in child protection involvement after using nursery services. The Hennepin County Children and Family Services Department's evaluation of the Greater Minneapolis Crisis Nursery found that families with no prior child protection involvement had a 0% risk of subsequent child protection involvement six months after using the Nursery's services. Families with prior child protection involvement who used the Nursery had only an 8% risk compared with an 84% risk for families who did not use the Nursery.

The Relief Nursery in Eugene, Oregon, reports that in 1997–98, 91.3% of children attending the Nursery were free of any reports of abuse, and 89% had no involvement with foster care. This is remarkable, because two-thirds of the families had more than ten risk factors, and 95% had five or more. A family with five risk factors is deemed to be at extremely high risk for abuse and neglect.

An evaluation of the Iowa Respite Child Care Project for families parenting a child with developmental disabilities found that respite care results in a statistically significant decrease in foster care placement (Cowen, Perle Slavik, 1996).

A study of Vermont's respite care program for families of children or adolescents with serious emotional disturbance found that participating families experience fewer out-of-home placements than nonusers and were more optimistic about their future ability to care for their children (Bruns, Eric, November, 15, 1999).

Preliminary data from the ARCH National Resource Center Outcome Evaluation project in which seventeen respite and crisis care programs nationwide participated, show that over 80% of caregivers using crisis respite services for their children reported that the crisis care they received helped protect their child from danger. Nearly half of those caring for children said without respite they would have had to leave their child in unsafe or inappropriate care or requested foster care.

Contrary to the Senate report, respite care can be very cost effective. According to the ARCH National Resource Center on Respite and Crisis Care, an average monthly cost of planned respite care can be estimated by multiplying the average number of hours a family receives respite per month (12), by the average cost of respite per hour (\$10.02). This model suggests an average cost of \$120.24 to provide respite to one individual per month or \$1,442.88 per year. The Child Welfare League of America reports that the average monthly

cost of foster care for children up to age 16 with special needs is \$971.00 per month or \$11,651 per year.

The average cost of crisis respite for families at risk of abuse or neglect is \$8.71 per hour. While the average number of hours a family receives crisis nursery or crisis respite services per month is not available, it can be assumed that it is significantly less than the average number of hours a family might receive planned respite, since crisis respite is used only in extreme emergencies when the family is at imminent risk of abuse or neglect. As a result, it can be estimated that the annual cost per family using crisis nursery or crisis respite services would be significantly lower than \$1,400.

The Senate Committee Report also suggests CAPTA Title II resources are better spent on services other than crisis respite, but like all important prevention and treatment services for at-risk families, crisis respite lacks sufficient resources to meet community need. ARCH reports that 63% of surveyed crisis respite programs and 48% of surveyed planned respite programs had to turn families away in a given year. Nationally, this represents a conservative estimate of 258,000 families who were on waiting lists for planned respite care last year alone, and 840,000 families who were turned away.

I would urge the Department of Health and Human Services to consider this evidence when it writes the program instructions for Title II of CAPTA and urge State and local community-based programs to consider it as well in implementing these services.

With this reauthorization we have made some important changes to these laws that should lead to better prevention and treatment services for children and families who need our help. We must do a better job preventing child abuse and neglect and providing services to children and families in need. Failure to help these children and families cannot be tolerated.

## THE GRAPES OF WRATH

**HON. BARBARA LEE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 16, 2002*

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman Farr for organizing this tribute to John Steinbeck and this celebration of *The Grapes of Wrath*. When Steinbeck created the Joads, he created a portrait of the American family at a moment of crisis but also a moment of great strength. His words still resonate, and we still face many of the same challenges: America still has its Hoovervilles. But California is still a land of dreams and promises. I have chosen for my selection, a portion of chapter nineteen, describing the arrival of generations of migrants into California, their hoped for promised land. I am happy to join my colleague in celebrating reading and celebrating this classic novel.

### CHAPTER NINETEEN

Once California belonged to Mexico and its land to Mexicans; and a horde of tattered feverish Americans poured in. And such was their hunger for land that they took the land—stole Sutter's land, Guerrero's land, took the grants and broke them up and

growled and quarreled over them, those frantic hungry men; and they guarded with guns the land they had stolen. They put up houses and barns, they turned the earth and planted crops. And these things were possession, and possession was ownership.

The Mexicans were weak and fed. They could not resist, because they wanted nothing in the world as frantically as the Americans wanted land.

Then, with time, the squatters were no longer squatters, but owners; and their children grew up and had children on the land. And the hunger was gone from them, the feral hunger, the gnawing, tearing hunger for land, for water and earth and the good sky over it, for the green thrusting grass, for the swelling roots. They had these things so completely that they did not know about them any more, they had no more the stomach-tearing lust for a rich acre and a shining blade to plow it, for seed and a windmill beating its wings in the air. They arose in the dark no more to hear the sleepy birds' first chittering, and the morning wind around the house while they waited for the first light to go out to the dear acres. These things were lost, and crops were reckoned in dollars, and land was valued by principal plus interest, and crops were bought and sold before they were planted. Then crop failure, drought, and flood were no longer little deaths within life, but simple losses of money. And all their love was thinned with money, and all their fierceness dribbled away in interest until they were no longer farmers at all, but little shopkeepers of crops, little manufacturers who must sell before they can make. Then those farmers who were not good shopkeepers lost their land to good shopkeepers. No matter how clever, how loving a man might be with earth and growing things, he could not survive if he were not also a good shopkeeper. And as time went on, the business men had the farms, and the farms grew larger, but there were fewer of them.

Now farming became industry, and the owners followed Rome, although they did not know it. They imported slaves, although they did not call them slaves: Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Filipinos. They live on rice and beans, the business men said. They don't need much. They wouldn't know what to do with good wages. Why, look how they live. Why, look what they eat. And if they get funny—deport them.

And all the time the farms grew larger and the owners fewer. And there were pitifully few farmers on the land any more. And the imported serfs were beaten and frightened and starved until some went home again, and some grew fierce and were killed or driven from the country. And the farms grew larger and the owners fewer.

And the crops changed. Fruit trees took the place of grain fields, and vegetables to feed the world spread out on the bottoms: lettuce, cauliflower, artichokes, potatoes—stoop crops. A man may stand to use a scythe, a plow, a pitchfork; but he must crawl like a bug between the rows of lettuce, he must bend his back and pull his long bag between the cotton rows, he must go on his knees like a penitent across a cauliflower patch.

And it came about that owners no longer worked on their farms. They farmed on paper; and they forgot the land, the smell, the feel of it, and remembered only that they owned it, remembered only what they gained and lost by it. And some of the farms grew so large that one man could not even conceive of them any more, so large that it took batteries of bookkeepers to keep track of interest and gain and loss; chemists to test the soil, to replenish; straw bosses to see that the stooping men were moving along the

rows as swiftly as the material of their bodies could stand. Then such a farmer really became a storekeeper, and kept a store. He paid the men, and sold them food, and took the money back. And after a while he did not pay the men at all, and saved bookkeeping. These farms gave food on credit. A man might work and feed himself; and when the work was done, he might find that he owned money to the company. And the owners not only did not work the farms any more, many of them had never seen the farms they owned.

And then the dispossessed were drawn west—from Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico; from Nevada and Arkansas families, tribes, dusted out, tracted out. Carloads, caravans, homeless and hungry; twenty thousand and fifty thousand and a hundred thousand and two hundred thousand. They streamed over the mountains, hungry and restless—restless as ants, scurrying to find work to do—to lift, to push, to pull, to pick, to cut—anything, any burden to bear, for food. The kids are hungry. We got no place to live. Like ants scurrying for work, for food, and most of all for land.

We ain't foreign. Seven generations back Americans, and

We ain't foreign. Seven generations back Americans, and beyond that Irish, Scotch, English, German. One of our folks in the Revolution, an' they was lots of our folks in the Civil War—both sides. Americans.

They were hungry, and they were fierce. And they had hoped to find a home, and they found only hatred. Okies—the owners hated them because the owners knew they were soft and the Okies strong, that they were fed and the Okies hungry; and perhaps the owners had heard from their grandfathers how easy it is to steal land from a soft man if you are fierce and hungry and armed. The owners hated them. And in the towns, the storekeepers hated them because they had no money to spend. There is no shorter path to a storekeeper's contempt, and all his admiration are exactly opposite. The town men, little bankers, hated Okies because there was nothing to gain from them. They had nothing. And the laboring people hated Okies because a hungry man must work, and if he must work, if he has to work, the wage payer automatically gives him less for his work; and then no one can get more.

And the dispossessed, the migrants, flowed into California, two hundred and fifty thousand, and three hundred thousand. Behind them new tractors were going on the land and the tenants were being forced off. And new waves were on the way, new waves of the dispossessed and the homeless, hardened, intent, and dangerous.

And while the Californians wanted many things, accumulation, social success, amusement, luxury, and a curious banking security, the new barbarians wanted only two things—land and food; and to them the two were one. And whereas the wants of the Californians were nebulous and undefined, the wants of the Okies were beside the roads, lying there to be seen and coveted: the good fields with water to be dug for, the good green fields, earth to crumble experimentally in the hand, grass to smell, oaten stalks to chew until the sharp sweetness was in the throat. A man might look at a fallow field and know, and see in his mind that his own bending back and his own straining arms would bring the cabbages into the light, and the golden eating corn, the turnips and carrots.

And a homeless hungry man, driving the roads with his wife beside him and his then children in the back seat, could look at the fallow fields which might produce food but not profit, and that man could know how a fallow field is a sin and the unused land a