

higher learning in my district, the University of North Texas and their Center for Advanced Research and Technology. This university's investment into research provides a unique opportunity to provide an incubator for interdisciplinary research with experimentation in material science, computer science and engineering. The university's goal is to provide the capabilities necessary to satisfy the growing technological and engineering needs of the north Texas region and for the talented faculty to advance research on projects of national importance associated with nanotechnology.

The University of North Texas had the foresight to invest in this facility and has taken the first step to serve as the region's research arm for nanotechnology research and all of the promise that this new branch of science holds. Once the center is fully established, it will serve as a focal point for basic and applied research. It will be the first high-tech entrepreneurial research and development park in Denton County, one of the fastest growing communities in the United States.

I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating the University of North Texas in their quest to keep America on the cutting edge of research and development.

THE PRESIDENT'S JOBS AND GROWTH PACKAGE

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in his first year in office, President Bush has put his MBA to the test and he has passed with very high marks. Through a recession, a terrorist attack and a war, the President has amply demonstrated leadership, helping businesses and their workers pull through some pretty tough times. The President and House Republicans understand a simple concept: When America works, America prospers. And the best way to foster that prosperity is by giving businesses the tools they need to create jobs and to grow the economy. Government does not tax things. Government taxes people. When workers and business owners are not allowed to keep the money they earn, productivity suffers, wages decline and research and development gets postponed. That is why the President's jobs and growth plan is so vital, because one American out of work is too many. When America works, America grows. When America works, America prospers. And when America works, America is proud.

Let us get to work along with the President, exert some leadership and get this country back to work.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today this Member rises to inform the House that the United States Senate a few minutes ago by a vote of 96-0 voted to give its advice and consent to U.S. ratification of the NATO enlargement protocols. The lines drawn across Europe at Yalta are gone. By its action today on the 58th anniversary of Victory in Europe Day, the Senate has approved the membership of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia in the North Atlantic Alliance.

According to the Constitution, it is the Senate that must give its advice and consent to treaty protocols. But, Mr. Speaker, this Member must note the leading role that this Chamber has played in promoting the admission into NATO of the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. The decision to admit former Communist countries from Central and Eastern Europe into the Atlantic Alliance is one of the great success stories in American foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. It is a bipartisan success, promoted by Republicans and Democrats in the Congress and by both the Clinton and Bush administrations. The seven nations across the face of Eastern and Central Europe that join NATO are democracies that will help build a stronger North Atlantic Alliance. Having fought so long and hard to gain their freedom, these nations know how very precious freedom is.

I ask all the states of the NATO nations to give their approval under their national processes as Canada, Norway and now the United States have done.

AMERICA STANDS WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, America stands with Israel. This weekend as the Secretary of State begins a key phase of negotiations in the road map for peace, I am confident he will remember this core value of the American people. America is not a neutral party in the negotiations in the Middle East. We are not, nor do we aspire to be, an honest broker. America stands with Israel.

In this vein yesterday in the Committee on International Relations, we adopted the Lantos amendment to the State Department authorization bill demanding a Palestinian first approach to concessions. The Palestinian Authority must first recognize Israel's right to exist, hunt down terrorists and dismantle terrorist infrastructure before Israel can be expected to make any concessions on the path to peace.

I pray for the peace of Jerusalem and I pray that Prime Minister Abbas and his Cabinet will defeat the terrorists within their midst and choose life for their people in that war-torn region.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1261, WORKFORCE REINVESTMENT AND ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 2003

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 221 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 221

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1261) to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 221 is a structured but fair rule providing for

the consideration of H.R. 1261, the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003. This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate, it will be in order to consider only the amendments printed in the report accompanying this resolution, by the Member designated and debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent.

In total, this rule makes eight amendments in order, three offered by Republican Members and five offered by Democrat Members.

Finally, the rule permits the minority a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

□ 1030

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest experiences for a Member of Congress is when we can acknowledge that a particular policy or plan that we have passed has been successful. Today is one of those times as we reauthorize the landmark 1998 Workforce Investment Act. In 1998, Congress passed the Workforce Investment Act to reform the Nation's job training system. At that time it was fragmented, duplicative and ineffective to both job seekers and employers. The path from unemployment to a job was long and winding and treacherous and often led to a dead end. There were many areas for improvement and we found them. What followed was a plan that consolidated and integrated employment and training services at the local level in a more unified work force development system. Today we can clearly see the positive results.

For example, if we take a snapshot view of the program from 2000 to 2001 we see 1.1 million individuals receiving intensive training from programs and services offered and millions more accessing self-service job listings and placement assistance through the one-stop centers and 82 percent of unemployed workers finding a job, up from 76 percent the previous year, increased employment rates for low-income adults rising from 69 percent to 76 percent, and higher diploma attainment rate for youth jumping from 35 percent to 54 percent. What a wonderful accomplishment. Few can dispute this evidence of success. Few can discount the millions of lives that have been changed with greater independence and greater self-worth.

So today we will build upon these achievements and pass the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003.

First, in this plan Congress goes even further in streamlining bureaucracy. Finding a new or better job is no small task, and workers will welcome few

barriers allowing them to take full advantage of the employment assistance.

Second, the package strengthens essential components such as adult education with vital reading and math skills. An adult education system should focus on improving results for those most in need of help, those who have already been left behind who have not attained the core skills that they need. By improving adults' basic reading and math skills and providing limited English proficiency lessons, this plan goes even further in equipping workers with tools and training necessary to enter the 21st century workforce.

This bill also enhances the landmark flexibility and local involvement that Congress provided to States and communities in the 1998 law. More duplicative programs and services have been identified and consolidated, saving money and precious resources. State and local officials receive even more flexibility to target Federal resources toward the unique needs of their own communities.

Finally, reauthorizing this plan helps strengthen America's economy by helping more workers find better jobs. The One-Stop Career Center system that provides job training and career information gives workers a necessary bridge to rejoin the workforce or retraining for better jobs. Such services are immeasurable and an investment into America's workforce.

Tomorrow this body will consider a jobs and growth package aimed at stimulating businesses and better jobs. Tomorrow we consider how to create new jobs. But today we consider how to strengthen the worker, how to equip the worker with the knowledge and the skills needed to succeed in those new jobs. An unlimited supply of jobs would not do America's economy any good without a qualified worker for each and every one of them. Strengthening America's economy requires both good jobs and good workers, and today I ask my colleagues to remember that when considering this bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the bill, and let me say just when we think that the Republican leadership of this House could not be any more out of touch with reality they bring this bill to the floor today, and today's contribution is the so-called Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003.

Let us review some of the basic facts of the failed economic policies of this President and of this Congress. Those policies have led to a 6 percent unemployment rate, the highest in years. There are more unemployed people in this country today than at any point since July of 1993. Of the 8.8 million people who are out of work in America, nearly 2 million have been out of work for 27 weeks or more. The average

length of unemployment is now approximately 20 weeks, the highest since 1984.

Mr. Speaker, the economy is ailing and Republican policies are failing, and every day the people of America are the ones who are suffering. And how does the majority propose to help the unemployed in this country? First, by proposing a misguided tax scheme. The President and the Republicans claim that their tax bill will create a million jobs. No serious economist or no serious person believes that.

But even taking them at their word, each new job under their plan would cost \$550,000 in lost revenue, about 17 times the salary of the average American worker. Talk about waste, fraud and abuse. On the other hand, every dollar we spend on unemployment benefits will boost the economy by \$1.73. That is what is called growth, not that the Republican majority knows anything about that.

The second part of their plan is to cut job training, disability, and veteran employment, and adult learning programs to hurt the very people we should be helping.

The Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003 we are considering here today does nothing to help create jobs or to reduce the number of unemployed people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve much better. Contrary to what we will hear from the majority, this bill actually makes it harder for the unemployed to get employment and re-employment training.

The SEIU, in an open letter to every Member of this body, said that "The primary task of the workforce development system must be to connect unemployed or underemployed workers with family-sustaining jobs that provide good wages and benefits and afford economic self-sufficiency." They are right. But if they are a young person who needs employment training while looking for their first job, this bill will not help them. If they are an adult who needs reemployment training and assistance as they look for a new job, this bill is not going to help them.

Specifically, this bill block-grants adult, dislocated worker, and employment service funding streams. It allows States to use funds from the Disability and Veteran Employment and Adult Learning programs to fund expenses at the Workforce Investment Act's centers. The result of this provision will be more bureaucracy and less training for the disabled and veterans.

Given all the rhetoric we hear in this place about veterans, this provision is unacceptable. We should be doing everything we can to help veterans find employment instead of slashing the Disability and Veteran Employment and Adult Learning Programs.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the bill eliminates existing protections and safeguards against low quality and potentially fraudulent job training providers and permits States to allow

these providers to receive Federal funding. It caps the use of funds for services for low-income youth, those considered most likely to drop out of school at 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, many Democrats offered several good amendments in the Committee on Rules yesterday. Unfortunately the majority has decided to stifle the debate on these important issues by denying these Members the opportunity to offer most of these amendments here on the floor.

One of the amendments offered in committee and denied by the majority was an extension of unemployment benefits for workers who have lost their jobs. Unemployment benefits expire at the end of this month. Too many unemployed workers simply cannot find work because the jobs are not there. These people desperately need the unemployment benefits traditionally supplied by the Federal Government in difficult times. It is flat wrong that the majority refuses to allow a vote on the extension of these important benefits. But if that were not bad enough, this bill also attacks the Constitution by repealing civil rights protections that are written in the current law.

Twenty-one years ago, then-Senator Dan Quayle sponsored legislation that provided civil rights protections against employment discrimination based on religion in programs that receive Federal funding. President Reagan signed that bill into law. It is not every day that a Democrat like me praises the good work of Dan Quayle, but the nondiscrimination provision he offered is good policy that has served us well.

And this provision received strong bipartisan support when the Workforce Reinvestment Act was reauthorized in 1998. But the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003 before us today shreds these protections by allowing religious organizations to receive Federal funding under the bill for job training activities and social services and then to discriminate in hiring based on religion. In other words, this bill would allow a religious organization that discriminates based on religion, like Bob Jones University, to get taxpayer money for Federal job training programs.

This provision is unconstitutional, unacceptable and offensive. An amendment to remove this provision was offered in the Committee on Rules and, like other substantive amendments, was not made in order.

Mr. Speaker, this is a lousy bill. Yesterday the Committee on Rules majority got into a debate over whose responsibility it is to deal with the unemployment benefits issue. Some said the Committee on Education and the Workforce, others said the Committee on Ways and Means. But I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, do they not go home to their districts? Do they not listen to their constituents? Do they not know that their

constituents care more about jobs and a strong economy than about jurisdictional cat fights? This is outrageous and they know it.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfair rule and it is a bad bill, and I urge my colleague to think of the unemployed in their districts and ask themselves does this bill help my constituents? The honest answer is no. I urge this House to defeat the rule and vote against the bill.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question of the rule on this Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003. This legislation before us today and the consideration tomorrow of the Republicans' irresponsible tax bill tell the American people everything they ever wanted to know about where the majority's priorities lie. And lest anyone be mistaken, their priorities do not lie with the workers and families who are suffering through the anxiety and stress of joblessness, with more than 10 million American workers now unemployed, with the loss of 2.7 million private sector jobs since President Bush was inaugurated, and 500,000 in the last 3 months; and with the unemployment rate at 6 percent, its highest level since 1994, the majority would undercut local reemployment efforts and eliminate services for job-seeking veterans, dislocated workers, and the disabled.

This Act was authorized 4 years ago after a lengthy bipartisan process. But today, today the majority turns it into a partisan vise that will squeeze America's jobless. It gives governors unlimited authority to divert funds from adult education, disability, and veterans' services. And we will, like Pontius Pilate, wring our hands and say it was not our responsibility, it was the governors' responsibility. And it fails to restore the \$440 million in cuts imposed on job-training programs or protect against 265 million more in proposed cuts for fiscal 2004.

Just imagine, just imagine, under Republican stewardship our economy has shed millions of jobs and at the same time the GOP is undermining job training programs. Republicans may call that compassion; Democrats call it indifference. Adding insult to injury, the big tent GOP seeks to change the original law to permit organizations that received Work Investment Act funds to discriminate on religious grounds in hiring, something that Dan Quayle said they should not do.

I commend my colleagues who fought to restore the current law. Their amendment should have been made in order. Was there a lack of conviction

that the allowing of discrimination in this bill was an appropriate policy and they could not hold their Members on their side of the aisle for such discrimination?

Democrats believe this Congress must enact policies that jump-start our economy and create jobs, and redoubling our job-training efforts is a vital part of that.

□ 1045

This bill simply gives the cold shoulder to millions of jobless Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question, to vote against the rule, and to vote against this bad bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the Committee on Rules for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 221 is a structured rule that gives the House the opportunity to consider eight amendments to the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003. The Committee on Rules has attempted to be as fair as possible in crafting this rule and has made in order five Democrat amendments, two Republican amendments, and a manager's amendment. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this rule so we can move on to debate the underlying legislation.

With respect to H.R. 1261, I wanted to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness and chairman of the full Committee on Education and the Workforce respectively, for all of the time and effort they have invested in bringing this very important and well-crafted legislation to the House floor today.

America's economy has been through a great deal in the last few years. We experienced the shock of September 11, we have endured a recession, and we faced the uncertainty of war. In spite of all this, the American economy is growing fast, and growing faster than most of the industrialized world. To ensure that our economy meets its full potential, we must create the conditions for continued growth and prosperity.

As the economy continues to recover, hundreds of thousands of Americans are searching for good, stable jobs. We have an opportunity here to assist those Americans in finding employment, and I believe that H.R. 1261 is a positive step in the right direction.

H.R. 1261 amends the 1998 Workforce Investment Act, which authorized the Federal Government's primary programs for helping our Nation's workers gain the skills they need to succeed in today's rapidly changing workforce. The 1998 act has helped unprecedented numbers of American workers find employment by finding workforce investment services and programs through

statewide and local One-Stop Career Center systems, but it could help even more, and that is exactly what H.R. 1261 is designed to do.

H.R. 1261 aims to streamline work investment programs in order to provide more efficient and results-oriented services. It will provide also an opportunity to build on and improve the current system so that it can respond quickly and effectively to the changing needs of both workers and employers. In addition, it will eliminate duplication, improve accountability, increase State flexibility, and strengthen adult education programs.

To the credit of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), and the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), I believe H.R. 1261, combined with President Bush's jobs and growth tax relief initiative, will move us toward our goal of creating more job opportunities for our citizens and ensuring that out-of-work Americans have the access to the tools and resources they need to rejoin the workforce or retrain for better jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed to debate the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), whose important amendment was denied yesterday in the Committee on Rules.

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

As a new Member of this House, I was appalled that one of the first actions we took in the Committee on Education and the Workforce was to adopt a provision that strikes at the heart of religious liberty in this country. The underlying bill contains a provision that takes us down a very dangerous road in this country, a road of religious bigotry and intolerance; and even worse, it uses taxpayers' dollars to promote that intolerance.

What am I talking about? Under current law, if you receive Federal funds to run a job training program in this country, you are not allowed to discriminate in your hiring based on religion. I think that makes sense to all Americans. If you are receiving Federal dollars for a program you are running, you should not be able to say to a prospective job applicant, I am sorry, you are the wrong religion. But that is what this does.

Here is a chart that shows what current law is. This was a law that was language originally signed into law by President Reagan. It was most recently adopted again by this body in 1988 as part of the last reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act. It has a prohibition of discrimination language, and it prohibits discrimination in employment based on religion, existing law.

But what this underlying bill does is it takes a big red X mark and crosses

out "religion." It is a green light in this country to allow organizations that receive Federal funds to say no, to give you the religion test.

Imagine if you were to open up your local newspaper and see a help wanted ad for a job training program, and it said Christians only need apply, Jews only need apply, or Muslims only need apply. In fact, it can say Baptists only, or Methodists only. We would be appalled. But even worse, we would be appalled if we saw that that ad in that newspaper was paid for with U.S. taxpayer dollars.

Imagine as an American citizen responding to an ad for a job with a job training program, and you are qualified and you go to the interview, and they say, Gee, you know, you are really qualified, in fact you provided job training services in the past, but, golly, you are just the wrong religion. You are not a Christian, or a Jew, or You are not a Muslim.

Or you could be the right religion, but they are allowed to interrogate you. They can ask you questions. How many times did you go to church? Or synagogue? What are your charitable contributions? Let's talk about your marriage and family life. They are allowed under this provision to probe into your personal life to determine whether you meet their "religious test." And they can do it all with your taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the America I know. I do not think that is the America most Americans know. It strikes at the heart of our constitutional protections for liberty.

I would just say I think the full House deserves an opportunity to at least debate this, so that all 435 members have an opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" on whether they want to use taxpayer dollars to discriminate.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, what is really disturbing in debates is how to counter misinformation when it is repeated on a constant basis on the floor of this House.

The constitutional protection for religious liberty also extends to churches and it extends to organizations that reflect faith. That applies in the Tax Code. I presume a previous speaker, based on that logic, would not want to give a tax deduction to a church or a religious organization that discriminates in their hiring practices. For example, you would not have a Christian as the head of a synagogue, or you would not have a Muslim preaching at a Christian church. The charitable deduction is shaped that way; tax deductions are shaped that way.

We have all sorts of court-approved guidelines, for example, in the sense of they have ruled in some of the schools

you can fund a computer, but you cannot fund the software, if you look at it that way. In other words, busing programs and other things can even be funded directly by the government.

But what is debated here is indirect funding. That is vouchers. We have numerous programs that have passed overwhelmingly in this House that have said when there is a choice, when no one is forced into it, why should people not be able to choose a job training program, an after-school program, a literacy program or other such type of thing that would enable them to be better prepared for the workplace?

If there is a secular choice and if there are multiple choices in job training, why can one of those choices not be in an inner-city neighborhood, where the churches are often the cultural organizing institution? Why can one of those choices not be, like the black churches in my district or some of the Hispanic outreach programs run through the Catholic Church, or some of the charismatic programs run in some of the immigrant Hispanic communities, where they are doing the job training, where we can leverage the dollars and have people committed as much as possible?

We know that regardless of who controls this House and the State houses, there will never be enough money to meet all the needs of those who are trying to find work, who are trying to secure health care, who are people with AIDS and so on; and unless we can engage the private sector that is faith-based, we will be overwhelmed with these problems.

This bill is one small step, and we should not practice religious bigotry and say everyone can be involved except for people of faith unless they give up their faith. That is just not right when there is choice.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental American principle that no citizen should have to pass someone else's religious test to qualify for a tax-funded job. The vast majority of American citizens agree with that principle, and yet this bill would violate that principle, that constitutional provision in the first amendment.

In my 12 years in the House, I have never been more deeply offended by the action of the Committee on Rules than with this rule. To deny the Members of the House of Representatives to debate the issue of religious freedom, to be able to apply for a federally funded job without having a religious test given to you by another citizen, to deny us even the right to debate that principle, an issue that Madison and Jefferson thought important enough to embed into the first 16 words of the first amendment of the Bill of Rights, I find deeply offensive, not only to the Members of this House and this institution, but to the American people who agree

with the principle that you should not be able to discriminate against people based on religion in order to obtain a federally funded job.

I think we lose our moral authority in preaching to the Iraqi citizens about religious freedom and democracy if we, this week, this day in this House of Representatives, in America, vote to say an American citizen can be denied a job for which they are fully qualified, a job funded by their taxes, simply because they were Christian or they were Muslim or they were Jewish.

It is not right that an organization associated with Bob Jones University could get a \$2 million job training program and put out a sign that says no Jews or no Catholics need apply here for a federally funded job.

If the Republican leadership of this House wants to defend the position that subsidizing religious discrimination in Federal job hiring is a good idea, then, okay. I will not defend that idea, but, if you do, I respect your right to try to debate that idea. But you have denied us even the opportunity to debate whether that idea is right or wrong, and that is deeply offensive.

We should vote against this rule and allow the House to debate this important American principle.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness and the man who has earned the nickname of the Father of One-Stop Career Centers.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on H.R. 1261, the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003. This important bill will reauthorize the Nation's job training programs.

In 1998, under the Committee on Education and the Workforce's leadership, Congress passed the Workforce Investment Act to reform the Nation's job training system that formerly was fragmented, contained overlapping programs, and did not serve either job seekers nor employers well. WIA consolidated and integrated employment and training services at the local level in a more unified workforce development system.

The act created three funding streams to provide for adult employment and training services, dislocated workers' employment and training services, and youth development services. These services are directed by the local business-led workforce investment boards.

One of the hallmarks of the new system is that, in order to encourage the development of comprehensive systems that improve services to both employers and job seekers, local services are provided through a one-stop delivery system. At the one-stop centers, the system ranges from core services such as job surge and placement assistance,

access to job listings, and an initial assessment of skills and needs, intensive services, such as comprehensive assessments and case management, and, if needed, occupational skills training.

In addition, to further promote a seamless system of services for job seekers and employers, numerous other Federal programs also must make their services available through the one-stop system.

The WIA system contains the Federal Government's primary programs for investment in our Nation's workforce preparation.

□ 1100

Even though the system is still maturing since its full implementation in July of 2000, States and local areas have created comprehensive services and effective one-stop delivery systems.

The system is serving the needs of unemployed workers seeking new jobs in this time of economic recovery. In addition, the training services provided through WIA are invaluable in helping employers find the workers they need in areas of the country facing skill shortages.

Nonetheless, there have been challenges with the system. For example, we have heard of the need to create to increase the financial contribution of the mandatory partners in the One-Stop Career Centers while, at the same time, increasing the service integration among the partner programs. This includes serving through the one-stop system special populations that have unique needs.

We have heard that we need to simplify the local and State governance processes and to strengthen the private sector's role. In addition, we have heard about the need to increase training opportunities and improve performance accountability.

Solutions to these challenges have been included in H.R. 1261.

They will enhance the system so that it will continue to meet the training and employment needs of the information-based, highly-schooled 21st century workforce.

As many Members have talked about already, the Nation's economic recovery has been slow at best. Between March and April, job cuts jumped 71 percent. U.S. employers wiped out over 146,000 jobs last month, compared with a little more than 85,000 in March.

My home State of California experienced the biggest loss, with a loss of 32,891 jobs.

This Congress cannot sit idly by while more and more Americans are added to the unemployment rolls. We must act now and pass legislation that will help Americans search for good and stable jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule and allow us to move forward in bringing H.R. 1261 to the floor for a vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time each side has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, because of our sorry history of bigotry in this Nation, for decades it has been illegal to discriminate in employment and make decisions, job decisions based on race or religion. The only exception is churches and religious organizations can discriminate with their own money, but not with Federal money.

So let us be clear. If this rule passes, we will vaporize civil rights protections that have been in effect for decades. It is not going to make it easier for Federal organizations to get contracts; they still need to apply, compete, and are subject to audit. But any program that can get funded under this bill can get funded anyway; just do not discriminate in employment. And under those rules, Catholic organizations, Jewish, Lutheran, Baptist organizations get hundreds of millions of dollars today. And, Mr. Speaker, if we allow religious discrimination, we will be allowing racial discrimination, because many organizations are 100 percent African American or 100 percent white.

Now, Mr. Speaker, employment discrimination is ugly. You can put lipstick on a pig, but you cannot pass it off as a beauty queen. And you cannot dress up discrimination with poll-tested semantics and euphemisms and pass it off as anything other than ugly discrimination.

Let us defeat this rule and allow an amendment to maintain basic traditional civil rights protections.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on this side of the aisle who are rejecting this legislation because of its embracing of religious bigotry. As was pointed out, the language that is in the current law was authored by Dan Quayle, it was signed into law by Ronald Reagan. I guess that was when the Republican Party was a more tolerant party.

But this Republican Party today, for the first time, will repeal a major civil rights piece of legislation that outlaws discrimination based upon religion. To do so is to embrace the ugly, ugly form of religious bigotry. There is no other explanation for that. The people will be rejected in the pursuit of their employment, and it comes in a bill that is designed to get people more employment. They can be qualified for the job, they can be ready to go to work, they can provide value-added to their employer, and they can be rejected because of their religion and for no other reason.

That is bigotry. That is what the Republican Party is embracing here.

Yes, today religions can reject this with their private money and their private donations and collections. They can do that. But if they take Federal money, they cannot do it.

This is not about whether or not religious organizations participate in work employment programs, work training programs. One of the most effective programs in my district is run by North Richmond Missionary Baptist Church. It came out of welfare reform. It has done a tremendous job of getting people trained and into employment. But they do not discriminate against people, because the law does not allow that. But hundreds of thousands of dollars are run through that program to try to help people be employed. But this law will say for the first time that a religious organization with Federal money, with a position paid by the Federal Government, can discriminate against individuals because of their religion.

My colleagues are right. We should reject this. And it is an insult, and it goes to the level of the corruption of the democratic institution of the House of Representatives that we would not be allowed to have an amendment where we could debate and vote on this measure. This is fundamental to the freedoms of this country, it is fundamental to the right of free speech in this institution, it is fundamental to the democracy of the people's House. But this process has been so corrupted in the Committee on Rules, so corrupted by the Republican leadership that we will not be allowed a vote on the matter of whether or not people should be allowed to discriminate with Federal dollars, whether organizations should be able to engage in religious bigotry. Members will not be able to have an up or down vote. You talk about a corrupt process.

We spilled blood to bring democracy and freedom in Iraq and we see it being closed down in the House of Representatives. We see the underlying basic tenets of the democratic foundation of this House, the right to debate, the right to vote, the right to express our differences being corrupted by the Republican leadership and the Republican Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about the reauthorization of the Workforce Reinvestment Act and we will get into a broader debate about that once we pass this very fair rule that we have before us. But as we can see, the debate is coming down over an issue of whether faith-based organizations can maintain, maintain their Title VII religious exemption.

When we wrote the civil rights laws in this Congress back in the 1960s, we made it clear that religious organizations could, in fact, discriminate in hiring for their church and church-related services, and the only thing that we do in this bill is to allow those organizations to continue to be faith-based organizations. They can provide services in terms of providing job training or retraining, and they can maintain, they can maintain their Title VII exemption.

Now, we are hearing all of this noise about this is the first time and this is such an abridgement. Let me just point out for my colleagues that there are a number of programs that allow organizations to accept Federal dollars and to maintain their religious identity. They are the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Title V of the abstinence education grants, Older Americans Act, the job opportunities for low-income individuals, abandoned infants grants, child abuse and neglect discretionary grants, runaway and homeless youth basic center programs, religious organizations can take Federal money and keep their Title VII exemptions which allow them to hire whom they want to hire within their organizations.

Now, if this is not enough, how about the four bills that President Bill Clinton signed into law that allow these same organizations to take Federal dollars and continue to maintain their Title VII exemption. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Act, the Community Services Block Grant Act, the Personal Responsibility of Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act, and the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act all allow organizations to take Federal money and to maintain their Title VII exemption.

Now, this is a debate that has been going on in this Congress over the last several years since President Bush made the case that faith-based organizations, which are integral in many of our inner city communities, that we ought to allow these organizations to provide services. And the big debate that we have here is that people want to say, well, yes, we want them to provide services, but if they take one Federal dollar in providing their services, they ought to give up all of their civil rights protections. Hogwash. These organizations are doing wonderful things in many communities in America and we should not deny them the civil rights protections that were granted to them in 1965 just because they take a Federal dollar in the pursuit of their mission of trying to help people in their own communities.

So I would ask my colleagues and urge my colleagues to support the rule today and support this bill and to support allowing faith-based organizations to do the job they are doing in many of our communities.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman's right to support this bill as written. In my opinion, it would discriminate against American citizens in job-hiring simply based on their religious faith. I think that is wrong.

But what I think is doubly wrong is that the Republican leadership in the House denied us the right to even have this honest debate on which the gentleman from Ohio and I would agree is a fundamentally important issue.

I would like to ask the gentleman, did he support shutting down our right to debate this issue?

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Congress in 1965 when they wrote the civil rights laws decided to allow these organizations to maintain their right to hire whom they please. All we are trying to do with this bill today is to allow that to continue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for this misguided reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act, a bill that fails to create job opportunities or extend unemployment benefits, that places the burden of increasing rising unemployment costs, that places the coping with that issue on our already financially crippled cities and States.

We are at a time in our history when record numbers of people are being laid off, when unemployment benefits are going to expire at the end of this month, and what is our response? Curtailing the services these workers depend on to find new employment, and doing so when these services are already underfunded and straining to meet the increasing demand.

The President's budget called for rescinding \$300 million in funding in addition to the more than \$700 million in cuts to job training programs for this year and next. This bill block grants adult dislocated worker and employment service funding and helps workers find jobs. It cuts summer employment opportunities mentoring and job counseling. At a time when men and women in our military are returning from combat, it takes money from disability and veteran employment and adult learning programs.

My Republican colleagues would like to tell us that what they are doing is providing flexibility to the States to deal with these issues. The only flexibility that they provide to these States is what populations to jettison, what programs to cut. Our States are not going to be capable of handling what the Federal Government and what this Bush administration and the Republican House leadership want to foist on them.

I tried to offer a modest amendment to provide assistance to women to help move into nontraditional jobs, like

carpentry, manufacturing, where women comprise less than 25 percent of the workforce. Jobs would provide long-term employment, they generate pay between \$14 and \$35 an hour, provide medical care, retirement benefits. To do that, all we would have had to do was to give governors the flexibility to direct resources to train one-stop employment center employees, help them to be trained so that they can help women find these jobs and others find these jobs. The Republican majority response? No.

The simple truth is that this bill abandons workers. It does nothing to stop these families from falling through the cracks.

Turn aside the rule. Let us pass a workforce bill that prepares our workforce and gives them the tools for economic security for themselves and for their families.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is interesting that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) was asked the question. Maybe the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) can answer it. Why not let us bring up the amendment on the issue they were discussing?

And another issue that is not being brought up today that should have been is the unemployment situation in this country: 341,000 people lost their jobs in April, almost 9 million people out of work.

This Congress, this House, this majority sits idly by. There is going to be the expiration of unemployment benefits, the extended benefits the end of this month. And there is over \$20 billion in the trust fund that could be applied to help these people. Oh, it is said the answer is get a job. These unemployed people are looking for a job.

A recent survey indicated that the average unemployed worker has applied for 29 jobs without finding work, and you sit idly by and do nothing. It also shows the average unemployed worker over 45 has applied for 42 jobs without finding work. Stop sitting and act on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Right now Oregon has 7.6 percent unemployment, the highest in the Nation. In March of this year food and trans-

portation lost manufacturing jobs, 800 jobs. These hardworking men and women are not statistics. They are real people with real lives and families, and right now they are facing the prospects of not having enough money to put food on the table, and they lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

We should not cut the very initiatives that help them retain these new jobs that will pay them decent wages and offer them health benefits.

The Dislocated Worker Program of the Workforce Investment Act is critical to making sure our States have the resources to keep dislocated workers from falling through the cracks, and it is imperative that we make sure it remains a separate program because it is a training program and its needs are very different from the other two programs with which it is being combined.

I have put forth an amendment with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that would have addressed this issue and ensure that those who are laid off can get the assistance they need to get back into the workforce. Yet the Committee on Rules refused to give the Members a chance to vote on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if there is any issue in Congress that should rise above partisanship, it should be the principle of religious freedom. I hope every Republican and Democrat in the House before voting on this rule asks his or herself this question: Is it right that an American citizen be denied a federally funded job simply because of his or her religious faith?

If you think that is right, then you should vote for this rule because that is what this bill does. It denies American citizens publicly funded jobs simply because of their choice of religious faith. If you agree with the vast majority of Americans that it is wrong to subsidize religious discrimination with federal tax dollars, vote "no" on this rule.

This is more important than sticking to the sacred altar of partisanship. The issue of religious freedom should rise above that altar of partisanship. And I hope my Republican colleagues will join with Democrats and all of us today to say we are going to stand up for religious freedom during the week we are preaching it to the Iraqi citizens.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, from listening to the other side, you would think that this was something that was run-of-the-mill, that we took away these protections every day and have in the past. That is just not true.

This is the first time this Congress will eliminate, delete language in our statutes, in our laws that expressly

prohibits discrimination in these programs based on religion. It is the first time we will remove a protection that this body has decided is important and fundamental to American principles of operation of church and State.

As has been stated, this language was first signed into law in 1982 by Ronald Reagan. It was readopted in 1998 by this House of Representatives. And it continues to make sense to every American out there that their tax dollars should not go to discriminate when it comes to federal programs that are secular in nature.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed that this full House is not given the opportunity to debate this full issue and vote up and down.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many more speakers the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) has.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we do not have any other speakers on the floor. There may be more coming; but if the gentleman is prepared, we can close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if people want a dictionary illustration of adding insult to injury, the Republicans are providing it. They do great injury today to the principle of nondiscrimination, and they have added to that the insult of not allowing this House to debate it.

As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) made clear, this is the first time we will be removing from the statute books an existing anti-discrimination provision, one that says you cannot take Federal money and then discriminate against some of the people who paid the taxes. If you are a particular organization, you can say, I do not care if you are Jewish and pay taxes or Catholic and pay taxes. I do not care if you are a Protestant and pay taxes, if you believe in abortion. I do not care if you are a Methodist and pay taxes, if you agree on evolution. We will exclude you.

It is appalling to me that they are going to be able to engineer this enormous regression in the principle of nondiscrimination without there even being a separate vote and debate. It is a tribute to the Republican majority, the most submissive body of elected officials gathered since the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet that they will ratify this decision to roll back a fundamental constitutional provision, a fundamental antidiscrimination public policy provision, and they will all march down and vote not to allow it to be debated.

The gentleman from Ohio is right. In 1965 there was an exemption for religion organizations, and it was expanded in 1972. A Senator said at the time, "This is to keep the hands of Caesar off of the place of God."

Now we are talking about the hands of Caesar coming to the religious institutions bearing money. And we were

saying this, if you as a religious institution want to preserve your autonomy, hire only whom you want, that is your right. But do not tell Americans of all religions to pay taxes and then take those tax dollars and say, but you are the wrong religion. You are the right religion but the wrong doctrine. And that is what this does.

It removes it from the statute books. The law now says you cannot discriminate based on religion. People have said, well, we need this so that religious organizations are not denied funds because of their name. Well, in the first place, that is up to the current administration. What is George Bush saying? Stop me before I discriminate again? If he does not want to discriminate, he has a good way to stop discriminating.

You know the person who went to the doctor and he said, Doctor, it hurts when I go like this. The doctor said, Do not go like this.

Mr. President, do not go like this. Do not discriminate. But do not take people's tax dollars and say you can only hire your own.

The question is two fold: Do we maintain the principle that if you take Federal money, if you are a religious organization and to be autonomous, that is fine? By the way, for secular purposes, remember by definition the religious group can only take Federal money for secular purposes. It would be unconstitutional as everyone acknowledges to give tax dollars to a religion for religious purposes. So the question is can a religious organization take money for secular purposes and discriminate? And we are told, well, wait, it is important for them to hold together.

It seems to me the worst thing being said about religious organizations are the people who say, you know what, if you want Baptist or Jews or Mormons or Catholics to help other people, you better not make them associate with nonbelievers. They can only help people find jobs, they can only give job training as long as they are free from the spiritual pollution of having to teach these jobs alongside nonbelievers. That is a condemnation of religion that I hope this House will not engage in, compounded by a denial of democracy on the floor of the House. To bring forward such an important issue and use your submissive majority to prevent debate is contemptible.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation, and I would like to add a few comments to the topic that seems to have drawn heated debate here.

I think it is a confusing topic and one that is important that we are discussing in this debate right now and

one that I believe will come up in the debate that goes forward and will no doubt be addressed in the motion to recommit which the minority will be allowed to offer.

The argument here is that the language added to this legislation somehow is inconsistent with our civil rights laws and is somehow inappropriate. I would like to address and dissect that argument.

I want to make it clear that our Nation's Constitution and our existing civil rights laws make it very clear and have since the day of their enactment that religious organizations in their hiring of their own staff can, in fact, discriminate based on religion. That is a provision that has been scrutinized by the United States Supreme Court and upheld by a unanimous United States Supreme Court, so that, if a Christian church wants to say that in hiring its minister it chooses to hire a Christian minister, it can do that. And the Supreme Court has said it may do so.

In those civil rights laws there is no mention of Federal money. The reason we have those laws extended into all sectors of employment is not just where there is Federal money involved, but we have our discrimination laws extended through commerce. If it is interstate commerce, then those civil rights laws apply and they should. But I want to make very clear that all nonprofits that have a mission are entitled to discriminate based on that mission. That is to say, if a particular group that supports abortion and is involved in that activity wants to, it can choose not to hire someone who is rabidly pro-life. A group that supports the environment and cleaning up the environment can choose not to hire on to its staff someone who is rabidly against cleaning up the environment. That is a privilege enjoyed by all nonprofits under our current law.

What this bill does, and it is important to understand this, and I have a letter here from the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America that makes this explanation very clear: what this bill does is say a very narrow exception for religious organizations to give them the same right that all other non-religious organizations have when they are performing services. Currently, we do not say to Planned Parenthood, if you take money from the Federal Government you must hire someone who is pro-life. But we do say under the current version of this law, if you are a faith-based organization and you want to provide, for example, job training services, then you must hire all-comers, people who even disagree with your fundamental beliefs.

The reality is this is about discrimination, but it is about the discrimination that exists in current law. Current laws prohibit religious organizations and only religious organizations from saying they have the right to choose to hire people who happen to share their values. We do not deny that right to

Planned Parenthood. We do not deny that right to the Sierra Club. We do not deny that right to any other group, and we ought not to deny that right to a faith-based organization providing its services.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if I had an indefensible point I would not yield either, despite all the time they have.

If, in fact, a religious organization get money for job training, they have a right to refuse to hire someone who does not believe in job training. If they have hired because they are going to try and fight drug addiction, they do not have to hire someone who is for drug addiction.

If the gentleman thinks I am going to yield him after he refused to yield to me when he has all the time and I do not, let him get some more time from his side which has the extra time and is sitting on it, and I will debate him.

The fact is that any organization has the right to deny people a job if they disagree with the job for which they are being hired. So, no, you do not have to hire someone who disagrees with what you are being hired for. That is totally not the case. And by the way, this law about discrimination does apply across the board.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) would like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) so the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) can continue this dialogue.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are reserving our time.

□ 1130

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I will urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order the Van Hollen amendment that was offered in the Committee on Rules last night and defeated on a party-line vote.

This very worthy amendment restores current law, which prohibits the use of Federal funds to discriminate in hiring based on religion. It will do this by striking the offending language from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is astounding to me that in the 21st century we would turn back the clock and allow American taxpayer dollars to be used to discriminate against our own citizens based on their religious beliefs.

This is 2003. I had hoped that we had moved beyond refusing to hire someone because they are Catholic or Jewish or Muslim or Presbyterian or whatever. This bill returns us to the bad old days.

The Van Hollen amendment would strike this offensive provision, and it deserves a vote by this House. This bill

is supposed to be about helping our unemployed workers, not about giving taxpayer money to organizations that discriminate. It is absolutely critical that we put aside partisan differences and give Members the chance to delete this language.

Vote "no" on the previous question so we can take up this vital amendment. I want to point out that a "no" vote will not stop us from considering this legislation. However, a "yes" vote will deny us the opportunity to vote on this terrible language. This is the only opportunity that the House will have to strike this provision from the bill.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

In conclusion, this is a fair rule which allows us to move on to the task at hand, strengthening the workforce and equipping the worker with the knowledge and skills needed to succeed.

As I said earlier, an unlimited supply of jobs would not do our economy much good without workers to fill those positions. Strengthening America's economy requires both good jobs and good workers; and today, we are focused on the worker.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would pick this apart and stand in the way of progress for America's workers. Nothing new. We see it today, we will see it tomorrow, but I ask my colleagues to put America's workers first, support this rule, and pass the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision in this resolution it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in Sec. 3 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;"

SEC. 3. Page 91, strike lines 9 through page 92, line 3 (and renumber subsequent sections and conform the table of contents accordingly).

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 221 will be followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on the question of adopting the resolution and by two additional 5-minute votes on the remaining motions to suspend the rules that were debated yesterday.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 199, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Ferguson	Manzullo
Akin	Flake	McCotter
Bachus	Foley	McCrery
Baker	Forbes	McHugh
Ballenger	Fossella	McInnis
Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	McKeon
Bartlett (MD)	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Barton (TX)	Galleghy	Miller (FL)
Bass	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)
Beauprez	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Bereuter	Gilchrest	Murphy
Biggert	Gillmor	Musgrave
Bilirakis	Gingrey	Myrick
Bishop (UT)	Goode	Nethercutt
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Ney
Blunt	Goss	Northup
Boehlert	Granger	Norwood
Boehner	Graves	Nunes
Bonilla	Green (WI)	Nussle
Bonner	Greenwood	Osborne
Bono	Gutknecht	Ose
Boozman	Hall	Otter
Bradley (NH)	Harris	Oxley
Brady (TX)	Hart	Paul
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Pence
Ginny	Hayworth	Peterson (MN)
Burgess	Hefley	Peterson (PA)
Burns	Hensarling	Petri
Burr	Herger	Pickering
Burton (IN)	Hobson	Pitts
Buyer	Hoekstra	Platts
Calvert	Hostettler	Pombo
Camp	Houghton	Porter
Cannon	Hulshof	Portman
Cantor	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Capito	Isakson	Putnam
Carter	Issa	Quinn
Castle	Istook	Radanovich
Chabot	Janklow	Ramstad
Chocola	Jenkins	Regula
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Rehberg
Cole	Johnson (IL)	Renzi
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Cox	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)
Crane	Keller	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kelly	Rogers (MI)
Cubin	Kennedy (MN)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cunningham	King (NY)	Royce
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Ryun (KS)
Deal (GA)	Kline	Saxton
DeMint	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kolbe	Sessions
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood	Shadegg
Doolittle	Latham	Shaw
Dreier	LaTourette	Shays
Duncan	Leach	Sherwood
Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Emerson	Linder	Simmons
English	LoBiondo	Simpson
Everett	Lucas (OK)	Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas

Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clay
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman

Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hoefel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klecicka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)

Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Klecicka
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews
Clyburn
Combest
DeLay
Dingell

Feeney
Fletcher
Gephardt
Gibbons
Hyde

Miller, Gary
Moran (VA)
Schrock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain to vote.

□ 1152

Messrs. BOUCHER, MCINTYRE, CASE, CROWLEY, and Ms.

VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, the vote on the question of adopting the resolution will be followed by one additional 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 874 that was debated yesterday.

The remaining suspension on House Resolution 213 will be taken later today.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 196, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—221

Aderholt	Emerson	LaTourette
Akin	English	Leach
Bachus	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Baker	Ferguson	Lewis (KY)
Ballenger	Flake	Linder
Barrett (SC)	Foley	LoBiondo
Bartlett (MD)	Forbes	Lucas (OK)
Barton (TX)	Fossella	Manzullo
Bass	Franks (AZ)	McCotter
Beauprez	Frelinghuysen	McCreary
Bereuter	Gallegly	McHugh
Biggett	Garrett (NJ)	McInnis
Billirakis	Gerlach	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Gilchrest	Mica
Blackburn	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Blunt	Gingrey	Miller (MI)
Boehrlert	Goode	Moran (KS)
Boehner	Goodlatte	Murphy
Bonilla	Goss	Musgrave
Bonner	Granger	Myrick
Bono	Graves	Nethercutt
Boozman	Green (WI)	Ney
Bradley (NH)	Greenwood	Northup
Brady (TX)	Gutknecht	Norwood
Brown (SC)	Hall	Nunes
Brown-Waite,	Harris	Nussle
Ginny	Hart	Osborne
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Ose
Burns	Hayes	Otter
Burr	Hayworth	Oxley
Burton (IN)	Hefley	Paul
Buyer	Hensarling	Pearce
Calvert	Herger	Pence
Camp	Hobson	Peterson (MN)
Cannon	Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)
Cantor	Hostettler	Petri
Capito	Houghton	Pickering
Carter	Hulshof	Pitts
Castle	Hunter	Platts
Chabot	Isakson	Pombo
Chocola	Issa	Porter
Coble	Istook	Portman
Cole	Janklow	Pryce (OH)
Collins	Jenkins	Putnam
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Quinn
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Radanovich
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Regula
Cunningham	Keller	Rehberg
Davis, Jo Ann	Kelly	Renzi
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Reynolds
Deal (GA)	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
DeMint	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Rohrabacher
Doolittle	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Knollenberg	Royce
Duncan	Kolbe	Ryan (WI)
Dunn	LaHood	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Latham	Saxton

Sensenbrenner	Stearns
Sessions	Sullivan
Shadegg	Sweeney
Shaw	Tancredo
Shays	Tauzin
Sherwood	Taylor (NC)
Shimkus	Terry
Shuster	Thomas
Simmons	Thornberry
Simpson	Tiahrt
Smith (MI)	Tiberi
Smith (NJ)	Toomey
Smith (TX)	Turner (OH)
Souder	Upton

Vitter	Walden (OR)
Walsh	Wamp
Weldon (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Weller	Whitfield
Wicker	Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)	Wolf
Young (AK)	Young (FL)

□ 1200

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

RAIL PASSENGER DISASTER FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 874.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 874, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, nays 5, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—414

NOES—196

Abercrombie	Harman
Ackerman	Hastings (FL)
Alexander	Hill
Allen	Hinchey
Baca	Hinojosa
Baird	Hoefl
Baldwin	Holden
Ballance	Holt
Becerra	Honda
Bell	Hooley (OR)
Berkley	Hoyer
Berman	Inslee
Berry	Israel
Bishop (GA)	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	(TX)
Boswell	Jefferson
Boucher	John
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski
Brown, Corrine	Kaptur
Capps	Kennedy (RI)
Capuano	Kildee
Cardin	Kilpatrick
Cardoza	Kind
Carson (IN)	Kleczka
Carson (OK)	Kucinich
Case	Lampson
Clay	Langevin
Conyers	Lantos
Cooper	Larsen (WA)
Costello	Larson (CT)
Cramer	Lee
Crowley	Levin
Cummings	Lewis (GA)
Davis (AL)	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Lofgren
Davis (FL)	Lowe
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)
Davis (TN)	Lynch
DeFazio	Majette
DeGette	Maloney
Delahunt	Markey
DeLauro	Marshall
Deutsch	Matheson
Dicks	Matsui
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)
Doolley (CA)	McCarthy (NY)
Doyle	McCollum
Edwards	McDermott
Emanuel	McGovern
Engel	McIntyre
Eshoo	McNulty
Etheridge	Meehan
Evans	Meeke (FL)
Farr	Meeke (NY)
Fattah	Menendez
Filner	Michaud
Ford	Millender-
Frank (MA)	McDonald
Frost	Miller (NC)
Gonzalez	Miller, George
Gordon	Mollohan
Green (TX)	Moore
Grijalva	Moran (VA)
Gutierrez	Murtha

Nadler	Rothman
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard
Neal (MA)	Ruppersberger
Oberstar	Rush
Obey	Ryan (OH)
Olver	Sabo
Owens	Sanchez, Linda
Pallone	T.
Pascrell	Sanchez, Loretta
Pastor	Sanders
Payne	Sandlin
Pelosi	Schakowsky
Pomeroy	Schiff
Price (NC)	Scott (GA)
Rahall	Scott (VA)
Rangel	Serrano
Ross	Sherman
Roybal-Allard	Skelton
Ruppersberger	Slaughter
Rush	Smith (WA)
Ryan (OH)	Snyder
Sabo	Solis
Sanchez, Linda	Spratt
T.	Stenholm
Sanchez, Loretta	Strickland
Sanders	Stupak
Sandlin	Tanner
Schakowsky	Tauscher
Schiff	Taylor (MS)
Scott (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Serrano	Tierney
Sherman	Towns
Skelton	Turner (TX)
Slaughter	Udall (CO)
Smith (WA)	Udall (NM)
Snyder	Van Hollen
Solis	Velazquez
Spratt	Visclosky
Stenholm	Waters
Strickland	Watson
Stupak	Watt
Tanner	Waxman
Tauscher	Weiner
Taylor (MS)	Wexler
Thompson (CA)	Woolsey
Thompson (MS)	Wu
Tierney	Wynn
Towns	
Turner (TX)	
Udall (CO)	
Udall (NM)	
Van Hollen	
Velazquez	
Visclosky	
Waters	
Watson	
Watt	
Waxman	
Weiner	
Wexler	
Woolsey	
Wu	
Wynn	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Feeney
Clyburn	Fletcher
Combest	Gephardt
Cox	Gibbons
DeLay	Hyde
Dingell	Miller, Gary

Ortiz	Reyes
Rodriguez	Schrock
Stark	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain to vote.

Abercrombie	Cardin	Ferguson
Ackerman	Cardoza	Filner
Aderholt	Carson (IN)	Foley
Akin	Carson (OK)	Forbes
Alexander	Carter	Ford
Allen	Case	Fossella
Baca	Castle	Frank (MA)
Bachus	Chabot	Franks (AZ)
Baird	Chocola	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Clay	Frost
Baldwin	Coble	Gallegly
Ballance	Cole	Garrett (NJ)
Ballenger	Collins	Gerlach
Barrett (SC)	Conyers	Gilchrest
Bartlett (MD)	Bartlett (MD)	Cooper
Barton (TX)	Costello	Gillmor
Bass	Cox	Gingrey
Beauprez	Cramer	Gonzalez
Becerra	Crane	Goode
Bell	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bereuter	Crowley	Gordon
Berkley	Cubin	Goss
Berman	Culberson	Granger
Berry	Cummings	Graves
Biggett	Cunningham	Green (TX)
Billirakis	Davis (AL)	Green (WI)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Greenwood
Bishop (NY)	Davis (FL)	Grijalva
Bishop (UT)	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Blackburn	Davis (TN)	Hall
Blumenauer	Davis, Jo Ann	Harman
Blunt	Davis, Tom	Harris
Boehrlert	Deal (GA)	Hart
Boehner	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bonilla	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Bonner	Delahunt	Hayes
Bono	DeLauro	Hayworth
Boozman	DeMint	Hefley
Boswell	Deutsch	Hensarling
Boucher	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Boyd	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hill
Bradley (NH)	Dicks	Hinojosa
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Doolittle	Hoefl
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hoekstra
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Holden
Brown, Corrine	Duncan	Holt
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Honda
Ginny	Edwards	Hooley (OR)
Burgess	Ehlers	Hostettler
Burns	Emanuel	Houghton
Burr	Emerson	Hoyer
Burton (IN)	Engel	Hulshof
Buyer	English	Hunter
Calvert	Eshoo	Inslee
Camp	Etheridge	Isakson
Cannon	Everett	Israel
Cantor	Farr	Issa
Capito	Fattah	Istook
Capps		Jackson (IL)
Capuano		