

income children for elementary school. At the same time, it is Congress' responsibility to examine every program up for reauthorization to see if it is truly meeting our high standards for success and if there are any potential reforms that we can perform.

I would argue that regardless of the political reluctance to enact and accept fundamental reforms, every Federal program could do a better job of carrying out its mission than it is currently performing. This applies to those programs on the elementary and secondary school level, it applies to programs governing postsecondary education, it applies to workforce development programs, and, yes, it applies to early childhood programs like Head Start.

And so we come here to consider H.R. 2210, which will improve the Head Start program and close the readiness gap that exists between Head Start children and their more affluent peers. We strongly believe that we must strengthen Head Start's academic standards by emphasizing cognitive development and the results of scientifically based research on topics critical to children's school readiness. I believe that Head Start has placed an unbalanced emphasis on providing health and social services to children and their families, which have resulted in Head Start children not making the gains necessary to begin school with an equal opportunity to succeed.

A critical component of school readiness is the attainment of prereading abilities. Head Start programs should provide children from low-income families with a high-quality oral language and literature-rich environment. Through scientific research, much has been learned about the way children learn to read and the strong foundation that is important before children are given formal reading instruction in kindergarten and first grade.

Consistent with the early reading initiative, launched as part of the No Child Left Behind Act, Head Start must play a pivotal role in this effort. We have done this and can do this while preserving all current health and nutrition services for Head Start children.

Mr. Chairman, I know there has been a lot of criticism about this bill because of the State option, but I think it is important to point out this committee has produced a bill which improves the education of our Nation's most vulnerable children, and for this reason I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 2100

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say to my colleague, we do not know whether this bill will improve the education of the children, but we do know that the language contained in this bill will weaken the education standards, will weaken the comprehensive services available to these chil-

dren and will weaken the accountability of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), subcommittee ranking member.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this bill.

This bill literally turns back the clock on decades of efforts to improve programs for our youngest children. Head Start has meant so much to so many of our most disadvantaged children and their families. Rather than strengthen Head Start through bipartisan consensus, this bill begins the dismantling of the most successful and popular early childhood education program in our Nation's history.

I must also express my disappointment that the majority has not sought to reach bipartisan consensus on this legislation. I have been through, Mr. Chairman, a number of Head Start reauthorizations during my 27 years here in the Congress, and they were all pleasant and productive experiences. This statute has always been reauthorized in a bipartisan manner. I strongly believe that we do our best work when we pass bipartisan legislation, especially legislation dealing with children. Not to do so is a doleful disappointment.

The Republican Head Start bill creates an unaccountable block grant that undermines the comprehensive nature of Head Start. Under this legislation, the strength of Head Start's decades of existence would be eviscerated through lower-quality State-controlled block grants.

What makes the bill's block grants even more troubling is that it departs from the efforts of this committee over the past decade to strengthen accountability and results in Federal programs, the most recent example being the No Child Left Behind. On that bill, Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate, along with the President, all worked to create bipartisan legislation to strengthen accountability in our K-12 programs.

Now we are confronted by a White House and Republican bill to create unaccountable block grants in the Head Start program. This does not make sense. I urge opposition to this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2210) to reauthorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2861, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-235) on the bill (H.R. 2861) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

SCHOOL READINESS ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 336 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2210.

□ 2103

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2210) to reauthorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, time remaining under general debate, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 15½ minutes and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 20¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) who not only is extremely well known for his expertise in coaching, but is one of the leading experts on mentoring in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) controls the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with all those who have spoken tonight that Head Start is an excellent program. It is a necessary program. Yet many people feel that no changes are needed to the program.

I guess if you put it in any context, let us say you ran a business for 35 years, a football team for 35 years, a school for 35 years, and you said over and over again, if it ain't broke, don't fix it and you stayed with a pat hand, my feeling is you would drift toward mediocrity. There is no organization that can stay the same year after year after year. I think there are a couple of things that really can be fixed. I think

there are some things that need to be done here.

The first question is, does Head Start do what it is designed to do, which is to get kids ready to go to school? As we have mentioned earlier tonight, the Family and Child Experience Survey, which is the best measure I know of of school readiness, says this. They said that the average student entering Head Start is at the 21st percentile in terms of readiness to go to school. And then 2 years later, \$6,500 a year, \$13,000 later, we see those same students ranking at the 24th percentile, a gain of 3 percent in 2 years.

I think that is unsatisfactory. I do not think we are doing the right thing by our children. When they enter Head Start, they are in the bottom fourth of school readiness, when they leave Head Start they are in the bottom fourth, and the best statistical prediction we can make is that at age 16, they are still going to be in the bottom fourth. This is something that I think needs to be rectified.

As we have mentioned, the Castle bill does introduce some academic rigor to Head Start. I think this is critical. I think this change needs to be made. Pre-math, pre-science, ramp up the reading programs. We think students ought to be somewhere around the 40th percentile on average after leaving Head Start instead of the 24th percentile. I think that can be done. I think that is doable.

Secondly, there are 1.5 million children eligible for Head Start; 900,000 are in Head Start and there are 600,000 left over. Of that 600,000, some are in State programs, and we have State programs here and we have Head Start and then we have got a whole bunch in the middle that are falling through the cracks. They are not in anything. That is why we think the demonstration program is critical, because we need to have a more seamless program where those kids are not falling through the cracks, where we have some type of a comprehensive plan as to how we are going to take care of all of them. I think that is going to be important.

The last thing I will mention, that in fact we might think about a little bit, is one of the real strengths of Head Start is we involve the parents. We are expecting now that there is a transition from Head Start to the elementary school where those kids' parents stay with the student. That is something that we have incorporated in this bill which we think is very important.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear about what we are doing here. We are asking this body to begin, in my opinion, to dismantle Head Start, one of the most successful programs in American history.

Head Start serves more than 900,000 3- to 5-year-olds in every State in this Nation every single year. Head Start teaches reading, writing, mathematics and language skills. Head Start, as well, provides comprehensive services that increase school readiness: health and mental health screenings and services, nutrition, dental and vision services, and extensive parent involvement in education, a critical component of this program.

And Head Start combines local control with strong Federal quality standards. That is the key. In fact, Head Start is one of our most evaluated education programs. Over the last 30 years, it has helped millions of children do better in school. But now, through H.R. 2210, the sponsors are trying, in my opinion, to unravel Head Start.

The Republican initiative initially was to block-grant all of Head Start. That did not fly. They are now down to eight States. This bill, however, would create a new block grant program for eight States without requiring any of the Federal Head Start program performance standards. What does that really mean to parents and their children? It means, I think, that States could run Head Start programs with lower educational standards, minimal comprehensive services and less oversight and accountability. That is not good for our children or their parents.

In looking at this bill, we should look at the intent. The intent of this bill directly contradicts, I believe, our bipartisan recognition that no child should be left behind, that the Federal Government needed to establish high educational standards and tough accountability for the educational achievement of low-income children because the States had not done so. In essence, this bill proposes that we turn our 3- to 5-year-olds in Head Start over to the States even though the premise of the No Child Left Behind Act is that States are not currently serving low-income children as well as they should. As the Los Angeles Times stated recently:

"Now, when States are in precarious financial shape, is hardly the time to dismantle the program's, Head Start's, Federal management."

Let me close by saying, despite our best efforts in Head Start, we still are not doing enough for low-income children. There are some 1.5 million children eligible. There are 900,000 participating, 600,000 being left behind. Now is not the time to start to dismantle Head Start.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about what the Republican majority is proposing today: They are asking this body to begin to dismantle Head Start, one of the most successful Government programs in American history.

Head Start serves more than 90,000 three- to five-year-olds in every State in this Nation every single year.

My Democratic colleagues and I are not standing here today just reflexively defending Head Start because Lyndon Johnson signed it into law in 1964.

No, we are here defending Head Start—and to expose the GOP's bill that is designed to dismantle it—Because Head Start Works!

Head Start teaches reading, writing, mathematics, and language skills.

Head Start provides comprehensive services that increase school readiness—health and mental health screenings and services; nutrition, dental and vision services; and extensive parent involvement and education.

And Head Start combines local control with strong Federal quality standards.

In fact, Head Start is one of our most evaluated education programs—and over the last 30 years it has helped millions of children do better in school and achieve more in life.

But now, House Republicans, through H.R. 2210—the misnamed "School Readiness Act"—are trying to unravel Head Start. They want to end it.

They would like nothing more than to see 50 State programs run by 50 State Governors.

This bill would create a new block grant program for eight States without requiring any of the Federal Head Start program performance standards.

What's that really mean to parents and their children?

It means that States could run Head Start programs with lower educational standards, minimal comprehensive services, and less oversight and accountability.

Now, doesn't that strike any of you as odd?

It should, because the intent of this bill directly contradicts our bipartisan recognition in the No Child Left Behind Act—that the Federal Government needed to establish high educational standards and tough accountability for the educational achievement of low-income children because the States had not done so.

In essence, the Republicans are proposing that we turn our 3- to 5-year-olds in Head Start over to the States even though the premise of the No-Child Left Behind act is that States are not currently serving low-income children.

And as the Los Angeles Times stated recently: "Now, when States are in precarious financial shape, is hardly the time to dismantle the Program's—Head Start's—Federal Management."

Let me close by saying, despite our best efforts in Head Start, we still are not doing enough for low-income children.

Right now, Head Start is only serving 6 out of every 10 eligible preschool children because of inadequate funding.

That's 600,000 American children left behind. And it's simply unconscionable.

It's unconscionable in the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth.

And it's unconscionable when Republicans talk about leaving no child behind, but then propose a budget for fiscal year 2004 for Head Start that barely covers inflation.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democratic plan offered by the gentleman from California Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to

the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, for its exemplary performance, Head Start deserves to be rewarded by the decision-makers in both parties. But instead of rewarding Head Start, the Republican majority is proposing to abandon Head Start through the slow death process which begins with the block-grant experiment.

When translated into realistic terms, realistic political terms, the Republican block grant means, first, a withdrawal of compliance requirements and the automatic granting of endless waivers. In the next appropriations cycle, it means a reduction in Federal funds. This slow strangling process has been utilized to destroy enough safety net and social programs to provide us with a clear vision of the fate that Head Start will suffer if it is block-granted.

Consider the fate of title XX social service programs. Consider the fate of the summer youth employment programs. For years, youth summer jobs could be protected from the floor of this House, but once the block grant took place, we have a situation this year where State by State you will find that everywhere summer youth employment programs are being drastically reduced. In New York State, the Governor started the budget process by putting zero in the budget for summer youth employment programs. Block grant means certain death.

The time to save Head Start is now. Vote "no" on this Republican proposal.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the dismantling of the Head Start program, a program that has proven to be a winner since its inception 38 years ago. These changes will result in lowering the quality and effectiveness and quite possibly end one of the most successful programs in the Nation. The New York Times said on July 11, 2003:

"The Bush administration has mastered the art of producing speeches and press that bear little resemblance to the legislative program they purport to describe."

□ 2115

"This block grant approach has loopholes that the President either does not understand or fails to acknowledge." The Boston Globe on June 16, 2003, said: "Over Democratic objections, they [Republicans] advanced a bill that would transfer Federal control of the program to as many as eight States," which has 33 percent of the students, "in a demonstration project. The measure requires those States to serve the same number of children and provide the same services. But there is

no guarantee that the quality of services will be maintained, and there is no extra money to handle the new enrollments."

The Star-Ledger of New Jersey on February 20, 2003, said: "Against the backdrop of Bush's anemic education budget, the President's proposal is to turn Head Start into a [block] grant program, to hand responsibility for delivering preschool services for poor children to the States," and this is very "suspect."

Let me just hold up, if I can, some of the mail that I have received from my district. Some are petitions with 10 names on it. I have never received as much mail from my constituents as I have on this particular bill. So I would just say that I have not heard parents say change it. I have not heard educators say change it. I have not heard people who are researchers say change it. Let us defeat this bill and keep the program as it is.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), who probably has had more to do with increasing the emphasis on math and science education than anybody in the Congress and has indicated this is one of the most misunderstood bills he has seen in 10 years here.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

It is a pleasure to rise and defend this bill. And as the chairman of the subcommittee has mentioned, I have been shocked by the misunderstanding about this bill that has been propagated throughout this country. It is a good bill, and I wanted to comment about one part of it that I think has really been improved.

The migrant and seasonal children of this country are special children who need special help. They need special help because they are moved from place to place, and they have special conditions that have to be dealt with. For example, in my community they must be attended to in Head Start programs from early summer to mid-fall. That is not the standard school year.

But that is just one of many ways in which they have to be treated specially. I am very familiar with their problems because in my youth I lived in a farming community. I worked on a produce farm. I worked side by side with migrant workers, both in the fields and in the packing sheds and even in transporting produce to markets.

It is very important to provide services for migrant children. When these children are not served, parents sometimes will bring their children to the field and sometimes even have them working. This certainly exposes them to harmful conditions.

Today, migrant and seasonal Head Start serves close to 35,000 children and operates in 39 States in every region of the country. But in contrast to the normal Head Start program that serves

approximately 60 percent of eligible children, migrant and seasonal Head Start serves only approximately 19 percent. That is a dramatic shortfall, and we must improve that.

I am pleased that I was able to get an amendment approved by the committee that, first of all, will allow all migrant and seasonal Head Start grantees to operate Early Head Start programs. That is not true of all Head Start programs, but it is essential because that way the youngest children of the migrant and seasonal workers can participate in Head Start programs rather than being taken to the fields.

My amendment will also require the Secretary to ensure that migrant and seasonal Head Start programs are included in the planning and coordination of the State system of training and technical assistance. In addition, part of my amendment, in combination with a change that the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) made in his substitute, specifically makes one-fourth of 1 percent of all the total authorization available for seasonal and migrant Head Start. This means that we will have an additional \$17.4 million in fiscal year 2005 and \$18.5 million in 2008. This also means that the funding that will be available will provide an additional 2,300 slots for children to receive services in 2005 and up to 2,500 in 2008. I expect that these provisions will allow the migrant and seasonal Head Start program to successfully take care of a substantially greater number of migrant and seasonal Head Start children.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we support Head Start, and we support constructive changes to Head Start. We must oppose this bill because of two very destructive changes. The majority says there are 600,000 children eligible for Head Start who, today, do not get Head Start. They do change that. They increase the number of children eligible who will not get funded. About 10,000 more children by the end of this bill who are eligible for Head Start will not be.

The second change is even more odious. There is an understanding in this country that if a church or religious organization runs a preschool program and someone who is not a member of that religious organization comes and applies for a teaching job to teach mathematics or reading or other skills that under present law they cannot deny that person a job because they do not go to their church or their religious organization. This bill changes that law. It violates that principle. It is wrong. It is divisive. It is destructive. It is unconstitutional.

There are a lot of good reasons to oppose this bill; but ripping us asunder,

giving employers the right not to hire people because of where they worship is just plain wrong, and so is this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill. The majority has placed divisive and damaging provisions in the legislation. They propose to begin the dismantling of Head Start through a block grant to the States. The majority has also proposed to allow discrimination in hiring of teachers that educate our youngest citizens. And I ask the Members, what kind of head start in life could that be?

In the few moments given me to debate, allow me to inform the Members about migrant Head Start children. In the case of perhaps our neediest children, the sons and daughters of migrant and seasonal farmworkers, the majority in the Committee on Education and the Workforce has offered crumbs. Only 19 percent of these eligible migrant children are served now, compared to the 60 percent for the regular Head Start program nationally. The majority bill will move that figure by only 1 percentage point to approximately 20 percent. Furthermore, their meager authorization funding level will ensure that a larger percentage of children will never be served and helped to be school-ready in the foreseeable future.

For farmworker families, access to Head Start is more than a school readiness issue. It is a public health and safety issue. The Republican bill provides no new money to close this access gap for the migrant children, and I have to emphasize that the only way to close this gap is to substantially increase our investment in Head Start. It does not have to be this way. Head Start has a 35-year history of bipartisan cooperation. Until that happens, I urge Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on H.R. 2210.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will come back to the table and work with us to write a bill that will be worthy of our children, our future.

Until that happens, I urge Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on H.R. 2210.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to the so-called School Readiness Act, H.R. 2210. Currently, Head Start provides services to our most vulnerable population, children born into families who live below the poverty line. Head Start reaches those children. It reaches their

families and does tremendous work in providing them with access to health services, teaching parenting skills, and preparing young children to overcome the obstacles related to poverty and enter kindergarten with a fighting chance.

Title II of H.R. 2210 strips Head Start programs of oversight and accountability measures. The already-vulnerable children served by Head Start will undoubtedly be left behind. Many indicators of the difference this program has made in children's lives are quite measurable, and we can prove that Head Start works. Add to that the immeasurable value of breaking the cycle of poverty, and I am at an utter loss to comprehend why the Republican leadership insists on this seriously flawed bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of preserving a program that works wonders, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2210.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), and I would like to thank him and the gentleman from Delaware (Chairman CASTLE) for their ongoing generosity in letting me voice my thoughts on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I testified before the Committee on Rules in support of an amendment which the gentleman from Delaware (Chairman CASTLE) and the administration support, dealing with accepted scientific standards of reliability and validity that will have a very positive impact on Head Start. As a psychologist who has focused my career on dealing with early childhood education, I know the values of these measures.

Head Start currently uses a variety of assessment measures, some acceptable and some less reliable, and teachers and parents need good, reliable information for the sake of tracking Head Start successes and providing taxpayers with information on how well this Federal program is functioning. Less reliable tests provide little value in identifying children's needs for further evaluations. They run the risk of misdiagnosing problems and mislabeling children and are more prone to cultural biases.

I ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), is it his intent to continue to explore this issue?

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, as we progress through the conference, I do intend to explore this issue further. Quality research relies on valid and reliable data, and I believe that we must

have quality research to drive the real improvements that are necessary in Head Start. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is a leader on these issues, and I appreciate his interest and his advice on this matter.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response.

I must add an emphasis on quality research that is going to drive program administrators to use scientifically valid measures. And additionally, when information is disclosed to the local community and parents, it is imperative that the reports depend on quality measures. Finally, let me add, we know that Head Start is not alone among early childhood education programs. The Perry Preschool Project and the Abecedarian Project are two that are frequently quoted in scientific literature, and we need room for innovations that follow research, but accompanying any Head Start help must be sound ways of measuring success.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his commitment to these quality programs and look forward to continuing to work with him as we move this bill through the conference.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

We have heard talk tonight about people saying that everybody on this side of the aisle wants to have things stay the same, and that frankly is not so. We worked quite hard together to make changes and improvements in the first section of this bill, as we have made changes and improvements on the bill in previous years, continually improving it and continually reducing the gap in readiness for school.

The problem comes in the second part of this bill. And the fact of the matter is that those proponents of the change in the block grant cannot show a single stitch of evidence that this would improve the situation. When the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) was asked at the Committee on Rules to give an example of one parent group, one child group, one educational group, one social advocacy group that supported the block grant section of the bill, he could not do it. When all the editorialists and all those are people are dead set against this, somehow the Republicans still think that they are right. Other people would have some pause for thought on it.

The fact of the matter is that the block grant does do damage to the Head Start program. It would not require performance standards. It would allow States to weaken educational standards by increasing class size, increasing child/teacher ratio, shortening

the program duration, cutting off 3-year-olds, using unproven curricula. States can, under their provisions, gut comprehensive services, eliminate parent classroom involvement, eliminate health and mental health screenings and services, eliminate adult literacy services, eliminate vision and dental services, eliminate health and nutrition education. And, yes, under this they can take block grant money and supplant other Federal funds. And CRS, Congressional Research Service, an independent group, says that that is so, despite the protestations of the other side.

□ 2130

We also leave too many children behind. For one-fourth of what we are spending in a month in Iraq, we could add another 87,000 children to this program that already underserves America's children.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE), a member of our committee.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2210.

While the resources spent for Head Start have been very significant, hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers, the results have been mixed. Studies indicate that children who are enrolled in Head Start make some progress, but are still lagging far behind the national average in school readiness.

Let me share some research from Health and Human Services. In 1997, Head Start children entered the program at an average of the 19th percentile in early learning knowledge areas and graduated in the 23rd percentile. That left Head Start students 27 percentile points behind the national average.

In the 1997-98 school year, Head Start students actually decreased performance in letter recognition.

In 2000, Head Start children entered the program at an average of the 21st percentile in early learning knowledge areas and graduated in the 24th percentile. That left these Head Start children more than 25 percentile points behind the national average.

Sadly, in the 2000-2001 school year, the Head Start students made no gains in letter recognition.

A recent publication by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services again concludes that both higher- and lower-achieving Head Start children have low scores overall and show limited progress after completion of the Head Start program, another way of saying they enter and leave the Head Start program with below average skill and knowledge areas.

We know that disadvantaged children need all the help they can get because in order for them to succeed in school, well before they enter school they have to have this knowledge base. We can predict how they are going to do in school by the progress they have made

when they enter. The importance of all children achieving academic parity upon entry into kindergarten is critical, because children who start behind have been shown to never catch up.

I am very much in support of this bill, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the staff and members for their hard work.

The stakes are high with these disadvantaged children. We need to do everything we can to prepare them for school.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather remarkable that the other side has discovered that the poorest children in the Nation do not do as well as the average children in the Nation, but what they ought to tell you is, these children do better than their peers that do not have an opportunity, and by the time they finish kindergarten, they are in the 50th percentile.

That was the job, to try to get them ready for school, and they are accelerating as they go through kindergarten; but they somehow seem astonished that they cannot compete with the average child the first year in Head Start, when they are the most impoverished children in the Nation.

Yes, we are dedicated to all of the changes in title I of this legislation. We are just not dedicated to the eradication of the Head Start program in title II.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, change for any program can be a good thing, if it is change the right way. That is why I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Head Start bill this evening. The recommended changes are wrong for the children of the Head Start program.

The story of Head Start is that it works. It is a highly successful program. Studies have shown for every \$1 we invest in children at this age in Head Start programs, we realize \$4 to \$7 worth of savings down the line. There is not a business person in the country that would not take that deal.

According to surveys, 96 percent of the Head Start families express a high level of satisfaction with their Head Start programs because of the quality and the accountability that exists there already. That is probably why there has been such overwhelming opposition to the radical Republican transformation of the Head Start program before us tonight.

We have heard the concerns of the block grant proposal that they are recommending without accountability or quality assurances. We have also heard the concerns that the bill would legalize religious discrimination in the Head Start program.

What we have not heard this evening is that under their bill they call for a

reduction in funding for professional development programs, again affecting the quality of these programs.

What we also have not heard, perhaps a very important issue, is that they are planning on moving forward with an entirely new testing regime by this fall for these 3- and 4-year-olds, when experts in early childhood development tell us, unless we do it right, unless we have the right measurements, it could do more harm than good for these children.

That is why I got included in the legislation a National Academy of Sciences study to recommend what measurements are appropriate for children. But instead of waiting for the results of that study, they are moving forward on an untested, unscientific, new testing system this fall, which could do our children more harm.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I join educators, parents, and Head Start staff around Wisconsin as well as many of my colleagues here today in opposing drastic changes to the highly successful, early education Head Start program. Changes offered by the Bush Administration and backed by the Republican Congressional majority threaten the program, which has helped millions of high-risk children from impoverished families achieve academic success.

In the 38 years of Head Start, there has always been bipartisan consensus to continue this program that currently helps more than 13,000 children in Wisconsin and 2,000 in the 3rd Congressional district alone. As a member of the House Education and Workforce Committee, it is my belief that the majority leaders have put our 3- and 4-year-old children in the middle of a partisan tug-of-war.

Under the bill, which I voted against during the committee consideration, the burden of Head Start would be on the shoulders of cash-strapped States through a series of block grants. Under current law, the Department of Health and Human Services gives money directly to local Head Start programs. Under the proposed changes, however, block grants would be administered by new State bureaucracies, which would cost additional money and provide no guarantee the money would go towards Head Start.

Nearly every State in the nation is facing a budget deficit. We cannot take the chance that one dime of this critical funding would fail to go towards Head Start and the kids it serves.

Educators and parents are particularly upset with the changes because of the success rate of Head Start. Further, numerous studies indicate that every dollar spent on Head Start saves taxpayers \$4 to \$7 in the future due to savings and lower education and welfare expenses.

I offered a series of amendments to H.R. 2210 during Committee markup and again to the Rules committee last week. The first amendment would restore to current law the 2 percent set aside for training and technical assistance for improving program quality in Head Start. We know the key to quality Head Start programming is having quality teachers dealing with the students. And, yet, the base bill before us would actually go backwards. It

would decrease the training and technical assistance fund to an undetermined amount between 1 and 2 percent. That is especially disconcerting since we know that approximately 2.5 percent of Head Start funds are currently being spent on such programs.

This money is critical for quality staff. Funds are being used to supplement teacher salaries and train staff in a variety of areas. For example, this funding is used to improve staff qualifications, to implement early childhood curriculum, to assess child development, to monitor child health and safety, provide human resources training, support parenting and family services, and to better integrate the use of technology in Head Start centers in working with these kids. Now is not the time we should be going back on the maximum amount that is allowed for ongoing training and technical assistance.

Furthermore, I offered an amendment that would have halted the National Reporting System until the National Academy of Science (NAS) reports to Congress on the appropriate standards and benchmarks for school readiness and valid measures of assessment.

I am concerned with the Administration's implementation of a country-wide testing system for Head Start children despite protests by early child education experts who question the validity and reliability of the assessments developed. The National Research Council's "Eager To Learn" report warns, "assessments must be used carefully and appropriately if they are to resolve and not create educational problems." Thus, while we support ongoing assessments of Head Start children to help ensure their school readiness, these specific assessments were developed behind closed doors and with very little input from Congress, Head Start Centers, or other experts.

Reauthorization provides Congress with an opportunity to evaluate appropriate standards and benchmarks for school readiness, as well as valid measures of assessments for Head Start students. Unfortunately, efforts to slow down and properly evaluate the National Reporting System during Committee consideration were defeated. For the sake of our children, it is important that these assessments are not rushed and are given ample review before implementation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose H.R. 2210. I will not support any legislation that reduces the opportunities for children. All children deserve a high-quality prekindergarten program and according to numerous studies that is exactly what Head Start children currently receive.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, when H.R. 2210 was considered in the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Democrats offered a number of amendments to the bill, an amendment to disallow a provision that taxpayer dollars be used to support religious discrimination in hiring, an amendment to provide money to Head Start teachers to help them acquire bachelor's degrees and be better qualified to teach low-income children of this Nation, and an amendment to fully fund Head Start, ensuring that all eligible preschoolers would have access to the program.

Unfortunately, all of these amendments were rejected. As a result, low-income children in 42 States will suffer and the Head Start program will not have improved access or resources for teacher quality or protection from discrimination in hiring.

In eight States, the majority would dismantle, would dismantle, the program, dissolving Head Start into a block grant without requiring Federal Head Start performance standards. This means States then can eliminate health screenings, parenting education, dental exams, adult literacy services, parent classroom involvement and vision services. The block grant is the first step towards the end of Head Start.

Poverty is on the rise. We should not be dismantling Head Start. Our Democratic substitute will ensure that the program continues unharmed, eliminating the discrimination provision and eliminating the block grant.

Children deserve Head Start. They deserve a chance in life. They deserve our votes for the Democratic alternative and to reject the wrong-headed Republican proposal.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), a member of our committee and a real leader on this issue.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I too want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER), the gentleman from Delaware (Chairman CASTLE) and the terrific staff for their work as we prepared this bill for the House floor tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation. I have worked with a number of Head Start operations all of my years. I have been impressed with the teachers and the aides; I have been impressed with the administrators, the parents often working as volunteers; and certainly the kids themselves, not only the kids I have seen in the classrooms, but the same kids as I have watched them progress K through 12.

Though tonight there has been a lot of criticism focused on title II of this bill, this is the provision that allows only eight States, only eight States, to establish a pilot program. It is important to note that those States cannot use the money that they receive for these pilot programs for other programs. It has to be dedicated solely to Head Start. They also have to dedicate more of their own State money for these programs. To me, the kids win. They get more money, particularly to see if they can make the program work even better.

As I said earlier, I visited many of these Head Start facilities, and I was concerned as we developed this legislation that under title II perhaps some of those Head Start grantees may have had their funds cut. Well, I did not want to see that happen. I offered a successful amendment in committee to have a hold-harmless provision that prevents any cuts to current grantees

that will now be in place for 5 years. So you cannot say that those grantees in fact are going to be cut if that State goes into a pilot program.

By the end of the demonstration period, the 5 years authorization period of this bill, Congress will have an accurate perspective on the effectiveness of whether or not these pilot programs work.

This is a better bill for our kids. Let us see it pass.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, for almost 40 years Head Start has assisted low-income, preschool children and their families, establishing a comprehensive, early learning environment addressing a variety of social and medical needs. Certainly in my district, as in districts all over the country, Head Start has been a tremendous success: IQ gains, reading and writing and math skills improved, high school graduation, significantly greater; the need for special education, reduced; crime, reduced.

So if it is so good, why overhaul it? If one wants to improve it, we can do that. But one should review it in a bipartisan way. This is not bipartisan. There is nothing bipartisan here. And this is not a debate. No Member will be persuaded, no vote will be changed.

The Republicans are foisting a block grant program on the country on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. And you know what a block grant program is. It is a pot of money that goes to the State with the message "This is for early education. You know what to do with it."

Well, some States know what to do with it, and some States do not.

The block grant approach is flawed and it is illogical. It guts quality comprehensive services, primary health care, dental care, mental health services. The block grant approach weakens performance standards, it sets no minimum thresholds for school readiness standards, teacher-student ratios, classroom size or curriculum content. It weakens oversight and evaluation.

Rather than pursuing a bill that will lead to a partisan vote on Head Start legislation, we should reconsider the block grant approach for the sake of America's children.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the committee.

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must regretfully rise in opposition to a bill which I believe has many good elements.

I see the Head Start program, as my colleagues do, as a successful and long-

standing effort to engage low-income children in the preparation for kindergarten, that we know is readily available and enjoyed by children from more financially secure families. In fact, I have two of my current staff members who are graduates of the Head Start program, and so I know that the program indeed does work.

I am pleased to support the requirements for relevant training for staff members, but the problem is that we really have not done the job of providing loan forgiveness for those staff members. We really have not done the job of finding a way for them to get the professional development that they need.

We have talked about the religious discrimination introduction into this bill, and that is a real problem. But let me just talk about another problem. We have targeted title II, and we have targeted that for a very good reason, because in reality the bill fails; it fails to secure guarantees and require that States not supplant State or other Federal funds with Head Start funds.

We know about the current budget crisis in my State of California. States will find a way to find opportunities to supplant when they are in fiscal crisis, and the bill does not really prevent that.

There is another thing that the bill does not do. It only says that States must generally meet the requirements, not meet or exceed those requirements, and all the special programs in Head Start, we need them to meet those requirements.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, Head Start is a program that works. Studies have shown that this is an investment that pays off. Children in Head Start are less likely to be held back in school or placed in special education classes, saving our schools precious dollars. These children are more likely to be successful students and to graduate.

In my home State, there are currently 16,000 children eligible for Head Start and not receiving services because of lack of funding.

□ 2145

Budget constraints this year have forced Minnesota to make drastic cuts in early childhood programs, cutting more than \$3 million in Head Start funding. Early childhood and family education was cut by \$7 million. School readiness was cut by almost \$2 million, and the Way to Go program, well, that was just plain eliminated. Combined, this represents a 14 percent cut in base funding for early childhood programs in Minnesota.

Now, this legislation would give States a block grant, and in my opinion, that will limit accountability, allowing States to reduce performance standards, allowing for increased class sizes, decreased child-teacher ratios,

cutting off services possibly for 3-year-olds, and using unproven curriculum. This legislation would allow States like Minnesota to cut Head Start funding, a temptation I know they will not be able to resist, given the current track record with early childhood programs, and allow governors like my own to shift funding away from Head Start and put programs at risk.

Head Start works. It does not need to be overhauled; it needs to be funded.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the author of the bill and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education Reform.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take on the question of how well we are doing, at least educationally, in Head Start. This is really, really important, that everybody understands it.

First of all, there are not that many studies with respect to how Head Start children are doing. There is a longitudinal study in the works right now which we should have pretty soon. This is a study, and I will show 2 charts, one from 1997 and one from 2000, which shows children in Head Start far below average. The average is 50 percent. That is the median that we are dealing with here.

This study is by the Family and Child Experiences Survey, and it shows, and you cannot see it probably, but the blue is the fall of 1997 and the purple is the spring of 1998, so after they had been through a year of this. It shows the vocabulary of the kids had gone from the 16th percentile to the 23rd. In letter recognition they actually went down from the 27th to the 25th. In early writing, 16th to 23rd, and early mathematics, 17 to 19.

Believe me, these are numbers which tell us that these kids are not going to make it in school. This is absolutely why we have to challenge Head Start. It is why we need to go to a State demonstration to make sure it is brought in with all of the other State programs which exist.

Now, the numbers really are not a lot different for the year 2000, but there they are: 16 to 23 for early letter recognition; early writing went from 16 to 19; early mathematics, 21 to 23. This means that when these children reach kindergarten, we can almost predict that they are not going to make it out of school ultimately, and that, unfortunately, Head Start has not done all for them that it could.

Head Start does a wonderful job in many ways that we have described here today in terms of helping with the well-being of our young children, but it is not doing what we need to do in education, and we need to challenge it. It is as we have seen and heard in some of the newspapers that have written about it. The Detroit News on July 9 said:

"Head Start advocates fear States will fritter away any Federal Head Start funds shifted their way, but proposals now in the House restrict States in how they spend earmarked money. The pilot program would be limited to eight States, and that would be a good test for proposed preschool reforms. If government can devise a better Head Start program, one which helps children more effectively, it should hurry to do so. The program's 900,000 children, the ones who need the help, deserve no less."

That is absolutely correct. We need to take steps to help them academically. What we have proposed will do so. Please support this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, sometimes when we evaluate, we need to look at the depths from which one comes as opposed to only the heights to which they have not excelled.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2210. I am pleased that my amendments in committee to restore reference to the importance of delivering culturally appropriate services and to increase opportunities for fathers to more actively participate in Head Start were agreed to. And while I am pleased with the acceptance of these amendments and others introduced by my colleagues, I am greatly disappointed by the fact that other amendments will not be discussed here today.

Among these is my amendment to provide funding for grantees to fulfill the requirement that 50 percent of teachers have bachelor's degrees. Since my amendment was not accepted, this will continue to be an unfunded mandate like the rhetoric of Leave No Child Behind.

Education is, in fact, the great equalizer, and since its introduction in 1965, the Head Start program has helped over 21 million of America's poorest children gain the academic, social, emotional behavior, and readiness skills necessary for success. In those 38 years, we have learned much about the needs of disadvantaged children living in poverty. What we have learned is what it takes to prepare them for school. It takes dedicated, skilled, well-trained teachers. It takes parental involvement. It takes comprehensiveness. It takes health care. It takes nutrition. It does not take some kind of program that has never been tested.

Let us keep Head Start. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by commending Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member MILLER from the Education and the Workforce Committee and Chairman CASTLE and Ranking Member WOOLSEY from the Subcommittee on Select Education for their work

on this bill. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2210. I am pleased that my amendments in committee to restore references to the importance of delivering culturally appropriate services and to increase opportunities for fathers to more actively participate in Head Start were agreed to. While I am pleased with acceptance of these amendments and others introduced by my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee, I am greatly disappointed by the fact that numerous amendments designed to improve this legislation will not be discussed today. Among these is my amendment to provide funding for grantees to fulfill the requirement that 50% of teachers have Bachelor's degrees. Since my amendment was not accepted, this will continue to be an unfunded mandate, like the rhetoric of Leave No Child Behind.

Education is the great equalizer. Since its introduction 1965, the Head Start program has helped over 21 million of America's poorest children gain the academic, social, emotional, behavioral and readiness skills necessary for success in the future. In those thirty-eight years, we have learned much about the needs of disadvantaged children living in poverty and what it takes to prepare them for school. It takes skilled, well trained and dedicated teachers. It takes comprehensiveness. It takes health care, nutrition, it takes parental involvement and participation. It takes more than eloquent speeches about Leave No Child Behind experiments. The Head Start program has grown and changed through the years with the increased knowledge of how best to serve low-income children and their families. Study after study has shown that participation in the program results in decreased incidence of school failure, higher graduation rates, lower crime rates later in life, and better social and emotional relationships. In these times when politicians speak so eloquently on how no child should be left behind, why would we conduct an experiment that would restructure an already successful program and, ultimately, result in thousands of children being left behind?

Title II of this bill would do just that. It implements a pilot program for eight states to take the Head Start money appropriated to them and run the program on their own. The idea behind this experimental program is to integrate Head Start with already existing state preschool programs. However, such a move would undermine the intent of Head Start as a comprehensive, family-based program. Title II would allow states to determine their own standards, guidelines, and qualifications. These states could decide to implement Head Start as a pre-kindergarten program, cutting out nutrition, vaccinations, dental care, medical care, and other important services currently guaranteed to children in the program. With the current state budget crisis, these services will almost certainly be eliminated, leaving the low-income children served by Head Start with no way to receive these extremely important services.

The Head Start program has been in place for 38 years and has been continually improving in quality as professionals have gained knowledge on how best to serve low-income children. This knowledge and understanding has resulted in high quality standards being set. In contrast, many states do not even have preschool programs, and those that do are still in the early stages of developing them. Few state-run preschool programs have estab-

lished quality standards. Nor do state-run preschool programs encourage the active participation of parents. Helping parents learn how to provide nurturing environments for their children has a positive impact for years after graduation from Head Start and is beneficial for the child in the program as well as his or her siblings. The role of parents in Head Start goes far beyond being a PTA member or a teacher's aide; parents learn that they are the most important role model for their children and must be a caring and supportive influence. The vast majority of State-run preschool programs also have little to no integration of services, which is already a major part of the Head Start program. Merging Head Start with programs that do not have quality standards, do not encourage parent participation, and do not provide such services as nutrition, health, and immunizations runs the risk of destabilizing a successful program and lowering standards and minimizing services that have been so painstakingly developed.

Mr. Chairman, Head Start could serve our children better. However, dismantling the program and leaving states to rebuild it without the insights gained over the past thirty-eight years would be a tragedy for our low-income children and their families.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the proposal that we have before us, in title I, the main part of the program, there is quite a bit of unanimity about the changes that need to be made to help improve Head Start if, in fact, we are going to improve the futures for many poor children in America. I think there is a recognition that more of an education component to Head Start is absolutely necessary.

And so if we look at title I of the bill, there is no amount of disagreement over it. The real disagreement is over title II which would set up an eight-State demonstration program, only for the States who have made big commitments to early childhood development, only States that would agree to meet or exceed Federal standards, only for States that are willing to make a big commitment and are already doing it, and they will have to add more money. And if that is not enough, we guarantee that the local grantees that are there today in those eight States will continue to receive their money for 5 years.

How anybody could ever refer to this as a block grant is beyond me.

Why are we doing this? Very simply this: Some States are making big commitments to help poor kids, and if they are able to take their pre-kindergarten programs, their early childhood development programs, their child care programs, they can work with poor children in their States and their families to create a more seamless system to help prepare children for school.

Why should we not see if it works? Why should we not take the chance to help these children? Because I do believe that some States will be better able to prepare these children to be ready for school.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, in my district, nearly 200 children and their families uti-

lize Head Start. I am opposed to the legislation before us today because it would pose a risk to the many Utahns who receive health, dental, social and educational services under this vital program.

This is a program with a long-term record of success in investing in the future of our children. Head Start has a proven pattern of success with enrollment correlating to IQ gains, improved high school graduation rates and higher achievement in writing, vocabulary and social skills.

For almost 40 years, Head Start has been a lifeline for disadvantaged Utah children, providing comprehensive services to them and their families. I have seen the positive results. Children are receiving medical, social and education help unavailable to them from any other entity.

After taking to Utah parents, administrators and children in Head Start, I am convinced that the current program serves as well, and I don't understand the why Congress would want to make the significant changes before us today.

Mr. RODRIQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act.

I rise today, not only as Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, not only as a Member of this body, but as a person who had to fight for every day of his education and who is determined not to have his grandchildren go through the same thing because of a partisan attack.

The changes to Head Start proposed through this legislation are disgraceful.

And the lack of resources committed to serve all eligible children is shameful.

We can no longer block grant the needs of families and then cut them off at our discretion.

There are currently an estimated 270,000 Hispanic children benefiting from Head Start today.

For over three decades, Head Start has grown tremendously, however, funding has failed to keep up with inflation, let alone provide enough to maintain or improve quality.

And now the President's 2004 budget proposals laid out the beginning of this plan to dismantle Head Start.

His plan will keep 32,000 of our immigrant and seasonal children in the fields and prevent the diversity of our education system through religious discrimination.

The Head Start program is not perfect, but this plan throws the baby out the bathwater.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act of 2003.

In my State of Ohio, the State Head Start Program, as passed by the Ohio General Assembly, and signed by Governor Taft, provided funding to serve only 11,672 children in fiscal year 2004 using \$57,170,000 in TANF Block Grant funds, which is a reduction of services to 6,328 kids. In the second year, funding was increased to \$110,184,000 in TANF Block Grant Funds with an anticipated enrollment of 14,000 children—still 4,000 fewer children that were served compared to last year.

There is only a small amount of State funds that are included in the Head Start line item, \$16 million in General Revenue Fund (GRF) money—\$11 million in fiscal year 2004 and \$5 million fiscal year 2005. But, State funds can

only be used for start-up, and can only be used for TANF-eligible services. This means that homeless children, children whose parents are unemployed, and foster care children are ineligible for State-funded Head Start. The State contends these children can be served by Federal Head Start even though there is no increase in funding in H.R. 2210 to accommodate these children.

Since the State program is funded almost exclusively by TANF, except for the self-imposed funding restrictions on the State money as mentioned above, comprehensive health services will not be able to be provided to children in State-funded Head Start. This violates both performance standards and common sense as to what we know these children need.

In tough economic times, one of the first programs to be cut in Ohio, as well as other States, has been early care and education services.

The goal of creating a comprehensive early care and education system that provides quality services for children, easier access for parents, and fabulous results for all children is laudable and one for which we all strive. In the last several years Ohio has taken several steps in the opposite direction by continuing to flat fund preschool, lowering child care eligibility, cutting 6,300 low-income children off of State Head Start, and eliminating almost all State resources to support one of our most vulnerable populations. Until Ohio has proven on a consistent basis that a comprehensive, appropriately funded early care and education system is one of its top priorities, Ohio should be one of the last in line for flexibility to do what it will with children: recent history already has shown we are not ready for it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to reiterate my opposition to H.R. 2210. Funding authorization in H.R. 2210 does not even cover cost of living increases, let alone provide enough to implement improvements in teacher credentialing and wages or to increase the number of children served in Head Start, Early Head Start, and the Indian, Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs, all of which are woefully underfunded. Ohio has done much work to help Head Start teachers receive higher credentials and degrees, but it takes a long time and significant resources.

States given the option to administer Head Start would have little federal monitoring. The states would be free to determine their own standards and monitor their progress, unlike the current requirements to closely monitor Head Start programs. This is of great concern.

Finally, several Ohio faith-based organizations and coalitions are not in support of provisions in H.R. 2210 that allow discrimination in hiring based on religion. My constituents believe that discrimination of any kind should not be allowed in this bill. It is also of great concern should this provision extend to volunteers. Parents are often the ones encouraged to volunteer in their child's classroom. Parents often are ultimately hired as staff in Head Start centers. Do we want to discourage parent involvement and a potential job applicant pool because of their religion?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. The Bush Administration and many in this Congress have said over and over that the education policies of this country should leave no child behind. The President pledged to leave no child behind, and then

proposed more than a billion dollars of education cuts. If the legislation before the House today passes, the Majority will once again fail the kids who need our help the most.

Head Start was created to help secure a good start, a good education, and good prospects for at-risk youth. Not only does it help children develop cognitive learning and social skills, but also provides comprehensive health, dental and nutrition services which are vital to educational success. This bill before the House would undo the foundation of a program that has been a glowing success for nearly 40 years.

In addition, this bill seriously underfunds Head Start. With already limited resources, Head Start struggles to serve two out of every five eligible children. Without additional funding, we will leave nearly 1 million children behind. It is ironic that the Majority will push to pass billions in tax cuts that chiefly benefit the very rich, yet is unwilling to provide the necessary funding to school kids. This speaks volumes about the priorities of the Majority.

In contrast, the Democratic substitute which I support would build on the success of Head Start. It does so by strengthening school readiness, improving program quality and accountability, and expanding access so more eligible children will be served. It does all this while maintaining local control and high program performance standards.

I ask you to defeat the Republican-sponsored legislation. If you vote for this legislation, not only are you voting to undermine the foundation of Head Start, you're voting to undermine the future of the children who depend on it.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic substitute to protect Head Start. I oppose H.R. 2210, because this bill will do nothing to help African American, Latino, and low-income children get a head start on education.

Head Start has been helping minority and low-income families for over 38 years.

It has helped millions of children from our families have access to quality education.

Ninety percent of the families served by Head Start are below the poverty level and 30 percent are Latino. We must fight to protect this program.

Head Start helps our children compete on a level playing field with children from more privileged backgrounds.

Our families deserve a level playing field. Our children deserve a quality education.

If we truly cared about all children, we would simply expand Head Start not leave it up to the States.

There are nearly 1 million children from Spanish speaking homes that could use a Head Start, but because of funding it can only serve 21 percent of them.

We must not let Republicans block grant this program. It is too important to minorities and low-income families. We must pass the Miller substitute and stop the destruction of Head Start.

Right now, States like my State of California are facing huge deficits. They have their hands full. They cannot adequately protect this program.

All children deserve a better chance at life. We should simply expand this program.

Right now, Head Start only serves 60 percent of all eligible children.

I am tired of watching legislation be passed every day that hurts minorities and hurts the poor. This doesn't make sense.

We must provide more money to our Latino communities since we are now the largest minority in the country.

We need more money to train teachers to meet the needs of children with limited English skills.

The only way to improve Head Start is to invest in our children. Giving control to the States simply doesn't make sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Democratic substitute and "no" on H.R. 2210.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act of 2003.

Head Start is one of the great success stories in the history of American education. Since 1965, Head Start has benefited more than 20 million low-income pre-school children, preparing them to compete with their more affluent peers when they reach primary school.

Head Start offers these kids a research-based academic curriculum and a wide range of vital services, including health screenings, nutrition, dental and vision services, as well as extensive parental involvement in education. It currently serves over 900,000 pre-schoolers, including 2,500 on Long Island.

Last week, I had the privilege of meeting several Head Start success stories in my district. Let me tell you about one of them.

Thomas Farrell attended Head Start for 2 years as a pre-schooler. Thomas came into Head Start with a speech impediment, which the Head Start educators worked to correct.

Now, Thomas has just finished his first year at Brown University. He has excelled in his coursework. He plays linebacker on the football team. And he speaks perfectly.

From Head Start to the Ivy League. That's the kind of life-changing difference that Head Start makes.

But this bill will pull the rug out from under all of the future Thomas Farrells out there—ending Head Start as we know it. H.R. 2210 dismantles Head Start, turning the program over to States with unproven expertise and without the Federal program's quality standards and oversight.

If this bill passes, our low-income kids will be placed into State-run Head Start programs, which will be held to a weaker set of quality standards—if they are held to any standards at all—than current, locally run Head Start programs.

States will be able to cut off all services to 3-year-olds, increase class size, eliminate adult literacy services, eliminate parent classroom involvement, and use unproven and untested academic curricula.

And under this bill, States will be able to raid Head Start funding to pay for other educational programs.

My Republican colleagues say they want to make Head Start better. But under this bill, States are under no obligation to show that they would improve the program. In fact, no State pre-kindergarten program has ever been demonstrated to be as effective as Head Start.

Mr. Chairman, my Democratic colleagues and I are willing to work with our friends across the aisle to make Head Start an even more effective program for our low-income kids. We can start by fully funding Head Start so no eligible child is left behind. We can work together to expand Early Head Start to serve

more infants and toddlers. And we can improve the quality of Head Start teachers by requiring that more of them have bachelor degrees and by compensating them properly so that they stay with Head Start.

But what we must not do is dismantle a program that has proven to be so effective for our low-income kids.

Mr. Chairman, education is the great equalizer for kids like Thomas Farrell to achieve the American Dream. I implore my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2210, which makes the playing field even more unlevel for them.

Our primary job in Congress is to set priorities for America. Let our children be our highest priority.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act of 2003. Since 1965, Head Start has profoundly improved the lives of more than 20 million children, and their families. The legislation before us undermines the very structure of the Head Start program and its ability to continue to improve the lives of low-income children who deserve a chance to succeed.

This bill establishes an eight state, block grant program that would provide funds to cash-strapped states that have neither the experience nor the commitment to run a Head Start program. These state run Head Start programs would not be required to meet Head Start performance standards that ensure a quality, comprehensive program that focuses on: health, education, and family and community development.

One of the most valuable parts of the Head Start program is the commitment to families and communities. The "federal to local" organization of Head Start has allowed each program to address the particular needs of their locality. Through this tailored approach, Head Start teaches and encourages parents to become more involved and committed to their children's continuing education. The result is that Head Start has been able to improve the long-term outlook for many children. Studies show that by the spring of their kindergarten year, Head Start students show substantial progress in word knowledge, letter recognition, math skills, and writing skills in comparison to national norms. In addition, Head Start students are less likely to be held back a grade, or require special education. Rather, they are more likely to graduate from high school and college, than their peers who did not enjoy the benefits of Head Start. There is no evidence to show that state-run Head Start programs could replicate these successes or the invaluable community focus.

In order to continue to help more low-income children overcome the disadvantage of poverty, Head Start must receive adequate funding. Currently, Head Start is capable of serving only: 60 percent of eligible children, and 19 percent of migrant children; while Early Head Start serves only 3 percent of eligible children. Rather than jeopardizing the quality programming of Head Start by ceding control to states that are inexperienced in managing Head Start programs, we need to catch more at risk children who are slipping through the cracks.

In addition to making irresponsible structural changes, H.R. 2210 repeals longstanding civil rights protections for the employees of Head Start programs that are operated through faith based organizations. Under this legislation,

faith based organizations could legally discriminate, on the basis of religion, in the hiring of their Head Start employees. Many Head Start programs are admirably operated by faith-based organizations, however, that does not give them the right to discriminate if they accept Federal funds. The only consideration in hiring Head Start teachers should be to secure the best possible educator for these children who so desperately need quality instruction. It is shameful to think that educational qualifications could be overshadowed by religious affiliation.

In my home State of California, over 100,000 children and their families participate in Head Start and Early Head Start programs annually. These programs have dramatically improved school readiness, health, and family relationships of participating children. I am unwilling to support H.R. 2210 and its unproven provisions that threaten the established success of the Head Start Program. I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this dangerous legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to proposed changes to Head Start that will lead to the dismantling of this important program for children. Instead of making these changes, we should be working in a nonpartisan manner to strengthen a program that has served so many children so well for almost 40 years. Turning Head Start over to the States who already face growing record budget revenue shortfalls can only lead to deep, unacceptable cuts in State government support for early childhood education and development programs.

Countless studies show that Head Start is effective at an early age and continues to be effective into adulthood.

One study shows that only about one-fourth as many female Head Start participants as nonparticipants failed to obtain a high school or GED diploma and only one-third as many were arrested for crimes.

The Administration itself said in a 2002 report by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) that Early Head Start programs consistency enhanced cognitive development and reduced negative aspects of children's social-emotional development.

HHS reported that the Head Start program received the highest customer satisfaction score of any government agency and even had a higher score than many major companies.

HHS also found that the children and families served by Head Start are diverse in culture and language and that parents have been pleased with the program's attempts to respond to linguistic and cultural uniqueness of their children.

We must not be persuaded by word games involving Head Start. I do not believe that we should attempt to "improve" Head Start by breaking it up and diverting its funding to the States for use in untested and unproven programs that may not survive deficit-driven State budget cuts over the next few years. Our constituents will be watching to see how we work to best serve their children.

It is inconceivable that we would strive to serve fewer children than Head Start does not or provide less comprehensive services to those children who are served. These outcomes are simply not acceptable since these at-risk children who rely upon Head Start re-

quire special assistance in order to be "ready to learn" when they start kindergarten and elementary school. Why, Mr. Speaker, should we support spending funds on state administrative costs that would be better spent serving children in the classroom? Perhaps, someone can explain to me how reducing teacher educational requirements and other key standards and providing no role for Head Start parents and volunteers will strengthen this program.

Rather than this dangerous bill, I support making Head Start work better rather than dismantling Head Start. This House should make sure that this program survives and is properly funded to serve all eligible children, including the two out of five 3- and 4-year-old children who could be in the program, but are not, today. We should be building on the success of Head Start, not rendering it useless. Mr. Chairman, Head Start deserves the funds it needs to serve all eligible children and to put more teachers with top qualifications into the classrooms where they are so urgently needed today.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican Anti-Head Start legislation that strives to destroy this nationwide pre-school program for poor children, and in support of the Democratic substitute.

The Head Start program is by far the most successful preschool program in this Nation's history. The facts show that Head Start works. Children enrolled in Head Start show gains in their IQs, are more likely to graduate from high school, and are less likely to need special education, repeat a grade, or commit crime than low-income children who do not attend Head Start.

Head Start works because it provides comprehensive health and nutritional services as well as educational services to poor children. This is important because well-fed and healthy children learn better than hungry and unhealthy children.

Head Start also works because it provides services to parents such as education classes, health services and parent training classes. This is vital because parent services involve fathers and mothers in their children's development and as a result their children perform better academically.

Unfortunately, the Republican bill today attempts to destroy all that is good about Head Start. Instead of expanding the program, the Republicans allow states to gut Head Start and the benefits it provides to children. By turning the program into a block grant, Republicans are ensuring that unproven state preschool programs could soon replace Head Start.

It is a proven fact that these state programs aren't as good at improving our children's academic performance. A recent Yale University Study shows that Head Start provides better health and nutritional services than any state preschool program. Yet, the Republican bill does not even require States to demonstrate that their preschool programs can do a better job than Head Start. In fact, States could use Head Start dollars to support preschool programs that have no quality education standards or that have no school readiness standards.

Republicans also allow States to cut off all services to 3 year olds, to increase class size, to increase child-staff ratios, and to eliminate adult literacy services, parent classroom involvement and all health and nutrition services.

Mr. Chairman, our children deserve better than a second rate start to their education. They need the best Head Start we can give them.

Unlike the Republican bill, the Democratic substitute builds on the proven success of Head Start by strengthening school readiness, improving program quality and accountability, and expanding access so more children can receive its benefits. The Democratic bill strengthens Head Start's focus on pre-literacy, language and pre-math skills and creates new quality standards to develop school readiness skills.

Our legislation also expands Head Start to all eligible preschoolers and increases access for poor families to the Early Head Start program. Even the most successful programs need improvements over time. The Democratic bill addresses this. It strengthens Head Start by providing meaningful reforms that build upon this program's success.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to stand up and stop this heartless destruction of Head Start. The hopes of millions low-income children are depending on us to do the right thing. We should not deny these children the Head Start services that give them a better chance, that help them to succeed, and allow them to become healthy and productive citizens of our great country.

I urge my colleagues to vote to save Head Start and Early Head Start by supporting the Democratic substitute and voting down this destructive Republican anti-Head Start bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, it makes no sense to gamble with Head Start. We have a program that serves almost a million people. Since Head Start's inception in 1965, the program has reached over 21 million children. In our community it has served over 214,000 children and their families. It works.

Head Start children score higher on standardized assessments of cognitive development than children who haven't been able to participate.

Head Start is an investment. There are estimates for each dollar invested in the long term savings to society are seven times as much, but that does not really tell the whole story. It's not just money, it is more stable families, a sense of worth and accomplishment and it is a demonstration that we care enough to invest in children who don't have all the advantages.

Children learn by example. Parents of Head Start children are more likely to be engaged with their children, and more likely to read with their children. Head Start is more than just an education program. Health screenings provided by Head Start are an essential component of many children's health at a time when too many of our working families do not qualify for health coverage.

In my 8 years serving in Congress I have not heard one complaint about Head Start. In fact, Oregonians support Head Start and are opposed to the changes. This bill is a sign that we don't care enough to provide services for another two-thirds of a million children and their families that are eligible but for whom funding is not available, this of course would be small fraction of the money we are giving in tax cuts to people who have all the financial advantages and do not want for education and support. It will be extremely difficult to explain to the vast majority of Americans how we have money for the most well off and not to extend this basic proven service to those not

in need and who would benefit not just themselves but the society for years to come.

The problem is compounded by the insistence administration and Republican leadership to take chances with Head Start. Because of economic upheaval, more restrictive financial operating requirements and frankly because the Federal Government has not kept its promises, state governments are a source of significant turmoil.

Across the country, states are dealing with the economic calamity and the lack of federal support by cutting back on services and some cases abandoning long held principles of their own. College tuition is skyrocketing, social service networks are unraveling and money that was to be directed to long-term social problems are being robbed to avoid complete financial breakdown. State after state is raiding tobacco settlement money which was given to correct health problems from use of tobacco. This money is being diverted, to provide short-term financial relief.

Why would we take a proven successful program and throw it into the financial black hole that is represented by so many states? Why would we abandon the guarantees that these Head Start money will go to the children who need it? Why after the travesty of Leave No Child Left Behind which has degenerated into a series of unfunded mandates would we now impose another unfunded mandate for Head Start teacher qualification and provide no addition resources? In my good conscious I cannot support a bill that gambles with our children.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to a bill that would turn back the clock on the improvements made to early childhood education and development in this country.

The School Readiness Act, H.R. 2210, would turn the successful Head Start education program for disadvantaged children into block grants in eight states, including Connecticut, which would reduce accountability and ignore performance standards. It would allow states to qualify for a block grant simply by having a state preschool program, regardless of the quality, components, size or proven record of that state program. It also allows states to run Head Start programs with lower educational standards, minimal comprehensive services, less oversight and accountability and no evidence that they do a job equal to or better than Head Start.

This legislation is the first step in the process of completely dismantling a very significant early childhood education program by turning it into a block grant initiative for states without requiring them to live up to any Head Start performance standards. The bill diverts funds from local programs to state governments while at the same time relieving states of the responsibility to meet the current federal performance standards that have made Head Start so successful. This change will result in reduced performance standards, accountability and oversight, ending the Department of Health and Human Services review process and weakening the program.

Mr. Chairman, Head Start is one of the most evaluated federal programs, and research concludes that Head Start works. Children who attend Head Start exceed national norms in vocabulary, early writing, letter recognition and social behavior, and they enter school better prepared than low-income children who

do not attend Head Start. Head Start students are less likely to need special education services, are less likely to repeat a grade, are more likely to graduate from high school and are less likely to commit crimes during adolescence.

For nearly 40 years, Head Start has successfully served millions of children through comprehensive services to ensure they are ready for school. The efforts to dismantle this program is little more than an ideological exercise cloaked in rhetoric about collaboration with states and improving outcomes. It is an unjustified and unnecessary experiment on a successful program that is less about real policy and more about advancing an ideological crusade. It will end up doing harm to the children of this country and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2210, because it unjustifiably turns the Head Start program—one of the most evaluated and successful federal anti-poverty programs—into an unproven experiment.

The very strength of the Head Start program lies in the comprehensive services it provides. Consistent with Maslow's hierarchy of needs, the program improves academic achievement only because it addresses basic health and mental health, nutritional, dental and other social needs of low-income children. These needs must be met in order to facilitate learning. H.R. 2210 discards Head Start's comprehensive approach and curtails parent involvement. It troubles me that proponents of this bill believe that we can expect children to excel academically, along with their privileged peers, when, in fact, their learning is seriously impeded by the devastating effects of poverty.

Pediatric dentists are rare in rural areas. In Blossburg, PA, the local Head Start program makes several trips each year to Scranton with children who needed so much dental work that local dentists will not treat them. Parents do not have the means to drive 180 miles to access dental treatment, so Head Start provides the transportation.

John Holdscaw, who worked with the National Head Start Association and was a Head Start student himself, would not be the successful adult that he is now without the program. When he entered Head Start at the age of four, he was called "Thick John," because he never responded when asked a question. Head Start employees found that he had an inner ear problem; had this problem not been corrected, John would have entered school unable to hear his teacher and unable to learn.

There are eleven Head Start agencies, including five tribal programs, serving families in my Congressional District. Over the past 5 years, these programs served 12,683 children ages 0–5. In my district, 50 percent of eligible children go unserved by Head Start and Early Head Start.

In recent weeks, I have received numerous expressions of support for this vital program from Early Childhood experts, Head Start teachers, and Head Start families in my district. They all state the obvious: Head Start has yielded countless success stories, and it should not be restructured in the name of "reform."

Recently, I heard from Susan Woidyla, a Head Start teacher who serves children in two

counties in my district. She described the success of the Early Head Start program's curriculum for prenatal woman. The program currently serves ten pregnant women, many of whom are teenagers who will be first-time mothers. Woityla spoke about one teenage mother who is homeless and in an abusive relationship. As the only social service program in her life, Head Start is not only providing her with critical information about the brain development of her fetus and the potential effects of periodontal disease, but the program is helping this young woman find the services she needs to care for herself and her developing child.

Julia Kicker, another constituent of mine, shared her family's experience with Head Start. Although Julia and her husband knew that their first son, Jacob, was lagging behind other children in his social development, they were told differing information from local day care providers. Some day care providers insisted that he was fine; others believed he needed to be medicated; and still others suggested parenting classes for the Kickers.

Then Jacob began Head Start. The staff identified his needs, and they encouraged special education professionals to become involved with assessments and other services for Jacob, who is now enrolled in kindergarten. He has a one-on-one para-professional helper in the classroom and has been diagnosed with sensory delay and emotional behavior disorder.

Not only did the program assist Jacob, but it assisted Julia as well. It was the support that the Head Start program routinely gives parents and families that gave Julia the self-confidence to run for and be elected to the Policy Council for Head Start, the Board of Directors of the Community Action Council, and the City Council.

I will not vote for legislation that guts Head Start's comprehensive services and parental involvement and unravels a successful program that HHS itself has said is working. Instead, Head Start should be adequately funded to meet the needs of all eligible children.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2210.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, Head Start works. In my home district, over 3,300 children benefit from Head Start programs. Ninety-seven percent of these children are part of families that live below the poverty level or receive public assistance. For these children in Western New York and the other million children enrolled in Head Start across the Nation, I oppose the Head Start Reauthorization Act and its attempts to dismantle Head Start.

Countless studies have shown that Head Start is an effective program that helps some of our Nation's neediest youths succeed. It takes a holistic approach to children's welfare by providing early childhood education in reading, writing, mathematics, and language skills, providing medical and dental care, providing mental health services, and providing disability assessment and treatment. Virtually every single child in Head Start programs in my district has received appropriate preventative and primary medical care and comprehensive dental care. This is health care they likely would not receive otherwise.

The comprehensive approach to preparing children for academic success is itself a success. Dollars spent on Head Start produce taxpayer dividends for year. Children who go

through Head Start are better prepared for elementary school. Without Head Start, many of these children would be far behind their peers from the first day of kindergarten. Head Start children are less likely to repeat a grade, require special education, or be convicted of a crime. Head Start children show IQ gains when compared to low-income children who are not in the program. In addition, Head Start children are more likely to graduate from high school and college.

H.R. 2210 is the first step toward destroying Head Start. The bill would hand control and responsibility for Head Start to eight states—states that are facing the severe budget crisis gripping almost every state and local government. However, these states would not be required to meet minimum federal standards. Without these federal basic requirement, states are likely to weaken educational standards, cut services like medical and dental care, and shift more funds to cover administrative costs—especially during this jobless recovery that is squeezing state budgets. It is irresponsible to hand states such a substantial sum of money without ensuring that it will be spent for the optimum benefit for the 900,000 children currently enrolled in Head Start and the thousands of eligible children who are not enrolled.

The Head Start programs in states that are not part of the block-grant experiment continue to be severely underfunded. The lack of sufficient funds denies many eligible children access to Head Start programs. Only 60 percent of eligible preschoolers are enrolled in Head Start; Early Head Start only serves 3 percent of eligible infants and toddlers; and Migrant and Seasonal Head Start only serves 19 percent of children or migrant and seasonal farm workers—all due to insufficient funds.

Further, I am incredibly disturbed that this bill promotes discrimination by allowing Head Start programs to hire and fire teachers based on religion. This country has an admirable history of advancing the fundamental principle of nondiscrimination, particularly when the federal government spends taxpayers' money. It is irresponsible to allow religious organizations using federal dollars to run secular Head Start programs which could discriminate against people of other faiths. The landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits many insidious forms of discrimination. It also permits religious organizations to hire people of their own faith for religious functions. It protects synagogues from discrimination suits for not hiring a Catholic priest to serve as a religious leader. This is as it should be. But Head Start is not a religious program—it is a secular education program. The faith of the teachers in Head Start is irrelevant to their jobs. It is a terrible lesson to teach thousands of children that discrimination against peoples of a differing religious faith is desirable. How are Head Start teachers supposed to teach their students that discrimination is wrong when a federal statute validates it? Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Woolsey/Edwards/Frank/Scott (VA)/Van Hollen amendment that would restore civil rights protections to Head Start teachers and oppose H.R. 2210.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act of 2003. Nationwide, Head Start programs are facing serious budget and service cutbacks in the comprehensive health, nutrition, social and edu-

cational services they offer. Most Head Start programs only have enough funds to operate a half-day schedule while most parents need full day care to accommodate their work schedules. Only three out of every five children eligible for services find a slot in a Head Start classroom. Only 62,000 infants and toddlers—just 3 percent of those eligible—are served in Early Head Start. Many centers will face possible closure within the next 5 years if President Bush's proposal is enacted.

Last year, federal funding for Head Start was almost cut by 10 percent. If that funding cut had been enacted, the Napa Solano Head Start Program, which serves children in some of the areas I represent, would have been forced to eliminate 100 slots for kids; would have had to close five classrooms; and would have had to fire 15 teachers. The Napa Solano Head Start program serves over a thousand infants, toddlers, and pre-school children in my district. These children come from families who live in poverty—where the parents' incomes are around \$18 thousand a year for a family of four. Without Head Start, these families would have almost no options.

Incredibly, Head Start is only receiving a paltry 1.6 percent increase in funding for 2004—an amount that barely covers inflation. Head Start administrators say they will be forced to make cuts. But Mr. Chairman, the cuts are not the biggest concern. The crux of this debate is that the White House and Republicans in Congress are trying to dismantle Head Start as we know it. The Republican bill being debated today would change Head Start from a program that provides federal grants directly to local community organizations into a state-controlled program.

I've always believed that education needs to be a national obsession and a local possession, and I am very concerned that taking money away from communities to run Head Start programs tailored to their needs would devastate children in our communities. States will be forced to use money for administrative expenses instead of spending it all on early education, healthcare, and nutrition services for our children. This plan may also allow states to use Head Start dollars for non-Head Start programs because the block grant money could be funneled to other programs to reduce state budget deficits. A state only needs an existing program providing pre-kindergarten in order to qualify for funds. Unfortunately, nothing in this bill requires the state to have a good pre-K program. There are no measures dictating quality, class size, or components of curriculum. Any program would suffice. Thus, a state with an untested, unproven program that is less rigorous and comprehensive than the Head Start program would still qualify for funds.

According to the National Head Start Association, only four states have services as comprehensive as Head Start, and none have been demonstrated to be of equal or better effectiveness. And, because of conditions put on states to receive Federal funds, many simply would not qualify. The net effect of this, Mr. Chairman, is that there will be fewer dollars to administer programs at the local level and our kids will be the ones who suffer. But that's not the only problem with this bill. It essentially guts performance standards, which will ultimately lead to dismantling Head Start. Current law requires the Department of Health and Human Services to thoroughly review all Head

Start grantees every 3 years. Head Start experts supervise and conduct the reviews. Under H.R. 2210, accountability and oversight will disappear because the reviews will be contracted out and there will be no initial evaluation of the quality of their state plan before funds are released. By determining priorities and making decisions at the state level instead of at the local level, the input of community leaders and parents would be eliminated.

I do support the underlying bill's provision requiring that 50 percent of Head Start teachers nationwide have a bachelor's degree by 2008, and that by 2005, all new teachers have at least an associate's degree. This would provide our children with better trained teachers and would provide our teachers with a way to earn a higher salary. Unfortunately, this bill provides no funding for teacher education or salaries. It actually cuts the amount of funds that may be reserved for teacher training and technical assistance to less than 2 percent. Head Start teacher salaries cannot compete with the benefit packages offered by county offices of education and school districts; therefore we train teachers and then lose them to the higher paying entities after they obtain their degrees. This bill does not provide enough money for teacher training and salaries and is thus another unfunded mandate.

Head Start is not just a literacy program or just a pre-kindergarten program. It is an anti-poverty program that seeks to build strong families and strong communities. Strengthening the family is the only way we can effect long-term, positive change in a child's life.

My colleague from California, GEORGE MILLER, has offered a substitute bill that will keep Head Start in place as we know it. The Miller substitute will strengthen school readiness, improve program quality, and expand access so more eligible kids are served—and provide enough funds to do so all while maintaining local control. The Democratic substitute includes assistance for children of migrant and seasonal farm workers, creates a new quality standard to develop school readiness, and focuses on pre-literacy, language and pre-math skills. While our children's performance standards in some content areas do need to be improved, dismantling the entire Head Start program, as the majority's proposal would do, is a huge leap backwards in the progress we've made for children in communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute and to preserve this great program.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am here today to oppose H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act of 2003. While I agree that every child deserves an early education—the “head start”—that they need to get a strong start in life, and to be safe and secure while their parents are at work, providing its funding in the form of block grants and moving the program from the Department of Health and Human Services would strip the program of its effectiveness.

Every day, three out of five preschoolers are in childcare and millions of older children are in after-school activities while their parents work. Head Start activities help to shape the way children think, learn, and behave for the rest of their lives, but little attention is being paid to the quality of those experiences.

While Head Start offers a strong educational foundation, the program teaches proper nutri-

tion and provides health mental health and mental health screenings and other important services that many of these children would not have if it were not for the Head Start program. This Nation's most comprehensive and successful pre-school program for low-income families, Head Start serves at least 1 million children each year.

As a member of this body, but more importantly as a grandmother I am troubled by the administration's plans to dismantle this proven program by turning it over to struggling states. I find this move to be incredulous and it baffles me as to why such a move would be necessary.

Disappointingly, last week the Rules Committee voted on a closed rule, which allowed no amendments to H.R. 2210. During the last week, colleagues on both sides of the aisle echoed the need for civility and respect in this institution in making this a better America. Republicans offer a rule that allows changes to their bill without allowing changes to the Democratic substitute, and also blocks consideration of critical Democratic amendments. I understand that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing everything to succeed the President's agenda, but I am shocked that they are doing it at the cost of innocent, deserving young children.

This administration is eager to prescribe unfunded mandates yet they offer no tangible means of implementing measures. An issue of great concern to many, which is not addressed in the current bill, is how Head Start programs will comply with new regulations issued by the Department of Health and Human Services (found at 45 CFR part 1310). These new regulations require significant changes to the manner in which these programs transport Head Start children to and from school and were issued without providing programs with any effective means to fund these changes.

As a result, numerous programs are having difficulty complying with the transportation regulations and particularly with the next deadline for implementation—January 20, 2004.

If an open rule were provided, I planned on offering an amendment. In order to address this problem, I recommend extending the deadline for Head Start programs to comply with the transportation requirements from January 2004 to 2006. During this time period, with the input from the local Head Start centers, I believe these regulations could be effectively revisited and modified.

The Head Start program not only involves the child but also recognizes the importance of the family. Head Start has included parents in both the child's education and their membership of in the Head Start Policy Council. Although this bill does focus on literacy, it abandons the comprehensive approach that is fundamental to Head Start's success. There are additional benefits of Head Start, including providing medical screenings, immunizations, nutritional assistance and referral service for families.

I have received numerous letters from teachers, parents, and other employees of the Sunnyview and Greater Head Start locations in my district of Dallas, Texas. Each one pleading for additional funding and urging the program to be kept in its current structure. One parent writes, “they teach them how to write, count, their ABCs, to draw, to be responsible. . . . Many families feel comfortable

with this program because they can come in and volunteer in the classes and see what the children are learning.”

Mr. Chairman, we must join hands and commit to work together in our country's educational struggle. A good education is the key component of success in the information age. That is why extending educational opportunity to every child in America has become my principal mission in life.

It is my earnest plea that my colleagues will join me and vote against H.R. 2210 in its current form. Head Start should not be moved to the Department of Education, nor should the funding ever be in question by having it succumb to the politics of block grants.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join my colleagues in speaking against the House leadership's ill-conceived plan to abandon our Nation's most vulnerable children, through their latest attempt to dismantle Head Start.

The re-authorization of Head Start grants Congress the express opportunity to honor and strengthen the original intent of this landmark anti-poverty legislation. Instead, we stand here today with legislation that directly assaults Head Start by weakening the academic, health, social and civil rights protections created by the Office of Economic Opportunity as part of President Johnson's War on Poverty social programs. Furthermore, we have once again been robbed of the opportunity to amend and improve H.R. 2210, through the leadership's restrictive, unfair rules denying us a voice in this process. It is unconscionable to play legislative games with policies that affect our most vulnerable citizens' lives.

First implemented in 1965, Head Start has been a beacon of hope for low-income families and has fostered their dreams for their children's successful futures. By offering comprehensive services, including early childhood development, educational support, social development, healthcare, dental services and parenting classes, we recognize the unique needs of disadvantaged children, and offer much needed assistance to level the playing field.

The leadership's so called reform legislation will only serve to undermine Head Start and the success of the children whose futures we debate here today. By block granting Head Start, states will be permitted to create their own achievement and readiness standards, while allowing them to gut the crucial programs currently used to achieve national objectives. Under H.R. 2210, class sizes can increase, programs can be shortened, and unproven curricula can be implemented.

Make no mistake about it, the existing Head Start guidelines value the communities that implement the program. Currently, funding is sent directly to the school systems, nonprofit organizations, and agencies that assist our Nation's low-income children. By block granting Head Start to states, funding will have to endure an extra level of bureaucracy, with an extra level of administrative costs, without the national accountability.

Our leadership's abysmal funding for Head Start is also indicative of the low priority it holds for this essential program. The bill's authorization does little more than cover inflationary costs by providing only 2.9 percent more than the fiscal year 2003 appropriation. In addition, while increasing teacher quality

degree requirements, a new unfunded federal mandate is enacted by its failure to provide the funds to achieve these measures. Even worse, H.R. 2210 cuts funding for training and technical assistance.

Jodi Ogden, the executive direct of Community Services of North East Texas, told me she is currently able to serve over 500 children in 10 Head Start centers under her purview. Weeks before the fall school year has even begun, five of these centers have wait lists for needy children. These children should not have to be waitlisted for essential services. We should do better by them today.

Finally, we should be ashamed that this Head Start program, a hallmark of federal social assistance, will allow nationwide discrimination under the new reauthorization legislation. Current law allows faith-based organizations to participate in the Head Start program, as long as they do so fairly. However, under the reauthorization these organizations will be permitted to use discriminatory hiring practices to favor job applicants of certain faiths over others. This is not how our scarce federal tax dollars should be used. It is sadly ironic that a program intended to create equity would permit such an inequitable hiring practice.

Like many of my colleagues, I have been gratified by the opportunity to visit with those at the front lines that are providing Head Start services to our disadvantaged children. They know the benefits of Head Start. They see how families are helped by comprehensive Head Start services. They know that we must augment, not annihilate the valued tenets of the Head Start program. Any reform to essential programs must be thoughtful, balanced, and reflect our citizens' most essential needs for successful lives. As Karen Swenson, executive director of Greater East Texas Community Action, wrote to me about this legislation, "I do not want children to suffer just because of the idea of change."

Mr. Chairman, this terrible legislation will cause children to suffer. Knowing this, I am forced to vote against it today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss a section of H.R. 2210 which is critical to my district. Section 640(a)(2) of the Head Start Act directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to reserve 13 percent of the amount appropriated for Head Start to be divided between Indian Head Start programs, services for children with disabilities, migrant and seasonal Head Start programs, and American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Marianas, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Chairman, American Samoa has a population of almost 60,000. Six out of every 10 residents in American Samoa live below the poverty level and more than 3,000 children qualify for Head Start services. American Samoa currently provides Head Start services for 1,532 children. American Samoa also has the highest enrollment of any other Pacific island group.

Given this, I am concerned about the lack of funding American Samoa is receiving and the allocation process being utilized by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. It was my intent to offer an amendment which would direct the Secretary to conduct a full review of how to more equitably distribute Head Start funding among Indian Head Start programs, services for children with disabilities, migrant and seasonal Head Start programs, and

American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Marianas, and the Virgin Islands, and it is my hope that language will be inserted into the conference report which will direct the Secretary to review the formula being utilized. If this is not possible, then I am hopeful that this statement will establish that it is the intent of Congress for the allocation process to be immediately reviewed.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I don't understand why the administration wants to fix a program that's not broken.

Head Start is one Federal program that works and gives parents a voice in how to best meet their children's educational needs.

I have visited a number of Head Start classrooms, and I have seen firsthand that Head Start is working well for "at-risk" preschoolers and their families.

I oppose this bill to recast Head Start because it would disrupt Head Start's comprehensive mission of education, health and nutrition. Comprehensive services, along with parental involvement, are the foundation that make Head Start successful.

This bill diverts funds from local programs to the States, while relieving States of the responsibility to meet current performance standards.

Early childhood experts agree that the proposed changes would be devastating for Head Start and the children and families it serves. The last thing Congress should do is experiment with a successful program.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Head Start and against H.R. 2210, the so-called "School Readiness act of 2003". The only thing this bill "readies," is the dismantling of the successful, time-tested Head Start program. I am an avid supporter of Head Start and have been since its beginning in 1965 when I taught Head Start classes. The Head Start program was founded on the basic principle that children cannot learn when they are hungry or sick or when their parents are not actively involved in their lives. Currently, this program serves only 60 percent of eligible pre-schoolers, 3 percent of eligible infants and toddlers, and 19 percent of migrant and seasonal farm workers. Congress should be working to strengthen the program and expand the ability of low-income families to access its benefits. Instead, this bill does not even authorize enough funds for the program to cover the cost of inflation.

There is a major difference between what H.R. 2210 claims to do and what it actually does. H.R. 2210 promises quality improvements by increasing teacher credential requirements, but fails to provide any funds to increase teacher salary or assist teachers in obtaining education. Head Start teachers earn half of the average salary for kindergarten teachers—this bill allows only for a modest raise. The bill increases teacher credential requirements—requiring 50 percent of Head Start teachers to have a B.A. by 2008—while decreasing the amount of funds that are spent on training and technical assistance.

Further placing the future of Head Start at risk, this bill would allow eight states to replace their successful Head Start programs with other unproven pre-school programs. At a time when our states are facing severe budget crises, this bill would turn complete control of the program over to the states. It allows states

to set their own quality standards and to determine whether or not they meet those standards. It guts that Head Start program—allowing increases in class size, unproven curricula, and shorter programs that do not provide the crucial nutrition, health, and social services children need to succeed.

More insidious than the full-frontal attack H.R. 2210 wages on Head Start is the attack it wages on civil rights. H.R. 2210 repeals long-standing civil rights protections to allow faith-based organizations to discriminate on the basis of religion. The bill allows these organizations to use Federal dollars to practice discriminatory hiring policies. This is an assault on two of our Nation's most fundamental principles: the separation of church and state and equal protection under the law. The Federal Government should never be in the business of permitting discrimination nor should it break down the historic separation of church and state.

We must stand up for our nations neediest. Head Start provides children in difficult, often impoverished, situations the developmental tools needed to give them a head start in their lives—an equal starting place in life so they can catch up to their more fortunate peers. Children, and their families, cannot afford the loss of any of those services. We must reject H.R. 2210.

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Head Start, the most successful program our country has in the war against poverty. The Head Start program gives children the tools they need to break the cycle of poverty. As the philosopher, Plato, once noted, "The direction in which education starts a man will determine this future life."

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Congressman JOHN LEWIS, A. Philip Randolph, and hundreds of thousands of others marched on Washington 40 years ago to demand that the President and Congress give every man, woman, and child an equal opportunity to be the best we can be. That opportunity can only come about when every child has equal access to education.

Indeed, providing a firm foundation for the education of our children is the most important investment we as a nation can make in our future. When President Lyndon B. Johnson convinced Congress to put this program in place almost 40 years ago, we began a war on poverty that has benefited this country in countless ways.

Poverty in America weakens our greatest resource by sapping our children of their hope that they can realize their dreams. These children can, and do, realize their dreams when they take part in Head Start.

Head Start is not a simple daycare program it focuses on the whole child. These children receive balanced, nutritional meals. They also receive basic health care, including dental, medical and vision screenings and vaccinations. Head Start children not only learn their colors, they are enveloped in nurturing relationships, and by age four or five come to school ready to learn. Head Start focuses on the whole child, and Head Start works.

It's a fact that Head Start children are:

Less likely to be held back in school.

Less likely to be placed in special education classes.

More likely to succeed in school.

More likely to graduate.

More likely to be rated as behaving well in class and being better adjusted in school.

And five times less likely to end up in jail as adults.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring up a sad state of affairs in America today: Right now, there are over 2 million Americans in prison.

The evidence shows that we can actually reduce incarcerations if we act early enough because children who participate in Head Start are five times less likely to end up in jail. There is no disagreement about this fact: Head Start reduces the likelihood that a child will become one of those two million in jail.

Unfortunately, Head Start serves fewer than 1 million children: only helping 1 out of 5 needy children in Georgia and across the Nation. Even though the money we put into this program now will save us much more in the long run by, among other things, reducing the amounts we need to spend on prisons. Head Start is quite simply the best investment opportunity we can offer our constituents for their tax dollars. We are being penny wise and pound foolish.

Despite this huge investment opportunity, taxpayers are currently supporting twice as many prisoners as Head Start students. The administration does not have its priorities straight. Just look at the cost: We spent less than \$7 billion on Head Start this year, while we spend over \$74 billion a year on the prison system. It costs only \$18 a day to place a child into Head Start, and over \$50 a day to keep someone incarcerated in jail. This is not fuzzy math—it is crystal clear. We can save money if we realign our priorities. We must fully fund with Head Start to guarantee that we leave no child behind.

This is not just any "program," it is an incredible investment in our future. Head Start takes our poorest children and cures their toothaches, fills their stomachs, and gives them eyeglasses. With that vision, children are able to see far beyond the blackboard. Full funding of Head Start would enable us to fulfill our Nation's promise to give everyone an equal opportunity in life. In short, Head Start gives children a reason to hope, and the ability to succeed.

And isn't that what our Nation is all about? The promise that everyone, regardless of their background, can pursue their own happiness and achieve their own dreams. Every day people come to America in the hope that their children will have better opportunities than they did. Head Start is a critical part of our commitment to fulfill this promise. It is our Nation's attempt to be sure that every child gets to take advantage of an education. A good education represents everyone's best hope of realizing the American dream. Head Start is our program, painstakingly designed over 35 years, to "aid participating children in attaining their full potential." This bill removes this language, but this ideal is still a part of Head Start.

Do we want children who get a head start to come to school ready to learn, graduate and become productive members of our society, or do we want to watch our prison population continue to explode and scratch our heads, wondering what went so wrong?

Today we have the capability to reduce the number of Americans in prison, to reduce the burden on taxpayers and at the same time give millions more children a reason to hope. Head Start is the smartest investment we can make in our future. For just \$12.5 billion over the next 5 years, we can set every child on

the road with their best foot forward and show them a world of possibilities.

We are spending \$1 billion a week in Iraq. Should we do less for the children of America?

If some citizens don't succeed, it may not be our fault, but if we fail to show them how to succeed in the first place, we have only ourselves to blame.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have always stood by the saying that "education is the great equalizer". Yet, in this bill, we are allowing education to be easily accessible to the haves and more difficult to obtain for our Nation's have-nots. This attitude toward education is a giant step backwards to 40 years ago. Low-income children, children with disabilities and individuals who want to go to college are the ones that are being hurt substantially in this bill.

Although, the 2004 budget resolution was to provide the Department of Education with a \$3 billion increase, this bill only allows for a \$2.3 billion increase over Fiscal Year 2003. The Title I program is one that is hit the heaviest. Title I schools have the least experienced teachers, less competitive teacher salaries, higher teacher turnover, a less rigorous curriculum, the least amount of resources and students with greater academic deficits, which all adds up to these schools being less able to meet the No Child Left Behind Act's mandates. Instead of providing a substantial increase to offset the disadvantage these schools are already facing, this bill only provides a \$666 million increase, compared to the \$1 billion in the 2004 budget resolution.

On April 30, this House passed the IDEA reauthorization bill with the promise attached from the 2004 budget resolution to provide a \$2.2 billion increase over the current level. Yet, this bill falls \$1.2 billion short of that promise. As deficit stricken states continue to cut from their school funding, schools will have to continue to absorb the costs of providing special education for nearly 6.7 million school children as well as even cut other school programs or hope for a local referendum to pass to offset the shortfall.

A college graduate can expect to earn 80 percent more than a high school graduate, or \$1 million over the course of a lifetime. This obviously allows for an individual to have a better quality of life by having a higher skilled job, better health insurance, pension and the ability to provide a better life for their children. Yet, this bill in essence abandons higher education federal student aid. All the federal student aid programs: Pell Grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), Federal Work Study, Perkins Loan Program, LEAP, and Graduate Education are level funded. This may not sound too bad but for example the Pell Grants maximum award was kept at \$4,050 which will only cover 38 percent or less of expenses in a 4-year public college compared to 84 percent of expenses covered by Pell Grants in 1975, when the program originated. Unfortunately, the Federal Government is abandoning higher education while the states suffer record breaking deficits. These simultaneous occurrences result in cuts in grant aid to students facing rising cost in higher education. Loyola University Chicago lost \$1 million in state grant aid for needy students due to Illinois \$5 billion deficit. How much more will their students lose without any increases to the federal student aid programs?

Mr. Chairman, If we pass this bill, we are sending the message that we do not care enough about all of our nation's children and young people. We need to ensure that we are helping those who are in most need of help—low-income children, children with disabilities, and those who have the desire to continue their education but who just can not afford to go without assistance of state and federal aid. Our message needs to be clear. But most importantly, our message needs to be more than just words. Let's see increases in funding where they are most needed.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2201, a bill that will dismantle the successful Head Start program. I am troubled that the Republican majority is trying to pass a bill that will hurt America's children under the guise of "reform."

The current Head Start program provides low-income children across the Nation with cost-free, high-quality early education. In my district, and other traditionally underserved communities, Head Start not only helps ensure the academic success of our children, but also provides a holistic approach to school readiness that includes individualized services in the areas of early childhood development, parental involvement, nutrition, and medical, dental, and mental health. This multi-pronged approach recognizes the fact that children need to be healthy in order to facilitate learning. Under the Republican plan, all these services are in jeopardy because guaranteed comprehensive services are made optional.

Nationally, Head Start serves more than 900,000 children, nearly a third of whom are Latino. Yet, this bill fails to provide resources for programs important to Latino and other immigrant children. For example, this bill does not include one new cent to train teachers to help limited English proficient students and provides no new resources for the more than 130,000 children eligible for the Migrant and Seasonal Head Start program.

Mr. Chairman, in closing the Republican bill not only fails to protect important provisions of one of the most successful Federal programs in the history of our country, but by all accounts, ends a program that has given countless children the opportunity to reach their full potential.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat the flawed Republican bill, known as the School Readiness Act, and to pass the Democratic substitute that will truly strengthen our children's pre-literacy, language and pre-math skills, without sacrificing essential comprehensive health and family services. The Democratic substitute, in every way, helps to ensure that every child in the United States is given all the tools needed to succeed in school.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the School Readiness Act, H.R. 2210, and I implore my colleagues to vote against it as this bill is a blatant attempt to dismantle the Head Start program.

Mr. Chairman, Head Start is a very successful Federal program run at the local level. As we are all well aware the program provides education, health care, nutrition and parent involvement programs to nearly 1 million low-income preschool children and their families. The language in the bill we are considering right now will weaken Head Start and jeopardize the comprehensive educational and social services Head Start now provides to hundreds of thousands of families.

On July 15, I released a report, prepared at my request by the House Government Reform Committee, entitled "Proposed Overhaul of Head Start Could Affect Thousands of Children in Maryland's 7th Congressional District." If the administration's changes are implemented in Maryland, the report indicates that almost 3,000 children in Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Howard County would be adversely affected in the following way:

2,742 children would not be guaranteed dental care;

2,433 families may be left out of participating in their child's education;

472 children may not receive mental health care that they currently get in Head Start;

444 children would be at risk for not getting treatment for asthma, anemia and vision problems; and

341 children could possibly lose guaranteed access to disability services.

What we may not be aware of is that by block granting, we are cutting the number of children currently served and leaving millions of eligible low-income children without the needed resources in advance is not wise. Many Head Start advocates are concerned that states that accept block grants will weaken educational standards. And let me tell you how, because I think it is a nuance that many of my compassionate conservative colleagues miss. This bill allows a demonstration project in eight states which essentially allows these States to take their Head Start monies and use them as they see fit for early childhood education programs. In a phrase blockgranting. We know block granting does not work because in tough economic times with a record \$544 billion national deficit, states make tough budget choices and programs like Head Start get shortchanged. Block grants are a veiled way to kill the Head Start program as we know it. Blockgranting makes it easier to cut programs and as a result more programs begin to dwindle. Eventually, Head Start will not exist. The comprehensive nature of the program supports the notion that success inside the classroom requires that children be physically and mentally healthy, with a stable home life.

Head Start works and is highly successful. The broad nature of the program has resulted in the following accomplishments:

Head Start has proven to narrow the gap between disadvantaged children and other children in vocabulary skills, writing and social behavior;

Children who participate in Head Start programs are less likely to repeat a grade, require special education or be convicted of a crime;

The program's graduates show higher IQ gains compared to low-income children who have not attended Head Start;

And finally, children who attend Head Start are more likely to graduate from high school, and college.

But one does not have to read this report to realize the positive impact Head Start can make on a child.

Any of my colleagues who questions the positive difference that Head Start can make should listen to my constituent, Ms. Portia DeShields.

When her son Marcus was three, Ms. DeShields realized that he was struggling with a speech and language disability. Recalling how she had gained from her childhood par-

ticipation in Head Start, Ms. DeShields and her husband enrolled Marcus in a Head Start program sponsored by Baltimore's Union Baptist Church.

Beginning in September of last year, a Head Start speech pathologist worked with Marcus two or three times each week. A mental health specialist helped Marcus learn how to control his anger, and "positive parenting" classes taught his parents how to better meet his needs.

Today, at age 4, Marcus's speech and language skills have improved to the point where he is functioning at near-kindergarten level.

Head Start is working for Marcus and nearly 1 million other children.

As such, I urge my colleagues to reject the underlying bill and support the Democratic substitute that builds on the proven success of Head Start by strengthening school readiness, improving program quality and accountability, and expanding access so more eligible children. The Democratic substitute accomplishes this while maintaining local control and high performance standards in its programming.

That is why the Democratic Substitute is supported by many organizations including the National Head Start Association, the National Education Association, the Children's Defense Fund, the American Federation of Teachers, the ACLU, and the National League of Cities.

H.R. 2210 is opposed by these same groups because these groups understand that block grants put this important program in a perilous position. But not only that, this bill does not improve Head Start—if it's not broken, don't tinker with it to break it!

Mr. Chairman, we cannot shortchange the early education of millions of children because to do so would be to shortchange the rest of their lives. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, compassionate conservatives too, to put children first and to make good on the promise that "no child be left behind."

This bad bill puts the future of these children in jeopardy. H.R. 2210 dismantles over 38 years of bipartisan support for this critical early education program. Reject the H.R. 2210 and support the Democratic substitute. Only by supporting the Democratic substitute will children indeed have a head start.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2210. My opposition is based on the following reasons. The bill will make it legal for faith-based institutions that receive Federal funds and run Head Start programs to discriminate in their hiring practices. I contend that our focus should be on continuing to fund a wonderful pre-school educational program. Unfortunately, this bill undermines current anti-discrimination laws, and will allow institutions to establish a litmus test in their hiring programs. Let me make it clear, I respect and admire the tremendous work performed by faith-based organizations. However, the Head Start Program is being used as a political vehicle to institutionalize discrimination in an early learning environment.

We all believe in educating our youth in their embryonic learning states. I am struck though by the rhetoric from my majority colleagues that they are motivated to help disadvantaged students. That is a laudable goal, but the goal can be achieved through the current Head Start program. I am struck by the hypocrisy of the bill before us. The majority abhors affirmative action, yet they seek legal

protection to discriminate based on religion. They allege that affirmative action is discriminatory. Yet they seek to sanction religious-based discrimination through the pre-school educational process. The logic and the method are flawed.

I also oppose this bill because it purports to administer Head Start through a state block grant. States can also use block grant money to supplant Federal funds, in addition to not requiring performance standards. I question the wisdom of relying on states to use their discretion in this manner. Increasingly, we have witnessed the administration promote policies that the House and the Senate pass as laws that re-direct power to the states. The majority recipe has produced catastrophic results, the most glaring example is the No Child Left Behind Act. The majority promised wholesale reform, and it is delivering widespread misery. If H.R. 2210 is enacted, more misery is surely on the way for America's poor and disadvantaged children. I urge my colleagues to reject the false premises put forward by the proponents of H.R. 2210, and to embrace the Woolsey amendment that restores civil rights to Head Start teachers, and the Miller substitute amendment that retains Federal-to-local funding and which strikes hiring discrimination.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the School Readiness Act of 2003, which will reauthorize the Head Start program.

I strongly support Head Start programs because they provide low-income preschool-aged children a comprehensive array of services such as child development, education, health, nutritional, social and other activities which help them receive greater advantages in life.

Some of these services include health screenings and services. Statistics have shown that children who receive crucial services such as dental and eye care, or a hot breakfast every morning, have increased school readiness.

In my congressional district, one of the most successful Head Start programs is the Alexandria Head Start. This is a collaboration among the Campagna Center, the city of Alexandria, and the Alexandria City Public Schools formed 35 years ago.

AHS serve 253 Head Start children, and because of a wonderful group of dedicated educators, parents and teachers, these children have truly been given a "head start."

While many of my low-income constituents in the city of Alexandria are served by Head Start, I am concerned with the devastating statistic that 40 percent of eligible children nationwide will continue to be underserved under H.R. 2210.

In fact, after a COLA adjustment for staff salaries and increased rent costs, H.R. 2210 just barely covers inflation and allows almost no program expansion. Due to "insufficient funds," a large number of children who need these services will be unable to obtain them.

Let's look at the facts right now. The President's budget request for fiscal year 2004 is \$7.2 billion below the level needed to maintain current services for domestic priorities.

Unfortunately with slashes in domestic discretionary spending coupled with massive tax cuts, the result has been fiscal crises at the State and Federal levels, which have translated into the underfunding of critical programs and services such as affordable housing, Medicare and Head Start.

Due to this stark economic climate, supporters of H.R. 2210 want to block-grant Head Start to eight States whose preschool programs are untested and unproven.

A year and a half ago, we all celebrated when the President Bush signed into law, the No Child Left Behind legislation, which was touted as the plan to bring stronger accountability and stronger standards to our Nation's schools.

H.R. 2210 will in fact do the exact opposite of NCLB, by allowing States that have not demonstrated expertise or the commitment to providing quality service to these children, to be eligible for this block grant.

Where are the standards? This block-grant will allow States to strip the Head Start program of the qualified services that it provides to children nationwide, and more importantly, that they and their families rely on. This was not what President Johnson intended when he founded this vital program.

It was once said that "Education is the great equalizer in a democratic society, and if people are not given access to a quality education, then what we are doing is creating an underclass of people who will ultimately challenge our very way of life."

This statement has never been more true than today. The Head Start program was designed to give preschoolers a quality education while also ensuring that their social and physical needs were met, which helps put them on the path to success.

Yet, the bill before us today will weaken and underfund the Head Start program while continuing to leave 40 percent of eligible children unserved.

Instead, I ask all my colleagues to support the Miller amendment which will continue to build upon the successes of the Head Start program while striving to ensure that all eligible children in our country are served by Head Start and obtain the services that they need to receive a true "head start" in life.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act.

Last year, President Bush proposed strengthening Head Start to help the program produce more kindergarten-ready children. Research shows that early learning skills such as letter, number, shape and color recognition are crucial to a child's future success in school. In fact, technological advances have made it possible to predict how well a child will read in the 10th grade based on his or her knowledge of the alphabet in kindergarten. Unfortunately, Head Start graduates consistently score in the lowest 25 percent in key early knowledge areas.

More than 1,000 children attend Head Start in Douglas County, NE. Last November, the Child and Family Development Corporation that runs the program failed its Federal review. Government inspectors cited mismanagement, health and safety concerns, and a lack of program goals. This situation is a perfect example of why we need greater accountability in Head Start programs. The children who graduated from this failed program entered school at a disadvantage. We must demand better for these children. We must give them the skills they need to overcome poverty and low expectations.

The Omaha Public School District and a charitable foundation tried to partner Head Start with a successful, private preschool pro-

gram last year. Almost a hundred additional low-income children could have been helped. Unfortunately, Head Start backed out at the last minute. Construction had already begun on the new \$6 million preschool building. From conversations with involved parties, I am convinced this decision was made in the interest of self-preservation rather than concern for disadvantaged children. Head Start pulled out to hide the failures of their program from parents, educators, and government officials. At least one member of the Head Start parents advisory board resigned in protest over this debacle.

H.R. 2210 is necessary to put the future of our children before the small-mindedness of entrenched bureaucrats. Partnerships between public schools, private foundations and Head Start programs are essential. Chicago and Atlanta have successfully implemented this model to benefit children, and another partnership is being created in Milwaukee. The Federal Government should not be allowed to stand in the way of such caring community partnerships to rescue disadvantaged children from hopeless futures. This is a travesty and an immeasurable disservice to the next generation.

It is crucial that school districts be involved in preparing low-income children for academic success. These children already face tremendous obstacles. Research conducted by D.E. Caspar highlights the differences between environments in which children from poor, middle-class and affluent families grow up. For example, affluent children are exposed to 45 million words before kindergarten; working-class children 26 million; and children in poverty only 13 million words.

These conditions affect a child's language development and word comprehension, skills necessary for learning to read. President Bush has called reading "the new civil right." We now know that children who are reading at grade-level by the third grade have a greater chance for success throughout their school years.

The disparity between low-income and affluent children is even more obvious in the amount of positive reinforcement they receive. Children from affluent families are given 32 positive affirmations an hour; working class children 12 per hour, and poor children only 5. Without assistance from caring educators in the community, disadvantaged children will not have the social, emotional or academic skills to succeed in school and life. We must allow States and local school districts the chance to partner with Head Start and provide these children with quality early education programs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 2210 to give disadvantaged children a real head start in life.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the House report 108-232. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2210

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "School Readiness Act of 2003".

TITLE I—HEAD START REAUTHORIZATION AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

Section 636 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 636. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"It is the purpose of this subchapter to promote school readiness by enhancing the development of low-income children, through educational instruction in prereading skills, premathematics skills, and language, and through the provision to low-income children and their families of health, educational, nutritional, social and other services that are determined, based on family needs assessments, to be necessary."

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

Section 637 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9832) is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (17) by striking ", but for fiscal years" and all that follows down to the period.

(2) By adding the following at the end thereof:

"(18) The term 'eligible entities' means an institution of higher education or other agency with expertise in delivering training in early childhood development, family support, and other assistance designed to improve the quality of early childhood education programs.

"(19) The term 'homeless children' has the meaning given such term in subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11431 et seq.)."

SEC. 103. AUTHORIZATION.

Section 639 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9834) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 639. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this subchapter \$6,870,000,000 for the fiscal year 2004, \$6,988,750,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$7,106,500,000 for fiscal year 2006, \$7,245,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, and \$7,427,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

"(b) SPECIFIC PROGRAMS.—From the amount appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make available not more than \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2005 through 2008 to carry out such other research, demonstration, and evaluation activities, including longitudinal studies, under section 649.

"(1) not more than \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to carry out impact studies under section 649(g); and

"(2) not more than \$13,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2008, to carry out other research, demonstration, and evaluation activities, including longitudinal studies, under section 649.

"(c) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to assist participating States with the administrative expenses associated with implementing a program under section 643A."

SEC. 104. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.

Section 640 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9835) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(2):

(A) By striking "1998" in subparagraph (A) and inserting "2003".

(B) By amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) payments, subject to paragraph (7) to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands of the United States;”.

(2) By striking the last sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(3)(A) By amending subsection (a)(2)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) training and technical assistance activities that are sufficient to meet the needs associated with program expansion and to foster program and management improvement as described in section 648 of this subchapter, in an amount for each fiscal year which is equal to one percent of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year, of which—

“(i) not less than 50 percent shall be made available to local Head Start agencies to comply with the standards described in section 641A(a)(1), of which not less than 50 percent shall be used to comply with the standards described in section 641A(a)(1)(B) and for the uses described in clauses (iii), (iv), and (vii) of subsection (a)(3)(B);

“(ii) not less than 30 percent shall be made available to support a State system of early childhood education training and technical assistance;

“(iii) not less than 20 percent shall be made available to the Secretary to assist local programs in meeting the standards described in section 641A(a)(1); and

“(iv) not less than \$3,000,000 of the amount in clause (iii) appropriated for such fiscal year shall be made available to carry out activities described in section 648(c)(4);”.

(B) By inserting the following at the end of subsection (a)(2):

“Of an additional one percent of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year, the Secretary shall use not less than 25 percent of such funds to fund the expansion of services to migrant and seasonal Head Start children. If sufficient migrant and seasonal eligible children are not available to use such funds, then enrollment priority shall be given to other disadvantaged populations referred to in subparagraph (A). Not less than 60 percent of such one percent amount shall be used to fund quality improvement activities as described in sec 640(a)(3)(B) and (C)”.

(4) In subsection (a)(3)(A) by inserting at the end thereof:

“(iii) After the reservation of amounts under paragraph (2) and the 60 percent amount referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, a portion of the remaining funds shall be made available for quality to expand services to underserved populations, such as children receiving services under the Early Head Start and Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs.”.

(5) In subsection (a)(3)(A)(i)(I) by striking “1999” and all that follows down to the semicolon and inserting “2004 through 2008”.

(6) By amending subsection (a)(3)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) Funds reserved under this paragraph (referred to in this paragraph as ‘quality improvement funds’) shall be used to accomplish any or all of the following goals:

“(i) Ensuring that Head Start programs meet or exceed standards pursuant to section 641A(a)(1).

“(ii) Ensuring that such programs have adequate numbers of qualified staff, and that such staff is furnished adequate training, including developing skills to promote the development of language skills, premathematic skills, and prereading in young children and in working with children with non-English language background, children referred by child welfare services, and children with disabilities, when appropriate.

“(iii) Developing and financing the salary scales described under section 644(a) and section 653, in order to ensure that salary levels

and benefits are adequate to attract and retain qualified staff for such programs.

“(iv) Using salary increases to improve staff qualifications, and to assist with the implementation of programs specifically designed to enable lead instructors to become more effective educators, for the staff of Head Start programs, and to encourage the staff to continually improve their skills and expertise by informing the staff of the availability of Federal and State incentive and loan forgiveness programs for professional development.

“(v) Improving community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments for such programs and collaboration efforts for such programs, including collaborations to increase program participation by underserved populations of eligible children.

“(vi) Ensuring that the physical environments of Head Start programs are conducive to providing effective program services to children and families, and are accessible to children with disabilities and their parents.

“(vii) Ensuring that such programs have qualified staff that can promote language skills and literacy growth of children and that can provide children with a variety of skills that have been identified, through scientifically based reading research, as predictive of later reading achievement.

“(viii) Providing assistance to complete post-secondary course work needed to attain baccalaureate degrees in early childhood education.

“(ix) Making such other improvements in the quality of such programs as the Secretary may designate.

“(x) To promote the regular attendance and stability of highly mobile children, including migrant and homeless children.”.

(7) By amending subsection (a)(3)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) Quality improvement funds shall be used to carry out any or all of the following activities:

“(i)(I) Not less than one-half of the amount reserved under this paragraph, to improve the compensation (including benefits) of classroom teachers and other staff of Head Start agencies providing instructional services and thereby enhancing recruitment and retention of qualified staff, including recruitment and retention pursuant to achieving the requirements set forth in section 648A(a). The expenditure of funds under this clause shall be subject to section 653. Salary increases, in excess of cost-of-living allowance, provided with such funds shall be subject to the specific standards governing salaries and salary increases established pursuant to section 644(a).

“(II) If a Head Start agency certifies to the Secretary for such fiscal year that part of the funds set aside under subclause (I) to improve wages cannot be expended by such agency to improve wages because of the operation of section 653, then such agency may expend such part for any of the uses specified in this subparagraph (other than wages).

“(III) From the remainder of the amount reserved under this paragraph (after the Secretary carries out subclause (I)), the Secretary shall carry out any or all of the activities described in clauses (ii) through (vii), placing the highest priority on the activities described in clause (ii).

“(ii) To train classroom teachers and other staff to meet the education standards described in section 641A(a)(1)(B), through activities—

“(I) to promote children’s language and prereading growth, through techniques identified through scientifically based reading research;

“(II) to promote the acquisition of the English language for non-English background children and families;

“(III) to foster children’s school readiness skills through activities described in section 648A(a)(1); and

“(IV) to educate and provide training necessary to improve the qualifications particularly with respect to such assistance to enable more instructors to meet the degree requirements under section 648A(a)(2)(A) and to support staff training, child counseling, and other services necessary to address the problems of children participating in Head Start programs, including children from dysfunctional families, children who experience chronic violence in their communities, and children who experience substance abuse in their families.

“(iii) To employ additional Head Start staff, including staff necessary to reduce the child-staff ratio lead instructors who meet the qualifications of section 648A(a) and staff necessary to coordinate a Head Start program with other services available to children participating in such program and to their families.

“(iv) To pay costs incurred by Head Start agencies to purchase insurance (other than employee benefits) and thereby maintain or expand Head Start services.

“(v) To supplement amounts provided under paragraph (2)(C) to provide training necessary to improve the qualifications of the staff of the Head Start agencies, and to support staff training, child counseling, and other services necessary to address the problems of children participating in Head Start programs, including children from dysfunctional families, children who experience chronic violence in their communities, and children who experience substance abuse in their families.

“(vi) To conduct outreach to homeless families in an effort to increase the program participation of eligible homeless children.

“(vii) Such other activities as the Secretary may designate.

“(viii) To conduct outreach to migrant and seasonal farm-working families and families with children with a limited English proficiency.”.

(8) In subsection (a)(4) by striking “1998” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “2003”.

(9) In subsection (a)(5)(B)—

(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by inserting “early childhood education” after “regarding”.

(10) By amending subsection (a)(5)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) In order to improve results for children, a State that receives a grant under subparagraph (B) shall—

“(i) appoint an individual to serve as the State Director of Collaboration between—

“(I) the appropriate regional office of the Administration for Children and Families;

“(II) the State educational agency;

“(III) the State Department of Health and Human Services;

“(IV) the State agency that oversees child care;

“(V) the State agency that assists children with developmental disabilities;

“(VI) the State Head Start Association;

“(VII) the State network of child care resource and referral agencies;

“(VIII) local educational agencies;

“(IX) community-based and faith-based organizations;

“(X) State representatives of migrant and seasonal Head Start programs;

“(XI) State representatives of Indian Head Start programs;

“(XII) State and local providers of early childhood education and child care; and

“(XIII) other entities carrying out programs serving low-income children and families in the State;

“(ii) ensure that the State Director of Collaboration holds a position with sufficient authority and access to ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) is effective and involves a range of State agencies;

“(iii) involve the entities described in section clause (i) to develop a strategic plan for the coordinated outreach to identify eligible children and implementation strategies based on a needs assessment conducted by the Office of the State Director of Collaboration which shall include an assessment of the availability of high quality prekindergarten services for low-income children in the State. Such assessment shall be completed within one year after the date of enactment of the ‘School Readiness Act of 2003’ and be updated on an annual basis and shall be made available to the general public within the State;

“(iv) ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) involves coordination of Head Start services with health care, welfare, child care, child protective services, education, and community service activities, family literacy services, activities relating to children with disabilities (including coordination of services with those State officials who are responsible for administering part C and section 619 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), and services for homeless children (including coordination of services with the Office of Coordinator for Education of Homeless Children and Youth designated under section 722 (g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001;

“(v) consult with the chief State school officer, local educational agencies, and representatives of local Head Start agencies and providers of early childhood education and care in unified planning regarding early care and education services at both the State and local levels, including collaborative efforts to develop school readiness standards; and

“(vi) consult with the chief State school officer, local educational agencies, State child care administrators, State human services administrators, representatives of local resource and referral agencies, local early childhood councils, providers of early childhood education and care and other relevant State and local agencies, and representatives of the State Head Start Associations to plan for the provision of full-working-day, full calendar year early care and education services for children.”

(11) By amending clause (i) of subsection (a)(5)(D) by inserting “and providers of services supporting early childhood education and child care” after “Associations”.

(12) By amending subsection (a)(6)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) From amounts reserved and allotted pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (4), the Secretary shall use, for grants for programs described in section 645A(a) of this subchapter, a portion of the combined total of such amounts equal to at least 10 percent for fiscal years 2004 through 2008, of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 639(a), except as provided in subparagraph (B).”

(13) By inserting the following before the period at the end of subsection (f): “, including models that leverage the existing capacity and capabilities of the delivery system of early childhood education and child care”.

(14) By inserting the following after “manner that will” in subsection (g)(2)(G): “leverage the existing delivery systems of such services and”.

(15) By amending subsection (g)(2)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) the extent to which the applicant has undertaken community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments involving other

community organizations and public agencies serving children and families (including organizations and agencies providing family support services and protective services to children and families, and organizations serving families in whose homes English is not the language customarily spoken), and organizations and public entities serving children with disabilities and homeless children (including the local educational agency liaison designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001);”.

(16) By inserting in subsection (g)(2)(H) after “serving the community involved” the following: “, including the liaison designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001.”.

(17) By adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

“(m) ENROLLMENT OF HOMELESS CHILDREN.—The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe policies and procedures to remove barriers to the enrollment and participation of eligible homeless children in Head Start programs. Such regulations shall require Head Start agencies to:

“(1) implement policies and procedures to ensure that eligible homeless children are identified and prioritized for enrollment,

“(2) allow homeless families to apply to, enroll in and attend Head Start programs while required documents, such as proof of residency, immunization and other medical records, birth certificates and other documents, are obtained within a reasonable time frame, and

“(3) coordinate individual Head Start centers and programs with efforts to implement Subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

“(n) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require a State to establish a program of early education for children in the State, to require any child to participate in a program of early education, to attend school, or to participate in any initial screening prior to participation in such program, except as provided under section 612(a)(3), (consistent with section 614(a)(1)(C)), of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

“(o) MATERIALS.—All curricula and instructional materials funded under this subchapter shall be scientifically based and age appropriate. Parents shall have the ability to inspect, upon request, any curricula or instructional materials.”.

SEC. 105. DESIGNATION OF AGENCIES.

Section 641 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9836) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting after “community” in the first place it appears “, including a community-based or faith-based organization”;

(B) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(D) by adding the following at the end thereof:

“(2) In order to be designated as a Head Start agency and to receive a grant under this subchapter, a grantee shall establish grantee-determined goals for improving the school readiness of children participating in a program under this subchapter, which shall include goals for—

“(A) educational instruction in prereading, premathematical, and language skills; and

“(B) the provision of health, educational, nutritional, social, and other services.

“(3) In order to receive a grant subsequent to the initial grant provided following the date of enactment of this subchapter, the

grantee shall demonstrate that it has met the goals described in paragraph (2).

“(4) Progress in meeting such goals shall not be measured primarily or solely by the results of assessments.”

(2) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) In the administration of the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the chief executive officer of the State involved if such State expends non-Federal funds to carry out Head Start programs, give priority in the designation of Head Start agencies to any local public or private nonprofit or for-profit agency which is receiving funds under any Head Start program on the date of the enactment of this Act that fulfills the program and financial management requirements, standards described in section 641A(a)(1), results-based performance measures developed by the Secretary under section 641A(b), or other requirements established by the Secretary.”.

(3) By amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) If no entity in a community is entitled to the priority specified in subsection (c), then the Secretary may designate a Head Start agency from among qualified applicants in such community. In selecting from among qualified applicants for designation as a Head Start agency, the Secretary shall give priority to any qualified agency that functioned as a Head Start delegate agency in the community and carried out a Head Start program that the Secretary determines met or exceeded such performance standards and such results-based performance measures. In selecting from among qualified applicants for designation as a Head Start agency, the Secretary shall consider the effectiveness of each such applicant to provide Head Start services, based on—

“(1) any past performance of such applicant in providing services comparable to Head Start services, including how effectively such applicant provided such comparable services;

“(2) the capacity of such applicant to serve eligible children with scientifically-based programs that promote school readiness of children participating in the program;

“(3) the plan of such applicant to meet standards set forth in section 641A(a)(1), with particular attention to the standards set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such section;

“(4) the plan of such applicant to provide comprehensive health, nutritional, educational, social, and other services needed to prepare children to succeed in school;

“(5) the plan of such applicant to coordinate the Head Start program it proposes to carry out with other preschool programs, including Early Reading First and Even Start programs under title I, part B, subparts 1 and 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; other preschool programs carried out under title I of the Act; programs under part C and section 619 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; State prekindergarten programs; and with the educational programs such children will enter at the age of compulsory school attendance;

“(6) the plan of such applicant to coordinate the Head Start program it proposes to carry out with private entities with resources available to assist the Head Start Program meet its program needs;

“(7) the plan of such applicant—

“(A) to seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities (at home and in the center involved where practicable) designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

“(B) to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;

“(C) to offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.), public and school libraries, and family support programs) to such parents—

“(i) family literacy services; and

“(ii) parenting skills training;

“(D) to offer to parents of participating children substance abuse counseling (either directly or through referral to local entities), including information on drug-exposed infants and fetal alcohol syndrome;

“(E) at the option of such applicant, to offer (directly or through referral to local entities) to such parents—

“(i) training in basic child development;

“(ii) assistance in developing communication skills;

“(iii) opportunities for parents to share experiences with other parents; or

“(iv) any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

“(F) to provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in subparagraphs (C) (D), and (E) in which such parents may choose to become involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities); and

“(G) to extend out reach to fathers in order to strengthen the role of fathers in families by working directly with fathers and father-figures through such activities as including fathers in home visits; implementing father outreach efforts, providing opportunities for direct father-child interactions; and targeting increased male participation in the program;

“(8) the ability of such applicant to carry out the plans described in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4);

“(9) other factors related to the requirements of this subchapter;

“(10) the plan of such applicant to meet the needs of non-English background children and their families, including needs related to the acquisition of the English language;

“(11) the plan of such applicant to meet the needs of children with disabilities;

“(12) the plan of such applicant who chooses to assist younger siblings of children who will participate in the proposed Head Start program to obtain health services from other sources;

“(13) the plan of such applicant to collaborate with other entities carrying out early childhood education and child care programs in the community; and

“(14) the plan of such applicant to meet the needs of homeless children.”.

SEC. 106. QUALITY STANDARDS; MONITORING OF HEAD START AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.

Section 641A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9836a) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(1)(B) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) additional education standards to ensure that the children participating in the program, at a minimum develop and demonstrate—

“(I) language skills;

“(II) prereading knowledge and skills, including interest in and appreciation of books, reading and writing either alone or with others;

“(III) premathematics knowledge and skills, including aspects of classification, seriation, number, spatial relations, and time;

“(IV) cognitive abilities related to academic achievement;

“(V) social and emotional development important for environments constructive for child development, early learning, and school success; and

“(VI) in the case of limited-English proficient children, progress toward acquisition of the English language.”.

(2) By amending subsection (a)(2)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) take into consideration—

“(i) past experience with use of the standards in effect under this subchapter on October 27, 1998;

“(ii) changes over the period since October 27, 1998, in the circumstances and problems typically facing children and families served by Head Start agencies;

“(iii) developments concerning best practices with respect to early childhood education and development, children with disabilities, family services, program administration, and financial management;

“(iv) projected needs of an expanding Head Start program;

“(v) guidelines and standards currently in effect or under consideration that promote child health services, and projected needs of expanding Head Start programs;

“(vi) changes in the population of children who are eligible to participate in Head Start programs, including the language background and family structure of such children;

“(vii) the need for, and state-of-the-art developments relating to, local policies and activities designed to ensure that children participating in Head Start programs make a successful transition to schools; and

“(viii) the unique challenges faced by individual programs, including those that are seasonal or short term, and those that serve rural populations; and”.

(3) In subsection (a)(2)(C)(ii) by striking all that follows “in effect on” down to the period and inserting “October 27, 1998”.

(4) By amending subsection (b)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) CHARACTERISTICS OF MEASURES.—The performance measures developed under this subsection shall—

“(A) be used to assess the impact of the various services provided by Head Start programs and, to the extent the Secretary finds appropriate, administrative and financial management practices of such programs;

“(B) be adaptable for use in self-assessment, peer review, and program evaluation of individual Head Start agencies and programs;

“(C) be developed for other program purposes as determined by the Secretary;

“(D) be appropriate for the population served; and

“(E) be reviewed no less than every 4 years, based on advances in the science of early childhood development.

The performance measures shall include the performance standards described in subsection (a)(1)(A) and (B).”.

(5) By amending subsection (b)(4) to read as follows:

“(4) EDUCATIONAL MEASURES.—Results based measures shall be designed for the purpose of promoting the competencies of children participating in Head Start programs specified in subsection (a)(1)(B)(ii), with an emphasis on measuring those competencies that have a strong scientifically-based predictability of a child's school readiness and later performance in school.”.

(6) In subsection (c)(1)(C) by striking “the standards” and inserting “one or more of the performance measures developed by the Secretary under subsection (b)”.

(7) By amending subsection (c)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) CONDUCT OF REVIEWS.—The Secretary shall ensure that reviews described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1)—

“(A) that incorporate a monitoring visit, do so without prior notice of the visit to the local agency or program;

“(B) are conducted by review teams that shall include individuals who are knowledgeable about Head Start programs and, to the maximum extent practicable, the diverse (including linguistic and cultural) needs of eligible children (including children with disabilities) and limited-English proficient children and their families;

“(C) include as part of the reviews of the programs, a review and assessment of program effectiveness, as measured in accordance with the results-based performance measures developed by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b) and with the standards established pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1);

“(D) seek information from the communities and the States involved about the performance of the programs and the efforts of the Head Start agencies to collaborate with other entities carrying out early childhood education and child care programs in the community;

“(E) seek information from the communities where Head Start programs exist about innovative or effective collaborative efforts, barriers to collaboration, and the efforts of the Head Start agencies and programs to collaborate with the entities carrying out early childhood education and child care programs in the community;

“(F) include as part of the reviews of the programs, a review and assessment of whether a program is in conformity with the income eligibility requirements, as defined in section 645 and regulations promulgated thereunder;

“(G) include as part of the reviews of the programs, a review and assessment of whether programs have adequately addressed the population and community needs (including populations of children with a limited English proficiency and children of migrant and seasonal farm-working families); and

“(H) include as part of the review the extent to which the program addresses the community needs and strategic plan identified in section 640(g)(2)(C).”.

(8) By amending so much of subsection (d)(1) as precedes subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(1) DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines, on the basis of a review pursuant to subsection (c), that a Head Start agency designated pursuant to section 641 fails to meet the standards described in subsection (a) or results-based performance measures developed by the Secretary under subsection (b), or fails to adequately address the community needs and strategic plan identified in 640(g)(2)(C), the Secretary shall—”

(9) By amending subsection (d)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—

“(A) AGENCY AND PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES.—In order to retain a designation as a Head Start agency under this subchapter, or in the case of a Head Start Program, in order to continue to receive funds from such agency, a Head Start agency, or Head Start program that is the subject of a determination described in paragraph (1) (other than an agency or program required to correct a deficiency immediately or during a 90-day period under clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(B)) shall—

“(i) develop in a timely manner, a quality improvement plan which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary, or in the case of a program, the sponsoring agency, and which shall specify—

“(I) the deficiencies to be corrected;

“(II) the actions to be taken to correct such deficiencies; and

“(III) the timetable for accomplishment of the corrective actions specified; and

“(ii) eliminate each deficiency identified, not later than the date for elimination of such deficiency specified in such plan (which shall not be later than 1 year after the date the agency or program received notice of the determination and of the specific deficiency to be corrected).

“(B) SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Not later than 30 days after receiving from a Head Start agency a proposed quality improvement plan pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall either approve such proposed plan or specify the reasons why the proposed plan cannot be approved.

“(C) AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT.—Not later than 30 days after receiving from a Head Start program, a proposed quality improvement plan pursuant to subparagraph (A), the sponsoring agency shall either approve such proposed plan or specify the reasons why the proposed plan cannot be approved.”.

(10) In subsection (d)(3) by inserting “and programs” after “agencies”.

(11) Subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) SUMMARIES OF MONITORING OUTCOMES.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish a summary report on the findings of reviews conducted under subsection (c) and on the outcomes of quality improvement plans implemented under subsection (d), during such fiscal year. Such information shall be made available to all parents with students receiving assistance under this Act in a understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand, and in addition, make the information widely available through public means such as distribution through public agencies, and at a minimum posting such information on the Internet immediately upon publication.”.

SEC. 107. POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF HEAD START AGENCIES.

Section 642 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837(b)) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) In order to be so designated, a Head Start agency shall also—

“(1) establish a program with standards set forth in section 641A(a)(1), with particular attention to the standards set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such section;

“(2) demonstrate capacity to serve eligible children with scientifically-based curricula and other interventions that help promote the school readiness of children participating in the program;

“(3) establish effective procedures by which parents and area residents concerned will be enabled to directly participate in decisions that influence the character of programs affecting their interests;

“(4) provide for their regular participation in the implementation of such programs;

“(5) provide technical and other support needed to enable parents and area residents to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources;

“(6) seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children, and to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;

“(7) conduct outreach to schools in which Head Start children enroll, local educational agencies, the local business community, community-based organizations, faith-based

organizations, museums, and libraries to generate support and leverage the resources of the entire local community in order to improve school readiness;

“(8) offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.)), to parents of participating children, family literacy services and parenting skills training;

“(9) offer to parents of participating children substance abuse counseling (either directly or through referral to local entities), including information on drug-exposed infants and fetal alcohol syndrome;

“(10) at the option of such agency, offer (directly or through referral to local entities), to such parents—

“(A) training in basic child development;

“(B) assistance in developing communication skills;

“(C) opportunities to share experiences with other parents;

“(D) regular in-home visitation; or

“(E) any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

“(11) provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in paragraphs (4) through (7) in which such parents may choose to be involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities);

“(12) consider providing services to assist younger siblings of children participating in its Head Start program to obtain health services from other sources;

“(13) perform community outreach to encourage individuals previously unaffiliated with Head Start programs to participate in its Head Start program as volunteers; and

“(14) (A) inform custodial parents in single-parent families that participate in programs, activities, or services carried out or provided under this subchapter about the availability of child support services for purposes of establishing paternity and acquiring child support; and

“(B) refer eligible parents to the child support offices of State and local governments.”.

(2) Amend subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) The head of each Head Start agency shall coordinate and collaborate with the State agency responsible for administering the State program carried out under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.), and other early childhood education and development programs, including programs under subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11431-11435), Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.), and programs under Part C and section 619 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431-1445, 1419), and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a), serving the children and families served by the Head Start agency to carry out the provisions of this subchapter.”.

(3) In subsection (d) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraph (3) through (5) and inserting the following new paragraph after paragraph (1):

“(2) In communities where both public prekindergarten programs and Head Start programs operate, a Head Start agency shall coordinate with the local educational agency or other public agency responsible for the operation of the prekindergarten program and

providers of prekindergarten, including for outreach to identify eligible children.”.

(5) In paragraph (3) (as redesignated) of subsection (d), strike “and” at the end of subparagraph (A) and insert the following after subparagraph (A) and redesignate subparagraph (B) as (C):

“(B) collaborating to increase the program participation of underserved populations of eligible children; and”.

SEC. 108. HEAD START ALIGNMENT WITH K-12 EDUCATION.

Section 642A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837a) is amended as follows:

(1) The heading is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 642A. HEAD START ALIGNMENT WITH K-12 EDUCATION.”.

(2) In paragraph (2) after “social workers,” insert the following: “McKinney-Vento liaisons as established under section 722 (g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001.”.

(3) Add the following new paragraph after paragraph (2) and redesignated paragraphs (3) through (7) as (4) through (8):

“(3) developing continuity of developmentally appropriate curricula between Head Start and local educational agencies to ensure an effective transition and appropriate shared expectations for children's learning and development as they make such transition to school;”.

(4) Paragraph (6)(as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) developing and implementing a family outreach and support program in cooperation with entities carrying out parental involvement efforts under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and family outreach and support efforts under subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act;”.

(4) In paragraph (7)(as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) by inserting “and continuity in parental involvement activities” after “developmental continuity”.

(5) Strike “and” at the end of paragraph (7)(as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) and strike the period at the end of paragraph (8)(as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) and insert a semicolon.

(6) Add the following after paragraph (8):

“(9) helping parents to understand the importance of parental involvement in a child's academic success while teaching them strategies for maintaining parental involvement as their child moves from Head Start to elementary school; and

“(10) developing and implementing a system to increase program participation of underserved populations of eligible children.”.

SEC. 109. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS.

Section 644 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9839) is amended in subsection (f)(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as (B) through (F) and inserting the following new subparagraph before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated):

“(A) a description of the consultation conducted by the Head Start agency with the providers in the community demonstrating capacity and capability to provide services under this Act, and of the potential for collaboration with such providers and the cost effectiveness of such collaboration as opposed to the cost effectiveness of the purchase of a facility;”.

SEC. 110. ELIGIBILITY.

Section 645(a) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9843) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking “to a reasonable extent” in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and inserting “not to exceed 10 percent of the total enrollment” and

by striking "benefit from such programs" and inserting "benefit from such programs, including children referred by child welfare services."

(2) By adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(3) The amount of a basic allowance provided under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, on behalf of an individual who is a member of the uniformed services for housing that is acquired or constructed under the authority of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, or any other related provision of law, shall not be considered to be income for purposes of determining the eligibility of a child of the individual for programs assisted under this subchapter."

SEC. 111. EARLY HEAD START PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 645A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9643) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(4) provide services to parents to support their role as parents (including parenting skills training and training in basic child development) and to help the families move toward self-sufficiency (including educational and employment services as appropriate);

"(5) coordinate services with services (including home-based services) provided by programs in the State and programs in the community (including programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities) to ensure a comprehensive array of services (such as health and mental health services, and family support services)";

(2) By amending paragraph (8) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(8) ensure formal linkages with the agencies and entities described in section 644(b) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1444(b)) and providers of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) and the agency responsible for administering the Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a); and"

(3) In subsection (g)(2)(B) by striking "and" at the end of clause (iii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting "; and" and by inserting the following at the end:

"(v) providing professional development designed to increase program participation for underserved populations of eligible children."

(b) MIGRANT AND SEASONAL PROGRAMS.—Section 645A(d)(1) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9643(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) entities operating Head Start programs under this subpart, including migrant and seasonal Head Start programs; and"

(c) COMMUNITY- AND FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 645A(d)(2) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9643(d)(2)) is amended by inserting ", including community- and faith-based organizations" after "entities" in the second place it appears.

SEC. 112. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

Section 648 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9843) is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting the following new subsection after subsection (a) and redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f):

"(b) The Secretary shall make available to each State the money reserved in section 640(a)(2)(C)(ii) to support a State-based system delivering training and technical assistance that improves the capacity of Head Start programs within a State to deliver

services in accordance with the Head Start standards in section 641A(a)(1), with particular attention to the standards set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such section. The Secretary shall—

"(1) ensure eligible entities within a State are chosen by the Secretary, in consultation with the State Collaboration Board described in section 640(a)(5)(C)(i), through a competitive bid process;

"(2) ensure that existing agencies with demonstrated expertise in providing high quality training and technical assistance to improve the delivery of Head Start services, including the State Head Start Association, State agencies, migrant and seasonal Head Start programs operating in the State, and other entities currently providing training and technical assistance in early education, be included in the planning and coordination of the State system of training and technical assistance; and

"(3) encourage States to supplement the funds authorized in section 640(a)(2)(C)(ii) with State, Federal, or local funds other than Head Start funds, to expand activities beyond Head Start agencies to include other providers of other early childhood services within a State."

(2) In subsection (d) (as redesignated):

(A) In paragraph (2), after "disabilities" insert "and for activities described in section 1221(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965";

(B) In paragraph (5) after "assessment" insert ", including the needs of homeless children and their families";

(C) By striking "and" at the end of paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting "; and" and by inserting the following at the end:

"(12) assist Head Start agencies and programs in increasing program participation of eligible homeless children."

(3) In subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) by inserting ", including community- and faith-based organizations" after "entities";

(4) By amending subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary shall provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, funds from programs authorized under this subchapter to support an organization to administer a centralized child development and national assessment program leading to recognized credentials for personnel working in early childhood development and child care programs, training for personnel providing services to non-English language background children (including services to promote the acquisition of the English language), training for personnel providing services to children determined to be abused or neglected, training for personnel providing services to children referred by or receiving child welfare services, training for personnel in helping children cope with community violence, and resource access projects for personnel working with disabled children."

(5) Insert at the end of the section:

"(g) HELPING PERSONNEL BETTER SERVE MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARM-WORKING COMMUNITIES AND HOMELESS FAMILIES.—The Secretary shall provide, either directly or through grants, or other arrangements, funds for training of Head Start personnel in addressing the unique needs of migrant and seasonal working families, families with a limited English proficiency, and homeless families."

"(h) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—The majority of funds expended under this section shall be used to provide high quality, sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused training and technical assistance in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom in-

struction. Funds shall be used to carry out activities related to any or all of the following:

"(1) Education and early childhood development.

"(2) Child health, nutrition, and safety.

"(3) Family and community partnerships.

"(4) Other areas that impact the quality or overall effectiveness of Head Start programs.

"(i) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds under this subchapter used for training shall be used for needs identified annually by a grant applicant or delegate agency in their program improvement plan, except that funds shall not be used for long-distance travel expenses for training activities available locally or regionally or for training activities substantially similar to locally or regionally available training activities.

(j) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible entities' means an institution of higher education or other entity with expertise in delivering training in early childhood development, family support, and other assistance designed to improve the delivery of Head Start services."

SEC. 113. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 648A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9843a) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending paragraph (2) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(2) DEGREE REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that not later than September 30, 2008, at least 50 percent of all Head Start teachers nationwide in center-based programs have—

"(i) a baccalaureate, or advanced degree in early childhood education; or

"(ii) a baccalaureate, or advanced degree in a field related to early childhood education, with experience in teaching preschool children.

"(B) PROGRESS.—Each Head State agency shall provide to the Secretary a report indicating the number and percentage of classroom instructors with child development associate credentials and associate, baccalaureate, or advanced degrees. The Secretary shall compile all program reports and make them available to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the United States Senate.

"(C) REQUIREMENT FOR NEW HEAD START TEACHERS.—Within 3 years after the date of enactment of this clause, the Secretary shall require that all Head Start teachers nationwide in center-based programs hired following the date of enactment of this sub-paragraph—

"(i) have an associate, baccalaureate, or advanced degree in early childhood education;

"(ii) have an associate, baccalaureate, or advanced degree in a field related to early childhood education, with experience in teaching preschool children; or

"(iii) be currently enrolled in a program of study leading to an associate degree in early childhood education and agree to complete degree requirements within 3 years from the date of hire.

"(D) SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish requirements to ensure that individuals who receive financial assistance under this Act in order to comply with the requirements under section 648A(a)(2) shall subsequently teach in a Head Start center for a period of time equivalent to the period for which they received assistance or repay the amount of the funds."

(2) By adding the following at the end thereof:

"(f) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS.—Every Head Start agency and program shall create, in consultation with an employee, a

professional development plan for all full-time employees who provide direct services to children.”.

SEC. 114. RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND EVALUATION.

Section 649 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9844) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (a)(1)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) use the Head Start programs to develop, test, and disseminate new ideas and approaches for addressing the needs of low-income preschool children (including children with disabilities and children determined to be abused or neglected) and their families and communities (including demonstrations of innovative non-center based program models such as home-based and mobile programs), and otherwise to further the purposes of this subchapter.”.

(2) By striking paragraph (9) of subsection (d) and inserting “(9) REPEALED.—”.

(3) By striking clause (i) of subsection (g)(1)(A) and redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii).

(4) In subsection (g)(7)(C)(i) by striking “1999” and inserting “2003”, striking “2001” and inserting “2005”, and striking “2003” and inserting “2006”.

(5) By amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

“(h) NAS STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use funds allocated in section 640(a)(2)(C)(iii) to contract with the National Academy of Sciences for the Board on Children, Youth, and Families of the National Research Council to establish an independent panel of experts to review and synthesize research, theory and applications in the social, behavioral and biological sciences and shall make recommendations on early childhood pedagogy with regard to each of the following:

“(A) Age and developmentally appropriate Head Start academic requirements and outcomes, including but not limited to the domains in 641A(a)(B).

“(B) Differences in the type, length, mix and intensity of services necessary to ensure that children from challenging family and social backgrounds including: low-income children, children of color, children with special needs, and children with limited English proficiency enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

“(C) Appropriate assessments of young children for the purposes of improving instruction, services, and program quality, including systematic observation assessment in a child’s natural environment, parent and provider interviews, and accommodations for children with disabilities and appropriate assessments for children with special needs, including English language learners.

“(2) COMPOSITION.—The panel shall consist of multiple experts in each of the following areas:

“(A) Child development and education, including cognitive, social, emotional, physical, approaches to learning, and other domains of child development and learning.

“(B) Professional development, including teacher preparation, to individuals who teach young children in programs.

“(C) Assessment of young children, including screening, diagnostic and classroom-based instructional assessment; children with special needs, including children with disabilities and limited English proficient children.

“(3) TIMING.—The National Academy of Sciences and the Board shall establish the panel not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph. The panel should complete its recommendations within 18 months of its convening.

“(4) APPLICATION OF PANEL REPORT.—The results of the panel study shall be used as

guidelines by the Secretary to develop, inform and revise, where appropriate, the Head Start education performance measures and standards and the assessments utilized in the Head Start program.”.

SEC. 115. REPORTS.

Section 650 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9845) is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows: “At least once during every 2-year period, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, a report concerning the status of children (including disabled, homeless, and non-English language background children) in Head Start programs, including the number of children and the services being provided to such children.”.

(2) Paragraph (8) of subsection (a) is amended by inserting “, homelessness” after “background”.

SEC. 116. HEAD START NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISIONS.

Section 654 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9849) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 654. NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISIONS.

“(a)(1) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program, project, or activity under this subchapter unless the grant or contract with respect thereto specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation thereof will discriminate with respect to any such program, project, or activity because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation, or beliefs.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recipient of financial assistance under this subchapter that is a religious corporation, association, educational institution, or society, with respect to the employment of individuals of a particular religion to perform work connected with the carrying on by such corporation, association, educational institution, or society of its activities. Such recipients shall comply with the other requirements contained in this subsection.

“(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under, or be denied employment in connection with any program or activity receiving assistance under this subchapter. The Secretary shall enforce the provisions of the preceding sentence in accordance with section 602 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 603 of such Act shall apply with respect to any action taken by the Secretary to enforce such sentence. This section shall not be construed as affecting any other legal remedy that a person may have if such person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefit of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment (except as provided in subsection (a)(2)), in the administration of any program, project, or activity receiving assistance under this subchapter.

“(c) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program, project, or activity under this subchapter unless the grant or contract relating to the financial assistance specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation of the program, project, or activity will discriminate against any individual because of a handicapping condition in violation of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, except as provided in subsection (a)(2).”.

SEC. 117. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning on and after October 1, 2003.

TITLE II—STATE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. STATE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

The Head Start Act is amended by inserting after section 643 the following new section:

“SEC. 643A. STATE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

“(a) GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) ELIGIBLE STATES.—In the case of each eligible State that submits to the Secretary an application that fulfills the requirements of this section, the Secretary, from amounts appropriated under section 639(a), shall make a grant to the State to carry out a State demonstration program under this section, except that the Secretary shall not make such grants to more than 8 eligible States.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make awards to those States that demonstrate—

“(i) that the State standards generally meet or exceed the standards that ensure the quality and effectiveness of programs operated by Head Start agencies;

“(ii) the capacity to deliver high quality early childhood education services to prepare children, including low-income children, for school; and

“(iii) success in improving the school readiness of children.

“(2) STATE ELIGIBILITY.—A State shall be eligible to participate in the program under this section if it meets each of the following criteria:

“(A) The State has an existing State supported system providing public prekindergarten to children prior to entry into kindergarten.

“(B) The State has implemented standards as of fiscal year 2003 for school readiness that include standards for language, prereading and premathematics development for prekindergarten that are aligned with State kindergarten through twelfth grade academic content standards and which shall apply to all programs receiving funds under this part or provides an assurance that such standards will be aligned by the end of the second fiscal year of participation.

“(C) State and locally appropriated funds for prekindergarten services and Head Start services in the base year under this section shall not be less than 50 percent of the Federal funds that the grantees in the State received under this Act in the base year for services to Head Start eligible children, excluding amounts for services provided under section 645A.

“(D) The State has established a means for inter-agency coordination and collaboration in the development of the plan under subsection (h).

“(b) LEAD AGENCY.—A program under this section shall be administered by a State governmental entity designated by the Chief Executive Officer of the State as the lead State agency.

“(c) STATE OPERATION OF PROGRAM.—The State may conduct all or any part of the program under this section (including the activities specified in subsection (g)) directly or by grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

“(d) TRANSITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For 60 months after the effective date of this section, the State shall continue to provide funds to each local grantee who—

“(A) was receiving funds under this subchapter, as in effect prior to the date of enactment of this section; and

“(B) is serving the geographic area covered by the plan in section 643A(h).

Such continuing grants shall be made in accordance with the terms of the grant made to the local grantee immediately prior to

such date of enactment. This paragraph shall not apply to a grant applicant who has experienced substantial uncorrected deficiencies on Department of Health and Human Services monitoring reports during any year of the most recent 5-year period, or to a grantee that, as determined by the State, does not comply with the State plan described in subsection 643A(h) submitted to the Secretary.

“(e) FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL ALLOTMENTS TO STATE PROGRAMS.—From each total amount described in paragraph (2) allotted to a State for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay to a State with a program approved under this section for such fiscal year an amount equal to—

“(A) if the State program is statewide, 100 percent of such total amount; and

“(B) if the State program is limited to a geographic area or areas, the sum of—

“(i) an amount equal to the amount received by grantees in such geographic area or areas for the Federal fiscal year preceding the first fiscal year of the State program under this section; plus

“(ii) an amount bearing the same ratio to the excess (if any) above the total amount for such preceding fiscal year as the number of children less than 5 years of age from families whose income is below the poverty line in the geographic area or areas included in the program bears to the total number of such children in the State (as determined using the same data used pursuant to section 640(a)(4)(B)).

“(2) FUNDS ALLOCATED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), amounts described in this paragraph are:

“(A) BASIC STATE ALLOTMENTS.—Amounts allotted to States pursuant to section 640(a)(4), including amounts reserved pursuant to section 640(a)(5), excluding amounts for services provided under section 645A.

“(B) STATE ALLOTMENTS OF EXPANSION FUNDS.—Amounts allotted to States pursuant to section 640(a)(3)(D)(i)(I) for program expansion.

“(C) QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FUNDS.—Quality improvement funds (if any) reserved pursuant to section 640(a)(3).

“(D) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS.—An amount bearing the same ratio to the amount set aside for training and technical assistance activities pursuant to section 640(a)(2)(C)(i) and (ii) as the State's share of amounts allotted under section 640(a)(4)(B) bears to the total amount so allotted (and for purposes of subparagraph (A), such amount shall be considered an amount allotted to the State for the fiscal year).

“(3) NON-FEDERAL MATCH.—(A) In determining the amount of Federal and non-Federal contributions for purposes of this section, the amounts required to be expended by the State under subsection (h)(14)(B) (relating to maintenance of effort) shall be excluded.

“(B) Financial assistance made available to a State under this subchapter shall be in an amount equal to 95 percent of the total amount expended for such programs. The Secretary shall require non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to 5 percent of the total amount expended under this subchapter for such programs.

“(C) Non-Federal contributions may be made in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

“(4) COMBINED OPERATIONS WITH OTHER EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—A State may combine funds for a program under this section with funds for other early childhood programs serving children in the same age group, as long as all applicable requirements of this subchapter are met with respect to either—

“(A) the entire combined program; or

“(B) each child served in such combined program for whom the services provided are funded from appropriations under this subchapter or non-Federal matching contributions under this subchapter.

“(5) USE OF FUNDS WITHOUT REGARD TO ALLOTMENT PURPOSES.—A State may use funds received pursuant to this section for any program purpose set forth in section 636, without regard to the purposes for such funds specified in section 640.

“(6) OTHER FUNDS.—Funds received under this section shall not supplant any non-Federal, State or local funds that would otherwise be used for activities authorized under this section or similar activities carried out in the State.

“(f) COORDINATION AND CHOICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State demonstration Program shall be coordinated with the education programs of local educational agencies in the State to ensure that the program is effectively designed to develop in children in the program the knowledge and behaviors necessary to transition successfully to kindergarten and to succeed in school.

“(2) PROGRAMS CONCERNED.—

“(A) REQUIRED PROGRAMS.—Such coordination shall occur regarding the implementation of the following:

“(i) The Early Reading First and Even Start programs under title I, part B, subparts 2 and 3 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and other preschool programs carried out under title I of that Act.

“(ii) State prekindergarten programs.

“(iii) The Ready-to-Learn Television Program under subpart 3 of Part D of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

“(B) OPTIONAL PROGRAMS.—Such coordination may occur regarding the implementation of the following:

“(i) Programs under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act.

“(ii) Other publicly funded early childhood education programs.

“(3) PARENTAL CHOICE.—The program shall allow parents to choose the preschool program for their child.

“(g) REQUIRED SERVICES.—With funds under this section, the State shall provide services described in section 641A at least as extensive as were provided, and to at least as many low-income children and families in each fiscal year as were provided such services, with such funds in the base year in the State (or, if applicable, in the geographic area included in the State program). A program under this section shall include the following comprehensive activities designed to promote school readiness and success in school:

“(1) CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION.—Activities with enrolled children that promote—

“(A) cognitive development, language development, prereading, and premathematics knowledge and skills;

“(B) physical development, health, and nutrition (including through coordination with, and referral of children and families to local health service entities; and

“(C) social development important for environments constructive for child development, early learning, and school success.

“(2) PARENT EDUCATION AND INVOLVEMENT.—Activities with the parents of enrolled children directed at enhancing and encouraging—

“(A) involvement in, and ability to support, their children's educational development;

“(B) parenting skills and understanding of child development; and

“(C) ability to participate effectively in decisions relating to the education of their children.

“(3) SOCIAL AND FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES.—Activities directed at securing appropriate social and family support services for enrolled children and their families, primarily through referral and coordination with local, State, and Federal entities that provide such services.

“(4) HEAD START SERVICES.—For purposes of paragraph (1) Head Start services furnished in a State program under this section shall include all Head Start services, other than—

“(A) Indian Head Start programs and migrant and seasonal Head Start programs supported with funds reserved under section 640(a)(2)(A); and

“(B) Early Head Start services provided under section 645A.

“(h) STATE PLAN.—A State proposing to administer a program under this section shall submit a State plan to the Secretary. The State plan shall include the following:

“(1) LEAD STATE AGENCY.—The plan shall identify the entity designated by the Chief Executive Officer of the State as the lead State agency.

“(2) GEOGRAPHIC AREA.—The plan shall specify whether the program is statewide, and, if it is not, identify the geographic area or areas covered by the plan. A geographic area may be a city, county, standard metropolitan statistical area, or such other geographic area in the State.

“(3) PROGRAM PERIOD.—A State program under this section shall be in effect for 5 Federal fiscal years.

“(4) PROGRAM DESCRIPTION.—The plan shall describe the services under subsection (f) to be provided in the program and arrangements the State proposes to use to provide the services specified in subsection (g), including how the State will leverage existing delivery systems for such services.

“(5) NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—The plan shall describe the results of a State needs assessment and shall provide an assurance that the State will use the results to identify the needs for early childhood education services within a State or geographic area to be served and is targeting services to those areas of greatest need and to expand and improve services to disadvantaged children in the State.

“(6) ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE.—The plan shall provide an assurance that the State program will comply with the requirements of this section, including each of the following:

“(A) PRIORITY FOR LOW-INCOME CHILDREN.—Requirements established pursuant to section 645(a) concerning the eligibility and priority of individuals for participation in Head Start programs.

“(B) CONTINUATION FOR EXISTING PROVIDERS.—An applicant who received funds under this subchapter in prior fiscal years and has not corrected any substantial deficiencies identified in the past 5 years shall not be eligible to receive any grants, contract, or cooperative agreements under this section.

“(C) PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.—Requirements pursuant to section 640(d) concerning Head Start enrollment opportunities and services for children with disabilities.

“(D) PROVISIONS CONCERNING FEES AND CO-PAYMENTS.—The provisions of section 645(b) concerning the charging of fees and the circumstances under which copayments are permissible.

“(E) FEDERAL SHARE; STATE AND LOCAL MATCHING.—The provisions of section 640(b) limiting Federal financial assistance for

Head Start programs, and providing for non-Federal contributions.

“(F) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The provisions of section 644(b) limiting the share of program funds that may be used for developing and administering a program.

“(G) FEDERAL PROPERTY INTEREST.—Applicable provisions of this subchapter regarding the Federal Government interest in property (including real property) purchased, leased, or renovated with Federal funds.

“(7) IDENTIFICATION OF BARRIERS.—The plan shall identify barriers in the State to the effective use of Federal, State, and local public funds, and private funds, for early education and care that are available to the State on the date on which the application is submitted.

“(8) STATE GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL READINESS.—The plan shall include—

“(A) a State definition of school readiness;

“(B) a description of the State’s general goals for school readiness, including how the State intends to—

“(i) promote and maintain ongoing communication and collaboration between providers of early care and education and local educational agencies in the State;

“(ii) align early childhood and kindergarten curricula to ensure program continuity; and

“(iii) ensure that children successfully transition to kindergarten.

“(9) TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS.—The plan shall assure that the qualifications and credentials for early childhood teachers meet or exceed the standards in section 648A(a)(2)(A), (B), and (C).

“(10) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—The plan shall provide a description of the State plan for assuring the ongoing professional development of early childhood educators and administrators including how the State intends to—

“(A) improve the competencies of early childhood educators in meeting the cognitive and other developmental needs of young children through effective instructional strategies, methods, and skills;

“(B) develop and implement initiatives to effectively recruit and promote the retention of well-qualified early childhood educators;

“(C) encourage institutions of higher education, providers of community-based training, and other qualified providers to develop high-quality programs to prepare students to be early childhood education professionals; and

“(D) improve the quality of professional development available to meet the needs of teachers that serve preschool children.

“(11) QUALITY STANDARDS.—The State shall describe the State’s standards, applicable to all agencies, programs, and projects that receive funds under this subchapter, including a description of—

“(A) standards with respect to services required to be provided, including health, parental involvement, nutritional, social, transition activities described in section 642(d) of this subchapter, and other services;

“(B)(i) education standards to promote the school readiness of children participating in a State program under Title II of this subchapter; and

“(ii) additional education standards to ensure that the children participating in the program, at a minimum develop and demonstrate—

“(I) language skills;

“(II) prereading knowledge and skills, including interest in and appreciation of books, reading and writing either alone or with others;

“(III) premathematics knowledge and skills, including aspects of classification, seriation, number, spatial relations, and time;

“(IV) cognitive abilities related to academic achievement;

“(V) social development important for environments constructive for child development, early learning, and school success; and

“(VI) in the case of limited-English proficient children, progress toward acquisition of the English language;

“(C) the State’s minimum standards for early childhood teacher credentials and qualifications;

“(D) the student-teacher ratio for each age-group served;

“(E) administrative and financial management standards;

“(F) standards relating to the condition and location of facilities for such agencies, programs, and projects; and

“(G) such other standards as the State finds to be appropriate.

“(12) STATE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The State plan shall—

“(i) ensure that individual providers are achieving results in advancing the knowledge and behaviors identified by the State as prerequisites for kindergarten success; and

“(ii) specify the measures the State will use to evaluate the progress toward achieving such results and the effectiveness of the State program under this section, and of individual providers in such program.

“(B) PUBLICATION OF RESULTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the results shall be made publicly available in the communities served by the program.

“(ii) CONFIDENTIALITY SAFEGUARDS.—The system shall have in effect privacy safeguards ensuring that information on children included in data and results made public in accordance with clause (i) shall be in aggregated form, and shall not include information allowing identification of individual children.

“(13) TRANSITION PLAN.—The initial State plan shall make provision for transition from the direct Federal program under section 640 to the demonstration program.

“(14) COOPERATION WITH RESEARCH STUDIES.—The plan shall provide assurances that the State will cooperate with research activities described in section 649.

“(15) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—The State plan shall—

“(A) contain a commitment to provide data, at such times and in such format as the Secretary requires, concerning non-Federal expenditures and numbers of children and families served in preschool and Head Start programs during the base year and each fiscal year covered under the State plan, sufficient to satisfy the Secretary that the State program will meet its obligation with respect to the maintenance of effort requirement under subparagraph (B); and

“(B) assure that the resources (which may be cash or in-kind) contributed by the State government to child care for preschool-aged children and other preschool programs, including Head Start, in the State (or, if applicable, in the geographic area included in the State program) for each fiscal year in which the program under this section is in effect shall be in an amount at least equal to the total amount of such State governmental resources contributed to support such programs in the State (or geographic area) for the base year.

“(16) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The State plan shall describe the training and technical assistance activities that shall provide high quality, sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused training and technical assistance in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction.

“(i) RECORDS, REPORTS AND AUDITS.—The State agency administering the State program, and each entity participating as a

Head Start service provider, shall maintain such records, make such reports, and cooperate with such audits as the Secretary may require for oversight of program activities and expenditures.

“(j) INAPPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRIORITY IN AGENCY DESIGNATION.—The provisions of subsections (c) and (d) of section 641 (concerning priority in designation of Head Start agencies, successor agencies, and delegate agencies) shall not apply to a State program under this section.

“(k) CONSULTATION.—A State proposing to administer a program under this section shall submit, with the plan under this section, assurances that the plan was developed through timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate public and private sector entities, including—

“(l) representatives of agencies responsible for administering early education and care programs in the State, including Head Start providers;

“(2) parents;

“(3) the State educational agency and local educational agencies;

“(4) early childhood education professionals;

“(5) kindergarten teachers and teachers in grades 1 through 4;

“(6) child welfare agencies;

“(7) child care resource and referral agencies;

“(8) child care providers; and

“(9) a wide array of persons interested in and involved with early care and early education issues in the State, such as representatives of—

“(A) health care professionals;

“(B) the State agency with responsibility for the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966;

“(C) institutions of higher education;

“(D) community-based and faith-based organizations;

“(E) the business community;

“(F) State legislators and local officials;

“(G) museums and libraries;

“(H) other relevant entities in the State; and

“(I) other agencies that provide resources for young children.

“(l) STATE PLAN SUBMISSION.—An application shall be submitted by a State pursuant to this section to the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, and shall be deemed to be approved by the Secretary unless the Secretary makes a written determination, prior to the expiration of a reasonable time beginning on the date on which the Secretary received the application, that the application is not in compliance with this section.

“(m) TREATMENT OF FUNDS.—If a State or local government contributes its own funds to supplement activities carried out under the applicable programs, the State or local government has the option to separate out the Federal funds or commingle them. If the funds are commingled, the provisions of this subchapter shall apply to all of the commingled funds in the same manner, and to the same extent, as the provisions apply to the Federal funds.

“(n) FEDERAL OVERSIGHT AUTHORITY; CORRECTIVE ACTION; WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL.—

“(1) FEDERAL OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary shall retain the authority to oversee the operation of the State program under this section, including through review of records and reports, audits, and onsite inspection of records and facilities and monitoring of program activities and operations.

“(2) CORRECTION OF DEFICIENCIES.—If the Secretary determines that a State program

under this section substantially fails to meet the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall notify the State of the deficiencies identified and require corrective action as follows:

“(A) DEFICIENCIES CAUSING IMMEDIATE JEOPARDY.—The Secretary shall require immediate corrective action to eliminate a deficiency that the Secretary finds threatens the health or safety of staff or program participants or poses a threat to the integrity of Federal funds.

“(B) OTHER DEFICIENCIES.—The Secretary, taking into consideration the nature and magnitude of a deficiency not described in subparagraph (A), and the time reasonably required for correction, may—

“(i) require the State to correct the deficiency within 90 days after notification under this paragraph; or

“(ii) require the State to implement a quality improvement plan designed to correct the deficiency within one year from identification of the deficiency.

“(3) WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL.—If the deficiencies identified under paragraph (2) are not corrected by the deadlines established by the Secretary, the Secretary shall initiate proceedings to withdraw approval of the State program under this section.

“(4) PROCEDURAL RIGHTS.—A State subject to adverse action under this subsection shall have the same procedural rights as a Head Start agency subject to adverse action under section 641A.

“(o) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall contract with an independent organization outside of the Department to design and conduct a multi-year, rigorous, scientifically valid, quantitative evaluation of the State demonstration program.

“(2) PROCESS.—The Secretary shall award a contract within 180 days of the date of enactment of the School Readiness Act of 2003, to an organization that is capable of designing and carrying out an independent evaluation described in this subsection.

“(3) ANALYSIS.—The evaluation shall include an analysis of each State participating in the State demonstration program, including—

“(A) A quantitative description of the State prekindergarten program and Head Start programs within such State, as such programs existed prior to participation in the State demonstration program, including—

“(i) data on the characteristics of the children served, including the overall number and percentages of children served disaggregated by socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity of those served;

“(ii) the quality and characteristics of the services provided to such children; and

“(iii) the education attainment of instructional staff.

“(B) A quantitative and qualitative description of the State program after each year of participation in the State demonstration, which shall include each of the following:

“(i) A description of changes in the administration of the State program, including the Head Start program, within such State.

“(ii) The rate of progress of the State in improving the school readiness of disadvantaged children in the key domains of development.

“(iii) Data as described in subparagraph (A), as updated annually.

“(iv) The extent to which each State has met the goals established by such State with respect to annual goals as described under section 643(h)(10).

“(4) REPORT.—(A) The Secretary shall provide an interim report on the progress of such evaluation and of the progress of States

participating in the State demonstration in increasing the availability of high quality prekindergarten services for low-income children not later than October 1, 2006 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions in the Senate.

“(B) The Secretary shall provide a final report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions in the Senate, not later than October 1, 2007, which shall include an overall evaluation of the State demonstration program, including an assessment of its success in increasing the overall availability of high quality prekindergarten services for low income children in each of the participating States as compared to a representative sample of non-participating States.

“(p) STATE PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT.—Following the submission of an application fulfilling all requirements of this section, a State that meets all eligibility requirements set forth in section 643A(a)(2) and is selected by the Secretary to participate in the demonstration program under this section shall—

“(1) maintain or increase fiscal year 2003 State funding levels for early childhood education;

“(2) provide an additional contribution of non-federal funds equal to five percent of the State's federal Head Start allotment;

“(3) use Head Start funding only for the purposes of Head Start as described in section 636;

“(4) provide all comprehensive social services currently available to Head Start children, including health and nutrition;

“(5) develop a strategy to maximize parental involvement to enable parents to become full partners in the education of their children;

“(6) demonstrate that the qualifications and credentials for early childhood teachers meet or exceed the standards in section 648A(a)(2)(A), (B), and (C);

“(7) enforce quality standards for school readiness that are aligned with K-12 educational standards and generally meet or exceed the Federal Head Start performance standards;

“(8) continue funding, for a period of 60 months, all current Head Start grantees as described in section 643A(d);

“(9) provide services described in section 641A that are at least as extensive as were provided, and to at least as many low-income children and families in the State, in each fiscal year as were provided such services in the base year;

“(10) establish a comprehensive collaboration effort to integrate Head Start, state-funded pre-kindergarten programs, Even Start, Title I preschool, and Early Reading First;

“(11) participate in independent evaluations of the demonstration program authorized under this subchapter; and

“(12) submit to Federal oversight by the Secretary.”

“(q) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘base year’ means the fiscal year 2003.”

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. 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 read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an op-

ponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House report 108-232.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. WOOLSEY: Page 57, strike lines 6 through 14.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 336, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It strikes the provision in the bill which would allow faith-based providers of Head Start services to discriminate based on religion against employees who are paid with public funds.

Faith-based providers are already participating in Head Start, Mr. Chairman, and they abide by current law which says they cannot discriminate based on religion when they use taxpayers' dollars to hire employees. H.R. 2210 changes that.

If H.R. 2210 becomes law with this employment discrimination exception in it, it will be the first time, the first time Congress has ever repealed a law that prohibits religious discrimination. And contrary to what my colleagues on the other side have been saying, H.R. 2210 is not consistent with title VII of the civil rights law.

Title VII allows faith-based organizations to discriminate using their own money. H.R. 2210 will allow public taxpayers' money to be used for religious discrimination.

Faith-based organizations do not want this, Mr. Chairman. That is why the Coalition Against Religious Discrimination sent a letter signed by 30 faith-based organizations asking Members to vote for the Woolsey-Edwards-Frank-Scott-Van Hollen amendment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and any attempt to deny organizations their longstanding civil rights protections. The amendment before us is a direct attack on faith-based service providers seeking to participate in the Head Start program, where they can make a valuable difference in the lives of disadvantaged children.

Make no mistake, the amendment before us would not only be stripping faith-based organizations of their rights, but worse, will eliminate an entire category of potential Head Start

service providers simply because they choose to maintain their legally protected right to make staffing decisions consistent with their organizational character and with the protections provided them under title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

This debate must be understood in real terms. Let us take the Catholic church, for example. Often these churches have strong roots in the community and a vast network of volunteers and employees who work together to make a difference for those who need a helping hand. They participate in many activities that are not about religion, but simply about making a difference in the lives of those in need. These organizations are a natural choice to participate in the Head Start program. After all, the infrastructure is in place, the members of the community already consider church a resource for social services, and workers are ready and willing to take in these needy children and give them the comprehensive support they need to get ready to enter school.

So what is the catch? Catholic churches have a tendency to hire Catholics. The Supreme Court does not see a problem with this. In fact, the Supreme Court has unanimously upheld the right of religious organizations to be religious and make staffing decisions based on that decision. There is no debate about that right. Until today, that is, when we consider this amendment that would make it illegal for these churches to continue to hire Catholics if they choose to participate in the Head Start program.

That is what we are talking about here, a double standard applying only to faith-based organizations, which tells them that they cannot serve disadvantaged children in Head Start unless they relinquish their identity, especially when it comes to hiring.

Faith-based organizations are a priceless national resource, providing help and hope to communities across America. And by their very nature, faith-based organizations often reach out to those in need when others may turn a blind eye. Improving lives is all in a day's work for faith-based organizations. That is why the President has called on Congress to level the playing field when these compassionate service providers are seeking to play a role in Federal initiatives like the Head Start program, to serve those who need our help.

□ 2200

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat this amendment. We should not ask religious groups to forfeit their religious character and identity as a condition of participating in Head Start. If we have discourage faith-based organizations from participating, we will be giving Head Start children less than we are capable of giving them. I think we must stand firm to protect the civil rights exemption for faith-based orga-

nizations so they can do their good works and community all across the Nation.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It preserves the law just as it has been since the Head Start program began. Faith-based organizations can and do sponsor Head Start programs. In fact, 8 percent of the Head Start programs today are sponsored by faith-based organizations. They administer the Head Start programs just as any other sponsor of a federally funded program, including compliance with traditional anti-discrimination laws.

The underlying bill allows many programs to discriminate in employment based on religion. Make no mistake, if there is discrimination based on religion, there can be discrimination based on race, because eleven o'clock on Sunday is still the most racially segregated hour of the week.

So if an organization can select employees based on which church, synagogue, mosque or temple someone belongs to, that will have racial overtones. There used to be a time in America when certain people were routinely denied the opportunity to even be considered for good jobs and all African American parents at one time or another had to explain to their children why they had to sit in the back of the bus or why they could not be considered for jobs at certain companies. That invidious discrimination was so ugly that our Nation passed laws to make it illegal to discriminate in employment based on race, color, creed, national origin or sex in most cases, even with private funds, but illegal to discriminate in all cases with Federal funds.

Now, churches can discriminate with their own money, but not with Federal taxpayers' money. If this amendment is not adopted, the days of invidious discrimination could return and some parents will have to explain to their children why other parents could become teachers but not them solely because of the family's religion. Just what kind of head start lesson is that?

So this vote is important because it will decide and we will decide tonight just what kind of head start our next generation will have.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a member of our committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago in my district we held a government reform subcommittee hearing on the effectiveness of faith-based organizations. And our chairman is exactly right. These are priceless national resources. There is an issue that I am familiar with and today I must rise in opposition to the Woolsey amendment to strike the faith-based

provision from the School Readiness Act.

I have listened to the debate on this bill in subcommittee and here on the floor, and actually I have been surprised at the level of false information being used to defeat what is an excellent aspect of this legislation. This bill does not ignore or undermine civil rights laws. Instead, it brings the Head Start program up to date with them. The Civil Rights Act was amended in 1972 by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act because Congress recognized that there needed to be a more defined relationship between church and State. Indeed, these changes were made in response to concerns that government might interfere with the affairs of religious organizations.

As the law is written now, a church or religious institution can set up a Head Start center, but they have to give up their right to hire based on a person's religion, something that most are not willing to do. And in many communities there is a great need to establish more Head Start centers. Think how many more children would be served if the restriction were removed.

One of the fundamental tenants of faith is that we must help people in need and work to better one's community. When religious organizations cannot participate in establishing and running Head Start centers, children lose out on an opportunity to learn, to prepare for school, and to be nurtured.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, no American citizen, not one, should have to pass someone else's religious test to qualify for a federally funded job. That is the principle behind the Woolsey amendment. Frankly, I am appalled that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would be mischaracterized by some to defend the act of religious discrimination and bigotry when using Federal tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to imagine for a moment that you are applying for a Head Start job which is funded by Federal tax dollars. You have a college degree in early childhood education. You have excellent references and 10 years of experience in working with prekindergarten children. Prior to your job interview, you prepare for days for possible questions regarding teaching methods and enhancing children's self-esteem. Then when you sit down for your job interview, the first question asked of you is this: Are you Jewish or Catholic? Puzzled about why you would be asked such a question for a Head Start job interview, you answer that your faith is a private matter and it has nothing to do with your job qualifications. But the job interviewer responds by saying, no, your job interview is over. You are not being hired because we do not hire Catholics or Jews. Offended, you say you are an American citizen and you cannot be denied a federally funded job based solely

on your private, personal religious faith.

The interviewer says, no, you are wrong. On July 24 of 2003, the House of Representatives in Washington passed the Head Start bill which allows me to make hiring and firing decisions based solely on your personal religious faith.

Mr. Chairman, I find this scenario to be deeply offensive and so do the vast majority of Americans. I would repeat: no American citizen should have to pass someone else's religious test to qualify for a federally funded tax-supported job. Yet, by saying no to the Woolsey amendment, Members of this House would be legalizing Federal subsidies of religious discrimination and bigotry. That is wrong. Stand up for the fundamental right of religious freedom. Vote for the Woolsey amendment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because quite simply it is an exceptionally bad idea.

Children who are served by Head Start have the right to receive those services in the most effective way possible. In many cases it will be a traditional public sector provider; but in at least some, in some, it may be a faith-based organization. We should encourage faith-based groups from coming forward. This would do the opposite. It is a bad idea. Vote down the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, let me start by talking about what this amendment is not about. It is not about whether faith-based organizations can provide valuable services. They can and they do. In fact, many are currently running Head Start programs. The issue is whether those Head Start programs, faith-based programs that are receiving taxpayers dollars can discriminate in hiring based on religion; whether someone who comes to them with a terrific background in early childhood education can have the door shut on them because they do not pass a particular religious test, because they are not Jewish or not Christian or not Muslim or whatever the particular test is.

Now, I have talked to many people around this country involved in the Head Start program, and not one of them has said to me, gee, we could do a much better job teaching children how to read, we could do a much better job teaching children arithmetic if only we could discriminate, if only we could fire the Jews in our organization, if only we could fire the Christians, if only we could fire the Baptists. No one has said that we need to do that, and it is a sad day that that comes up on this bill.

Nothing should be more universal. Nothing is more universal in this coun-

try than the desire of everyone to provide their children with a good start in life, a head start in life. And yet what this provision of the bill does that we are stripping out is sends a terrible message to the children of this country that it is okay to discriminate based on religion.

When we are teaching children in their earliest years the values that we want them to learn, we do not want to teach them the lesson of religious intolerance and religious bigotry. We must support the Woolsey amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), a new member of our committee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2210 and in opposition to the Woolsey amendment.

The United States Supreme Court has ruled and has looked at this issue in the Corporation of the Presiding Bishop v. Amos and has upheld the title VII exemption as constitutional under our law. Finding that the exemption did not violate the establishment clause, the Supreme Court has made it clear that "it is a permissible legislative purpose to alleviate significant governmental interference with the ability of religious organizations to define and carry out their religious missions."

This is not a matter of discrimination or teaching children discrimination. This is a matter of abiding by the law. The Clinton administration passed numerous legislation that followed this same idea. These faith-based organizations provide good services. They should be able to hire the people that they feel are important to their cause, and this would in no way interfere with the rights of the students that come before the Head Start program. It is a good idea led by good people. I urge its support.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) has 3 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 3½ minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a couple of things that have been said that I think need direct response to.

One is you could serve more children if you allow people to discriminate. That is not true. You will serve more people if you put more money into the Head Start program. There are plenty of sponsors who are willing to provide services without discriminating.

Second, you lose your right to discriminate. You do not lose your right to discriminate with your church money if you sponsor a federally funded program, but you cannot discriminate with the taxpayers' money. I think that needs to be said in response to some of the comments previously made.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), a former member of our committee.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this difficult bill. When you make changes that are important to help poor kids in America, those who are disadvantaged, you will get controversy. You have plenty of it, but I congratulate you on trying to improve a good program.

Let me directly address this amendment. This amendment would in effect say that if you have strong religious values of any faith, check it at the door or do not apply. In fact, it was also said by another Member that many organizations and people who are currently serving these kids are not asking for this amendment. Of course not. They have the contracts.

Let us be frank here. In these inner-city areas where the Head Start programs are concentrated or in the rural poorer areas, we are mostly looking at black and Hispanic small churches that have been cut out of the system. We are also looking at rural white churches, the only institutions that have often stayed in those communities and they would like to be involved and some of those of deepest passion.

If you are a Christian church, you believe your church is supposed to reflect the glory of God. You do not want to be forced to hire who the government says you must hire. If you have somebody who has had things that violate your faith, you do not want to be told that you cannot violate them. You want to be involved in helping people. You want to practice that compassion, whether you are Muslim, whether you are Jewish, whether you are Christian. This amendment would say to those small churches who are the pillars of those institutions, no, you are not eligible.

Of course the people who have the contracts want this. This has already been ruled constitutional by the Supreme Court. They have said that there is a constitutional right, even when you get public funds, to keep your religious liberty to hire and fire who you want. This is a question of do we believe these programs are effective. Do we believe the local-based programs in these communities have a value there; that the minority churches that I have visited in the urban centers who want to get involved with the kids and give them a chance, should these churches be allowed to participate without accepting the mandates of the Federal Government.

□ 2215

This is not about big white suburban churches coming in and discriminating. This is mostly going to be minority churches in these poor areas who want to apply for these grants, and you are saying, unless you are willing to take

the Federal Government telling you who to hire, who to fire, do not apply. And that is wrong, and it is a constitutionally protected right, and this amendment would be a disaster to many of those small churches who want to participate.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair advise me, please, who has the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has the right to close.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as to the history, it is clear, as it has been for 31 years, that the law says that if you take Federal funds, you cannot take the money you took from all the taxpayers and then tell some of those taxpayers many of them are ineligible because of their religion.

The gentleman from Indiana is wrong. We are not having the Federal Government tell you who to hire. We are saying that the Federal Government tells you you cannot refuse to hire most of the people who pay taxes that you are now spending because they do not like your religious beliefs. And I have to say, you tell me that this drives religions away. What are we talking about, the Taliban? I mean, what is it that is so terrible?

We are saying when you run your church, you run your church. When you hire people with your own money then you hire whoever you want, but when you take Federal tax dollars for a secular purpose, remember by definition, you cannot get Federal funds for religious purposes. So you are getting Federal funds for secular purposes, nonreligious purposes. Every taxpayer contributes and you are telling people then you can hire only people of your religion as they believe. That means racial segregation *de facto*.

How many whites will the black Muslims hire? How many blacks will the Orthodox Jews hire? Religion unfortunately *de facto* means segregation. But they also have to say what is it that is so terrible?

What we are saying to religious people is, in doing these good works with Federal money, we ask you please to associate with people of other religions, and you are telling us that asking religious people to associate with people of other religions defiles them. You ought to call your position the Antiheretic and Infidel Association Act. Unclean. Get away from me, unbeliever.

Well, if you want to say, get away from me, unbeliever, go ahead, but do not take the unbeliever's money through taxes and say, thank you for the tax money, now get out of here before you profane my day care center, before you profane my Head Start center.

How can you tell people that everybody has to pay taxes, but only those who meet a certain religious test, and

it is not a broad religious test, it is a specific one, you believe in evolution, you cannot do Head Start here? You believe in all kinds of things, out you go.

So we are simply asking that the law be maintained. Our amendment maintains current law, and we ask you, please do not take the Taliban as the model for American social service.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, can the Chair advise me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, the people in this country will not believe what they are hearing tonight, that this amendment will allow thousands of dedicated Head Start teachers to be fired for no other reason than religious prejudice.

Our amendment will reinstate the fundamental American protections against religious discrimination in employment. It will protect the jobs of thousands of Head Start teachers and the stability of children and families in Head Start programs.

Voting for this amendment means that my colleagues are voting against religious discrimination.

Why would anyone do otherwise?

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I think there is some misunderstanding. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act says that religious organizations can discriminate in their hiring based on religion. That is what it says.

Look at Federal laws that provide grants to community-based organizations. Some of those require these organizations to give up their title VII protections, like the Head Start program we have before us. We have other programs, dozens of them, where they can maintain their title VII protections, and as I have told the Members on the other side over the last several months, as we bring these reauthorizations through our committee, like the Workforce Investment Act, like Head Start, I am going to provide some consistency.

President Clinton signed five programs into law that allowed faith-based organizations to have their title VII exemption with Federal funds, and all we want to do is to say if you take Federal funds and you provide Head Start services, you do not have to give up your title VII protections that are granted to you, plain and simple.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support the Woolsey-Scott amendment to H.R. 2210 to remove the provision allowing religious discrimination in employment from the underlying bill. The Head Start Act, a bill that should be designed to improve the education of children, is no place to encourage discrimination. In fact, there is no place for re-

ligious discrimination in American law just as there should be no place in America for that kind of backwards thinking.

H.R. 2210, in its current state, erodes fundamental civil rights protections for Head Start workers and families by exempting faith-based organizations from compliance with the current Head Start law. Presently, under our country's existing laws, in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, employing institutions using private funds were exempt from employment discrimination protections. However, Head Start programs are federally funded and as such do not fall under the jurisdiction of the Title VII statute. Simply put: Public funds are not allowed to be used to encourage religious discrimination in employment and that should not change.

Each of my colleagues should understand that without the Woolsey-Scott amendment, we are advocating the notion that one's ability to nurture and develop the minds of our children is contingent on the religious institution to which the individual belongs. What if anything is accomplished by attempting to create religious hierarchies in the workplace? What benefit does that provide the Head Start child? None. And thus the language allowing religious discrimination should be stricken from the bill. As should all language that does not add to the well being of children.

The Founding Fathers of this country found it necessary to say that no one should be unfairly judged or discriminated against on the basis of their religion. This Congress should do no less. We should not create law that does harm. We should not encourage discrimination of any kind, religious or otherwise.

Surely, this country prides itself on its diversity and its willingness to open its doors to people of different religions, races, and ethnic backgrounds. Yet on the floor of the people's House we are faced with an attempt by the Republicans to create a monolithic sub-culture within our Head Start programs. Despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, H.R. 2210 as it currently reads will not only result in the loss of jobs for teachers who do not identify with their employer's religious beliefs but more importantly it will cause the loss of role models and advocates for youth who are already at-risk.

The Woolsey-Scott amendment will effectively retain civil rights protections for employees of Head Start programs. This amendment simply retains their freedom of religious choice and their freedom not to be discriminated against due to their religion. This amendment adds nothing to the law rather it maintains current law. Without the addition of the Woolsey-Scott amendment, however, the body elected to serve all of the people of this country will have endorsed employment discrimination with federal dollars. We simply cannot allow this to happen. We must do everything we can to preserve the fundamentals of Head Start. I urge my colleagues to vote to ensure that our child readiness programs are not muddled and degraded by the promotion of religious discrimination. Therefore, I stand in full support of the Woolsey-Scott amendment and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-232.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "School Readiness Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

Section 636 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 636. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"It is the purpose of this subchapter to promote school readiness by enhancing the development of low-income children, through educational instruction in prereading skills, premathematics skills, and language, and through the provision to low-income children and their families of health, educational, nutritional, social and other services that are determined, based on family needs assessments, to be necessary."

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 637 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9832) is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (17) by striking ", but for fiscal years" and all that follows down to the period.

(2) By adding the following at the end thereof:

"(18) The term 'eligible entities' means an institution of higher education or other agency with expertise in delivering training in early childhood development, family support, and other assistance designed to improve the quality of early childhood educations programs.

"(19) The term 'homeless children' has the meaning given such term in subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11431 et seq.)."

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION.

Section 639 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9834) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 639. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this subchapter \$6,870,000,000 for the fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2005 through 2008.

"(b) SPECIFIC PROGRAMS.—From the amount appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make available not more than \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2008, to carry out such other research, demonstration, and evaluation activities, including longitudinal studies, under section 649.

"(1) not more than \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to carry out impact studies under section 649(g); and

"(2) not more than \$13,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2008, to carry out other research, demonstration, and evaluation activities, including longitudinal studies, under section 649.

"(c) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to assist participating States with the administrative expenses associated with implementing a program under section 643A."

SEC. 5. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.

Section 640 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9835) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(2):

(A) By striking "1998" in subparagraph (A) and inserting "2003".

(B) By amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

"(B) payments, subject to paragraph (7) to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands of the United States;"

(2) By striking the last sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(3)(A) By amending subsection (a)(2)(C) to read as follows:

"(C) training and technical assistance activities that are sufficient to meet the needs associated with program expansion and to foster program and management improvement as described in section 648 of this subchapter, in an amount for each fiscal year which is not less than one percent, and shall not exceed 2 percent, of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year, of which—

"(i) not less than 50 percent shall be made available to local Head Start agencies to comply with the standards described in section 641A(a)(1), of which not less than 50 percent shall be used to comply with the standards described in section 641A(a)(1)(B) and for the uses described in clauses (iii), (iv), and (vii) of subsection (a)(3)(B);

"(ii) not less than 30 percent shall be made available to support a State system of early childhood education training and technical assistance;

"(iii) not less than 20 percent shall be made available to the Secretary to assist local programs in meeting the standards described in section 641A(a)(1); and

"(iv) not less than \$3,000,000 of the amount in clause (iii) appropriated for such fiscal year shall be made available to carry out activities described in section 648(c)(4);"

(B) By inserting the following at the end of subsection (a)(2):

"If less than 2 percent of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year is made available for the activities authorized in subparagraph (C), then the Secretary is authorized to use at least 25 percent of such funds to fund migrant and seasonal Head Start programs for expansion of services. If sufficient migrant and seasonal eligible children are not available to use such funds, then enrollment priority shall be given to other disadvantaged populations referred to in subparagraph (A)."

(4) In subsection (a)(3)(A) by inserting at the end thereof:

"(iii) After the reservation of amounts under paragraph (2) (including the 2 percent amount referred to in paragraph (2)(C)) and the 60 percent amount referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, a portion of the remaining funds shall be made available to expand services to underserved populations, such as children receiving services under the Early Head Start and Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs."

(5) In subsection (a)(3)(A)(i)(I) by striking "1999" and all that follows down to the semicolon and inserting "2004 through 2008".

(6) By amending subsection (a)(3)(B) to read as follows:

"(B) Funds reserved under this paragraph (referred to in this paragraph as 'quality improvement funds') shall be used to accomplish any or all of the following goals:

"(i) Ensuring that Head Start programs meet or exceed standards pursuant to section 641A(a)(1).

"(ii) Ensuring that such programs have adequate numbers of qualified staff, and that such staff is furnished adequate training, including developing skills to promote the development of language skills, premathematic skills, and prereading in young children and in working with children with non-English language background, children referred by child welfare services, and children with disabilities, when appropriate.

"(iii) Developing and financing the salary scales described under section 644(a) and section 653, in order to ensure that salary levels and benefits are adequate to attract and retain qualified staff for such programs.

"(iv) Using salary increases to improve staff qualifications, and to assist with the implementation of programs specifically designed to enable lead instructors to become more effective educators, for the staff of Head Start programs, and to encourage the staff to continually improve their skills and expertise by informing the staff of the availability of Federal and State incentive and loan forgiveness programs for professional development.

"(v) Improving community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments for such programs and collaboration efforts for such programs, including collaborations to increase program participation by underserved populations of eligible children.

"(vi) Ensuring that the physical environments of Head Start programs are conducive to providing effective program services to children and families, and are accessible to children with disabilities and their parents.

"(vii) Ensuring that such programs have qualified staff that can promote language skills and literacy growth of children and that can provide children with a variety of skills that have been identified, through scientifically based reading research, as predictive of later reading achievement.

"(viii) Providing assistance to complete post-secondary course work needed to attain baccalaureate degrees in early childhood education.

"(ix) Making such other improvements in the quality of such programs as the Secretary may designate.

"(x) To promote the regular attendance and stability of highly mobile children, including migrant and homeless children."

(7) By amending subsection (a)(3)(C) to read as follows:

"(C) Quality improvement funds shall be used to carry out any or all of the following activities:

"(i)(I) Not less than one-half of the amount reserved under this paragraph, to improve the compensation (including benefits) of classroom teachers and other staff of Head Start agencies providing instructional services and thereby enhancing recruitment and retention of qualified staff, including recruitment and retention pursuant to achieving the requirements set forth in section 648A(a). The expenditure of funds under this clause shall be subject to section 653. Salary increases, in excess of cost-of-living allowance, provided with such funds shall be subject to the specific standards governing salaries and salary increases established pursuant to section 644(a).

“(II) If a Head Start agency certifies to the Secretary for such fiscal year that part of the funds set aside under subclause (I) to improve wages cannot be expended by such agency to improve wages because of the operation of section 653, then such agency may expend such part for any of the uses specified in this subparagraph (other than wages).

“(III) From the remainder of the amount reserved under this paragraph (after the Secretary carries out subclause (I)), the Secretary shall carry out any or all of the activities described in clauses (ii) through (vii), placing the highest priority on the activities described in clause (ii).

“(ii) To train classroom teachers and other staff to meet the education standards described in section 641A(a)(1)(B), through activities—

“(I) to promote children's language and prereading growth, through techniques identified through scientifically based reading research;

“(II) to promote the acquisition of the English language for non-English background children and families;

“(III) to foster children's school readiness skills through activities described in section 648A(a)(1); and

“(IV) to educate and provide training necessary to improve the qualifications particularly with respect to such assistance to enable more instructors to meet the degree requirements under section 648A(a)(2)(A) and to support staff training, child counseling, and other services necessary to address the problems of children participating in Head Start programs, including children from dysfunctional families, children who experience chronic violence in their communities, and children who experience substance abuse in their families.

“(iii) To employ additional Head Start staff, including staff necessary to reduce the child-staff ratio lead instructors who meet the qualifications of section 648A(a) and staff necessary to coordinate a Head Start program with other services available to children participating in such program and to their families.

“(iv) To pay costs incurred by Head Start agencies to purchase insurance (other than employee benefits) and thereby maintain or expand Head Start services.

“(v) To supplement amounts provided under paragraph (2)(C) to provide training necessary to improve the qualifications of the staff of the Head Start agencies, and to support staff training, child counseling, and other services necessary to address the problems of children participating in Head Start programs, including children from dysfunctional families, children who experience chronic violence in their communities, and children who experience substance abuse in their families.

“(vi) To conduct outreach to homeless families in an effort to increase the program participation of eligible homeless children.

“(vii) Such other activities as the Secretary may designate.

“(viii) To conduct outreach to migrant and seasonal farm-working families and families with children with a limited English proficiency.”

(8) In subsection (a)(4) by striking “1998” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “2003”.

(9) In subsection (a)(5)(B)—

(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by inserting “early childhood education” after “regarding”.

(10) By amending subsection (a)(5)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) In order to improve results for children, a State that receives a grant under subparagraph (B) shall—

“(i) appoint an individual to serve as the State Director of Collaboration between—

“(I) the appropriate regional office of the Administration for Children and Families;

“(II) the State educational agency;

“(III) the State Department of Health and Human Services;

“(IV) the State agency that oversees child care;

“(V) the State agency that assists children with developmental disabilities;

“(VI) the State Head Start Association;

“(VII) the State network of child care resource and referral agencies;

“(VIII) local educational agencies;

“(IX) community-based and faith-based organizations;

“(X) State representatives of migrant and seasonal Head Start programs;

“(XI) State representatives of Indian Head Start programs;

“(XII) State and local providers of early childhood education and child care; and

“(XIII) other entities carrying out programs serving low-income children and families in the State;

“(ii) ensure that the State Director of Collaboration holds a position with sufficient authority and access to ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) is effective and involves a range of State agencies;

“(iii) involve the entities described in section clause (i) to develop a strategic plan for the coordinated outreach to identify eligible children and implementation strategies based on a needs assessment conducted by the Office of the State Director of Collaboration which shall include an assessment of the availability of high quality prekindergarten services for low-income children in the State. Such assessment shall be completed within one year after the date of enactment of the ‘School Readiness Act of 2003’ and be updated on an annual basis and shall be made available to the general public within the State;

“(iv) ensure that the collaboration described in subparagraph (B) involves coordination of Head Start services with health care, welfare, child care, child protective services, education, and community service activities, family literacy services, activities relating to children with disabilities (including coordination of services with those State officials who are responsible for administering part C and section 619 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), and services for homeless children (including coordination of services with the Office of Coordinator for Education of Homeless Children and Youth designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001);

“(v) consult with the chief State school officer, local educational agencies, and representatives of local Head Start agencies and providers of early childhood education and care in unified planning regarding early care and education services at both the State and local levels, including collaborative efforts to develop school readiness standards; and

“(vi) consult with the chief State school officer, local educational agencies, State child care administrators, State human services administrators, representatives of local resource and referral agencies, local early childhood councils, providers of early childhood education and care and other relevant State and local agencies, and representatives of the State Head Start Associations to plan for the provision of full-working-day, full calendar year early care and education services for children.”

(11) By amending clause (i) of subsection (a)(5)(D) by inserting “and providers of serv-

ices supporting early childhood education and child care” after “Associations”.

(12) By amending subsection (a)(6)(A) to read as follows:

“(A) From amounts reserved and allotted pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (4), the Secretary shall use, for grants for programs described in section 645A(a) of this subchapter, a portion of the combined total of such amounts equal to at least 10 percent for fiscal years 2004 through 2008, of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 639(a), except as provided in subparagraph (B).”

(13) By inserting the following before the period at the end of subsection (f): “, including models that leverage the existing capacity and capabilities of the delivery system of early childhood education and child care”.

(14) By inserting the following after “manner that will” in subsection (g)(2)(G): “leverage the existing delivery systems of such services and”.

(15) By amending subsection (g)(2)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) the extent to which the applicant has undertaken community-wide strategic planning and needs assessments involving other community organizations and public agencies serving children and families (including organizations and agencies providing family support services and protective services to children and families, and organizations serving families in whose homes English is not the language customarily spoken), and organizations and public entities serving children with disabilities and homeless children (including the local educational agency liaison designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001);”

(16) By inserting in subsection (g)(2)(H) after “serving the community involved” the following: “, including the liaison designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001.”

(17) By adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

“(m) ENROLLMENT OF HOMELESS CHILDREN.—The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe policies and procedures to remove barriers to the enrollment and participation of eligible homeless children in Head Start programs. Such regulations shall require Head Start agencies to:

“(1) implement policies and procedures to ensure that eligible homeless children are identified and prioritized for enrollment,

“(2) allow homeless families to apply to, enroll in and attend Head Start programs while required documents, such as proof of residency, immunization and other medical records, birth certificates and other documents, are obtained within a reasonable time frame, and

“(3) coordinate individual Head Start centers and programs with efforts to implement Subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

“(n) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require a State to establish a program of early education for children in the State, to require any child to participate in a program of early education, to attend school, or to participate in any initial screening prior to participation in such program, except as provided under section 612(a)(3), (consistent with section 614(a)(1)(C)), of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

“(o) MATERIALS.—All curricula and instructional materials funded under this subchapter shall be scientifically based and age appropriate. Parents shall have the ability to inspect, upon request, any curricula or instructional materials.”

SEC. 6. DESIGNATION OF AGENCIES.

Section 641 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9836) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting after “community” in the first place it appears “, including a community-based or faith-based organization”;

(B) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(D) by adding the following at the end thereof:

“(2) In order to be designated as a Head Start agency and to receive a grant under this subchapter, a grantee shall establish grantee-determined goals for improving the school readiness of children participating in a program under this subchapter, which shall include goals for—

“(A) educational instruction in prereading, premathematical, and language skills; and

“(B) the provision of health, educational, nutritional, social, and other services.

“(3) In order to receive a grant subsequent to the initial grant provided following the date of enactment of this subchapter, the grantee shall demonstrate that it has met the goals described in paragraph (2).

“(4) Progress in meeting such goals shall not be measured primarily or solely by the results of assessments.”

(2) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) In the administration of the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the chief executive officer of the State involved if such State expends non-Federal funds to carry out Head Start programs, give priority in the designation of Head Start agencies to any local public or private nonprofit or for-profit agency which is receiving funds under any Head Start program on the date of the enactment of this Act that fulfills the program and financial management requirements, standards described in section 641A(a)(1), results-based performance measures developed by the Secretary under section 641A(b), or other requirements established by the Secretary.”

(3) By amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) If no entity in a community is entitled to the priority specified in subsection (c), then the Secretary may designate a Head Start agency from among qualified applicants in such community. In selecting from among qualified applicants for designation as a Head Start agency, the Secretary shall give priority to any qualified agency that functioned as a Head Start delegate agency in the community and carried out a Head Start program that the Secretary determines met or exceeded such performance standards and such results-based performance measures. In selecting from among qualified applicants for designation as a Head Start agency, the Secretary shall consider the effectiveness of each such applicant to provide Head Start services, based on—

“(1) any past performance of such applicant in providing services comparable to Head Start services, including how effectively such applicant provided such comparable services;

“(2) the capacity of such applicant to serve eligible children with scientifically-based programs that promote school readiness of children participating in the program;

“(3) the plan of such applicant to meet standards set forth in section 641A(a)(1), with particular attention to the standards set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such section;

“(4) the plan of such applicant to provide comprehensive health, nutritional, educational, social, and other services needed to prepare children to succeed in school;

“(5) the plan of such applicant to coordinate the Head Start program it proposes to carry out with other preschool programs, including Early Reading First and Even Start programs under title I, part B, subparts 1 and 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; other preschool programs carried out under title I of the Act; programs under part C and section 619 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; State prekindergarten programs; and with the educational programs such children will enter at the age of compulsory school attendance;

“(6) the plan of such applicant to coordinate the Head Start program it proposes to carry out with private entities with resources available to assist the Head Start Program meet its program needs;

“(7) the plan of such applicant—

“(A) to seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities (at home and in the center involved where practicable) designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

“(B) to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;

“(C) to offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.), public and school libraries, and family support programs) to such parents—

“(i) family literacy services; and

“(ii) parenting skills training;

“(D) to offer to parents of participating children substance abuse counseling (either directly or through referral to local entities), including information on drug-exposed infants and fetal alcohol syndrome;

“(E) at the option of such applicant, to offer (directly or through referral to local entities) to such parents—

“(i) training in basic child development;

“(ii) assistance in developing communication skills;

“(iii) opportunities for parents to share experiences with other parents; or

“(iv) any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

“(F) to provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in subparagraphs (C) (D), and (E) in which such parents may choose to become involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities); and

“(G) to extend out reach to fathers in order to strengthen the role of fathers in families by working directly with fathers and father-figures through such activities as including fathers in home visits; implementing father outreach efforts, providing opportunities for direct father-child interactions; and targeting increased male participation in the program;

“(8) the ability of such applicant to carry out the plans described in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4);

“(9) other factors related to the requirements of this subchapter;

“(10) the plan of such applicant to meet the needs of non-English background children and their families, including needs related to the acquisition of the English language;

“(11) the plan of such applicant to meet the needs of children with disabilities;

“(12) the plan of such applicant who chooses to assist younger siblings of children who will participate in the proposed Head Start program to obtain health services from other sources;

“(13) the plan of such applicant to collaborate with other entities carrying out early childhood education and child care programs in the community; and

“(14) the plan of such applicant to meet the needs of homeless children.”

SEC. 7. QUALITY STANDARDS; MONITORING OF HEAD START AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.

Section 641A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9836a) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(1)(B) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) additional education standards to ensure that the children participating in the program, at a minimum develop and demonstrate—

“(I) language skills;

“(II) prereading knowledge and skills, including interest in and appreciation of books, reading and writing either alone or with others;

“(III) premathematics knowledge and skills, including aspects of classification, seriation, number, spatial relations, and time;

“(IV) cognitive abilities related to academic achievement;

“(V) social and emotional development important for environments constructive for child development, early learning, and school success; and

“(VI) in the case of limited-English proficient children, progress toward acquisition of the English language.”

(2) By amending subsection (a)(2)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) take into consideration—

“(i) past experience with use of the standards in effect under this subchapter on October 27, 1998;

“(ii) changes over the period since October 27, 1998, in the circumstances and problems typically facing children and families served by Head Start agencies;

“(iii) developments concerning best practices with respect to early childhood education and development, children with disabilities, family services, program administration, and financial management;

“(iv) projected needs of an expanding Head Start program;

“(v) guidelines and standards currently in effect or under consideration that promote child health services, and projected needs of expanding Head Start programs;

“(vi) changes in the population of children who are eligible to participate in Head Start programs, including the language background and family structure of such children;

“(vii) the need for, and state-of-the-art developments relating to, local policies and activities designed to ensure that children participating in Head Start programs make a successful transition to schools; and

“(viii) the unique challenges faced by individual programs, including those that are seasonal or short term, and those that serve rural populations; and”

(3) In subsection (a)(2)(C)(ii) by striking all that follows “in effect on” down to the period and inserting “October 27, 1998”.

(4) By amending subsection (b)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) CHARACTERISTICS OF MEASURES.—The performance measures developed under this subsection shall—

“(A) be used to assess the impact of the various services provided by Head Start programs and, to the extent the Secretary finds appropriate, administrative and financial management practices of such programs;

“(B) be adaptable for use in self-assessment, peer review, and program evaluation of individual Head Start agencies and programs;

“(C) be developed for other program purposes as determined by the Secretary;

“(D) be appropriate for the population served; and

“(E) be reviewed not less than every 4 years, based on advances in the science of early childhood development.

The performance measures shall include the performance standards described in subsection (a)(1)(A) and (B).”.

(5) By amending subsection (b)(4) to read as follows:

“(4) EDUCATIONAL MEASURES.—Results based measures shall be designed for the purpose of promoting the competencies of children participating in Head Start programs specified in subsection (a)(1)(B)(ii), with an emphasis on measuring those competencies that have a strong scientifically-based predictability of a child's school readiness and later performance in school.”.

(6) In subsection (c)(1)(C) by striking “the standards” and inserting “one or more of the performance measures developed by the Secretary under subsection (b)”.

(7) By amending subsection (c)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) CONDUCT OF REVIEWS.—The Secretary shall ensure that reviews described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1)—

“(A) that incorporate a monitoring visit, do so without prior notice of the visit to the local agency or program;

“(B) are conducted by review teams that shall include individuals who are knowledgeable about Head Start programs and, to the maximum extent practicable, the diverse (including linguistic and cultural) needs of eligible children (including children with disabilities) and limited-English proficient children and their families;

“(C) include as part of the reviews of the programs, a review and assessment of program effectiveness, as measured in accordance with the results-based performance measures developed by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b) and with the standards established pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1);

“(D) seek information from the communities and the States involved about the performance of the programs and the efforts of the Head Start agencies to collaborate with other entities carrying out early childhood education and child care programs in the community;

“(E) seek information from the communities where Head Start programs exist about innovative or effective collaborative efforts, barriers to collaboration, and the efforts of the Head Start agencies and programs to collaborate with the entities carrying out early childhood education and child care programs in the community;

“(F) include as part of the reviews of the programs, a review and assessment of whether a program is in conformity with the income eligibility requirements, as defined in section 645 and regulations promulgated thereunder;

“(G) include as part of the reviews of the programs, a review and assessment of whether programs have adequately addressed the population and community needs (including populations of children with a limited English proficiency and children of migrant and seasonal farm-working families); and

“(H) include as part of the review the extent to which the program addresses the community needs and strategic plan identified in section 640(g)(2)(C).”.

(8) By amending so much of subsection (d)(1) as precedes subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(1) DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary determines, on the basis of a review pursuant to subsection (c), that a Head Start agency designated pursuant to section 641 fails to meet the standards described in subsection (a) or results-based performance measures

developed by the Secretary under subsection (b), or fails to adequately address the community needs and strategic plan identified in 640(g)(2)(C), the Secretary shall—”

(9) By amending subsection (d)(2) to read as follows:

“(2) QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—

“(A) AGENCY AND PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES.—In order to retain a designation as a Head Start agency under this subchapter, or in the case of a Head Start Program, in order to continue to receive funds from such agency, a Head Start agency, or Head Start program that is the subject of a determination described in paragraph (1) (other than an agency or program required to correct a deficiency immediately or during a 90-day period under clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(B)) shall—

“(i) develop in a timely manner, a quality improvement plan which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary, or in the case of a program, the sponsoring agency, and which shall specify—

“(I) the deficiencies to be corrected;

“(II) the actions to be taken to correct such deficiencies; and

“(III) the timetable for accomplishment of the corrective actions specified; and

“(ii) eliminate each deficiency identified, not later than the date for elimination of such deficiency specified in such plan (which shall not be later than 1 year after the date the agency or program received notice of the determination and of the specific deficiency to be corrected).

“(B) SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Not later than 30 days after receiving from a Head Start agency a proposed quality improvement plan pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall either approve such proposed plan or specify the reasons why the proposed plan cannot be approved.

“(C) AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT.—Not later than 30 days after receiving from a Head Start program, a proposed quality improvement plan pursuant to subparagraph (A), the sponsoring agency shall either approve such proposed plan or specify the reasons why the proposed plan cannot be approved.”.

(10) In subsection (d)(3) by inserting “and programs” after “agencies”.

(11) Subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) SUMMARIES OF MONITORING OUTCOMES.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish a summary report on the findings of reviews conducted under subsection (c) and on the outcomes of quality improvement plans implemented under subsection (d), during such fiscal year. Such information shall be made available to all parents with students receiving assistance under this Act in a understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand, and in addition, make the information widely available through public means such as distribution through public agencies, and at a minimum posting such information on the Internet immediately upon publication.”.

SEC. 8. POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF HEAD START AGENCIES.

Section 642 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837(b)) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) In order to be so designated, a Head Start agency shall also—

“(1) establish a program with standards set forth in section 641A(a)(1), with particular attention to the standards set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such section;

“(2) demonstrate capacity to serve eligible children with scientifically-based curricula and other interventions that help promote

the school readiness of children participating in the program;

“(3) establish effective procedures by which parents and area residents concerned will be enabled to directly participate in decisions that influence the character of programs affecting their interests;

“(4) provide for their regular participation in the implementation of such programs;

“(5) provide technical and other support needed to enable parents and area residents to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources;

“(6) seek the involvement of parents of participating children in activities designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children, and to afford such parents the opportunity to participate in the development, conduct, and overall performance of the program at the local level;

“(7) conduct outreach to schools in which Head Start children enroll, local educational agencies, the local business community, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, museums, and libraries to generate support and leverage the resources of the entire local community in order to improve school readiness;

“(8) offer (directly or through referral to local entities, such as entities carrying out Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.)), to parents of participating children, family literacy services and parenting skills training;

“(9) offer to parents of participating children substance abuse counseling (either directly or through referral to local entities), including information on drug-exposed infants and fetal alcohol syndrome;

“(10) at the option of such agency, offer (directly or through referral to local entities), to such parents—

“(A) training in basic child development;

“(B) assistance in developing communication skills;

“(C) opportunities to share experiences with other parents;

“(D) regular in-home visitation; or

“(E) any other activity designed to help such parents become full partners in the education of their children;

“(11) provide, with respect to each participating family, a family needs assessment that includes consultation with such parents about the benefits of parent involvement and about the activities described in paragraphs (4) through (7) in which such parents may choose to be involved (taking into consideration their specific family needs, work schedules, and other responsibilities);

“(12) consider providing services to assist younger siblings of children participating in its Head Start program to obtain health services from other sources;

“(13) perform community outreach to encourage individuals previously unaffiliated with Head Start programs to participate in its Head Start program as volunteers; and

“(14)(A) inform custodial parents in single-parent families that participate in programs, activities, or services carried out or provided under this subchapter about the availability of child support services for purposes of establishing paternity and acquiring child support; and

“(B) refer eligible parents to the child support offices of State and local governments.”.

(2) Amend subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) The head of each Head Start agency shall coordinate and collaborate with the State agency responsible for administering the State program carried out under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.), and other

early childhood education and development programs, including programs under subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11431-11435), Even Start programs under part B of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.), and programs under Part C and section 619 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431-1445, 1419), and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a), serving the children and families served by the Head Start agency to carry out the provisions of this subchapter."

(3) In subsection (d) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraph (3) through (5) and inserting the following new paragraph after paragraph (1):

"(2) In communities where both public pre-kindergarten programs and Head Start programs operate, a Head Start agency shall coordinate with the local educational agency or other public agency responsible for the operation of the prekindergarten program and providers of prekindergarten, including for outreach to identify eligible children."

(5) In paragraph (3) (as redesignated) of subsection (d), strike "and" at the end of subparagraph (A) and insert the following after subparagraph (A) and redesignate subparagraph (B) as (C):

"(B) collaborating to increase the program participation of underserved populations of eligible children; and".

SEC. 9. HEAD START ALIGNMENT WITH K-12 EDUCATION.

Section 642A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837a) is amended as follows:

(1) The heading is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 642A. HEAD START ALIGNMENT WITH K-12 EDUCATION."

(2) In paragraph (2) after "social workers," insert the following: "McKinney-Vento liaisons as established under section 722 (g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001,".

(3) Add the following new paragraph after paragraph (2) and redesignated paragraphs (3) through (7) as (4) through (8):

"(3) developing continuity of developmentally appropriate curricula between Head Start and local educational agencies to ensure an effective transition and appropriate shared expectations for children's learning and development as they make such transition to school;"

(4) Paragraph (6) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) developing and implementing a family outreach and support program in cooperation with entities carrying out parental involvement efforts under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and family outreach and support efforts under subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act;"

(4) In paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) by inserting "and continuity in parental involvement activities" after "developmental continuity".

(5) Strike "and" at the end of paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) and strike the period at the end of paragraph (8) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section) and insert a semicolon.

(6) Add the following after paragraph (8):

"(9) helping parents to understand the importance of parental involvement in a child's academic success while teaching them strategies for maintaining parental involvement as their child moves from Head Start to elementary school; and

"(10) developing and implementing a system to increase program participation of underserved populations of eligible children."

SEC. 10. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS.

Section 644 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9839) is amended in subsection (f)(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as (B) through (F) and inserting the following new subparagraph before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated):

"(A) a description of the consultation conducted by the Head Start agency with the providers in the community demonstrating capacity and capability to provide services under this Act, and of the potential for collaboration with such providers and the cost effectiveness of such collaboration as opposed to the cost effectiveness of the purchase of a facility;"

SEC. 11. ELIGIBILITY.

Section 645(a) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9843) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking "to a reasonable extent" in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and inserting "not to exceed 10 percent of the total enrollment" and by striking "benefit from such programs" and inserting "benefit from such programs, including children referred by child welfare services,".

(2) By adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(3) The amount of a basic allowance provided under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, on behalf of an individual who is a member of the uniformed services for housing that is acquired or constructed under the authority of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, or any other related provision of law, shall not be considered to be income for purposes of determining the eligibility of a child of the individual for programs assisted under this subchapter."

SEC. 12. EARLY HEAD START PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 645A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9643) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(4) provide services to parents to support their role as parents (including parenting skills training and training in basic child development) and to help the families move toward self-sufficiency (including educational and employment services as appropriate);

"(5) coordinate services with services (including home-based services) provided by programs in the State and programs in the community (including programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities) to ensure a comprehensive array of services (such as health and mental health services, and family support services);"

(2) By amending paragraph (8) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(8) ensure formal linkages with the agencies and entities described in section 644(b) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1444(b)) and providers of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) and the agency responsible for administering the Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a); and".

(3) In subsection (g)(2)(B) by striking "and" at the end of clause (iii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting "and" and by inserting the following at the end:

"(v) providing professional development designed to increase program participation for underserved populations of eligible children."

(b) MIGRANT AND SEASONAL PROGRAMS.—Section 645A(d)(1) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9643(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) entities operating Head Start programs under this subpart, including migrant and seasonal Head Start programs; and".

(c) COMMUNITY- AND FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 645A(d)(2) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9643(d)(2)) is amended by inserting ", including community- and faith-based organizations" after "entities" in the second place it appears.

SEC. 13. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

Section 648 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9843) is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting the following new subsection after subsection (a) and redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f):

"(b) The Secretary shall make available to each State the money reserved in section 640(a)(2)(C)(ii) to support a State-based system delivering training and technical assistance that improves the capacity of Head Start programs within a State to deliver services in accordance with the Head Start standards in section 641A(a)(1), with particular attention to the standards set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such section. The Secretary shall—

"(1) ensure eligible entities within a State are chosen by the Secretary, in consultation with the State Collaboration Board described in section 640(a)(5)(C)(i), through a competitive bid process;

"(2) ensure that existing agencies with demonstrated expertise in providing high quality training and technical assistance to improve the delivery of Head Start services, including the State Head Start Association, State agencies, migrant and seasonal Head Start programs operating in the State, and other entities currently providing training and technical assistance in early education, be included in the planning and coordination of the State system of training and technical assistance; and

"(3) encourage States to supplement the funds authorized in section 640(a)(2)(C)(ii) with State, Federal, or local funds other than Head Start funds, to expand activities beyond Head Start agencies to include other providers of other early childhood services within a State."

(2) In subsection (d) (as redesignated):

(A) In paragraph (2), after "disabilities" insert "and for activities described in section 1221(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965".

(B) In paragraph (5) after "assessment" insert ", including the needs of homeless children and their families".

(C) By striking "and" at the end of paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting "and" and by inserting the following at the end:

"(12) assist Head Start agencies and programs in increasing program participation of eligible homeless children."

(3) In subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) by inserting ", including community- and faith-based organizations" after "entities".

(4) By amending subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary shall provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, funds from programs authorized under this subchapter to support an organization to administer a centralized child development and national assessment program leading to recognized credentials for personnel working in early childhood development and child care programs, training for personnel providing services to non-English language background children (including services to promote the acquisition of the English language), training for personnel providing services to children determined to be abused or neglected, training for personnel providing services to children referred

by or receiving child welfare services, training for personnel in helping children cope with community violence, and resource access projects for personnel working with disabled children.”.

(5) Insert at the end of the section:

“(g) **HELPING PERSONNEL BETTER SERVE MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARM-WORKING COMMUNITIES AND HOMELESS FAMILIES.**—The Secretary shall provide, either directly or through grants, or other arrangements, funds for training of Head Start personnel in addressing the unique needs of migrant and seasonal working families, families with a limited English proficiency, and homeless families.

“(h) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—The majority of funds expended under this section shall be used to provide high quality, sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused training and technical assistance in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction. Funds shall be used to carry out activities related to any or all of the following:

“(1) Education and early childhood development.

“(2) Child health, nutrition, and safety.

“(3) Family and community partnerships.

“(4) Other areas that impact the quality or overall effectiveness of Head Start programs.

“(i) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds under this subchapter used for training shall be used for needs identified annually by a grant applicant or delegate agency in their program improvement plan, except that funds shall not be used for long-distance travel expenses for training activities available locally or regionally or for training activities substantially similar to locally or regionally available training activities.

“(j) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible entities’ means an institution of higher education or other entity with expertise in delivering training in early childhood development, family support, and other assistance designed to improve the delivery of Head Start services.”.

SEC. 14. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 648A of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9843a) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending paragraph (2) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(2) **DEGREE REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall ensure that not later than September 30, 2008, at least 50 percent of all Head Start teachers nationwide in center-based programs have—

“(i) a baccalaureate, or advanced degree in early childhood education; or

“(ii) a baccalaureate, or advanced degree in a field related to early childhood education, with experience in teaching preschool children.

“(B) **PROGRESS.**—Each Head State agency shall provide to the Secretary a report indicating the number and percentage of classroom instructors with child development associate credentials and associate, baccalaureate, or advanced degrees. The Secretary shall compile all program reports and make them available to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the United States Senate.

“(C) **REQUIREMENT FOR NEW HEAD START TEACHERS.**—Within 3 years after the date of enactment of this clause, the Secretary shall require that all Head Start teachers nationwide in center-based programs hired following the date of enactment of this sub-paragraph—

“(i) have an associate, baccalaureate, or advanced degree in early childhood education;

“(ii) have an associate, baccalaureate, or advanced degree in a field related to early

childhood education, with experience in teaching preschool children; or

“(iii) be currently enrolled in a program of study leading to an associate degree in early childhood education and agree to complete degree requirements within 3 years from the date of hire.

“(D) **SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall establish requirements to ensure that individuals who receive financial assistance under this Act in order to comply with the requirements under section 648A(a)(2) shall subsequently teach in a Head Start center for a period of time equivalent to the period for which they received assistance or repay the amount of the funds.”.

(2) By adding the following at the end thereof:

“(f) **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS.**—Every Head Start agency and program shall create, in consultation with an employee, a professional development plan for all full-time employees who provide direct services to children.”.

SEC. 15. RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND EVALUATION.

Section 649 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9844) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (a)(1)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) use the Head Start programs to develop, test, and disseminate new ideas and approaches for addressing the needs of low-income preschool children (including children with disabilities and children determined to be abused or neglected) and their families and communities (including demonstrations of innovative non-center based program models such as home-based and mobile programs), and otherwise to further the purposes of this subchapter.”.

(1) By striking paragraph (9) of subsection (d) and inserting “(9) **REPEALED.**—”.

(2) By striking clause (i) of subsection (g)(1)(A) and redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii).

(3) In subsection (g)(7)(C)(i) by striking “1999” and inserting “2003”, striking “2001” and inserting “2005”, and striking “2003” and inserting “2006”.

(4) By amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

“(h) **NAS STUDY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall use funds allocated in section 640(a)(2)(C)(iii) to contract with the National Academy of Sciences for the Board on Children, Youth, and Families of the National Research Council to establish an independent panel of experts to review and synthesize research, theory and applications in the social, behavioral and biological sciences and shall make recommendations on early childhood pedagogy with regard to each of the following:

“(A) Age and developmentally appropriate Head Start academic requirements and outcomes, including but not limited to the domains in 641A(a)(B).

“(B) Differences in the type, length, mix and intensity of services necessary to ensure that children from challenging family and social backgrounds including: low-income children, children of color, children with special needs, and children with limited English proficiency enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

“(C) Appropriate assessments of young children for the purposes of improving instruction, services, and program quality, including systematic observation assessment in a child’s natural environment, parent and provider interviews, and accommodations for children with disabilities and appropriate assessments for children with special needs, including English language learners.

“(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The panel shall consist of multiple experts in each of the following areas:

“(A) Child development and education, including cognitive, social, emotional, physical, approaches to learning, and other domains of child development and learning.

“(B) Professional development, including teacher preparation, to individuals who teach young children in programs.

“(C) Assessment of young children, including screening, diagnostic and classroom-based instructional assessment; children with special needs, including children with disabilities and limited English proficient children.

“(3) **TIMING.**—The National Academy of Sciences and the Board shall establish the panel not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph. The panel should complete its recommendations within 18 months of its convening.

“(4) **APPLICATION OF PANEL REPORT.**—The results of the panel study shall be used as guidelines by the Secretary to develop, inform and revise, where appropriate, the Head Start education performance measures and standards and the assessments utilized in the Head Start program.”.

SEC. 16. REPORTS.

Section 650 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9845) is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows: “At least once during every 2-year period, the Secretary shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, a report concerning the status of children (including disabled, homeless, and non-English language background children) in Head Start programs, including the number of children and the services being provided to such children.”.

(2) Paragraph (8) of subsection (a) is amended by inserting “, homelessness” after “background”.

SEC. 17. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning on and after October 1, 2003.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 336, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion tonight about those who do not want to see change or are somehow suggesting that those who oppose the block grants are against change. This amendment is an amendment to strike the block grant and to retain title I of the legislation as it has been reported from committee. Many Members on this side of the aisle worked with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in committee on title I.

We had numerous discussions, and we all believe, as I said, that there can be continuous improvement, and this is the purpose of the reauthorization of Head Start, to provide for that continuous improvement, to take the evaluations, to take the studies, to take the things that we have learned and apply them to make this an even better program for America’s poorest children so that, in fact, they will have a better opportunity at achieving an education

that will allow them to fully participate in American society and the American economic system.

The fly in the ointment to that continuous improvement is the block grant, because as many times as my colleagues will say it, that the block grant requires the adherence with the quality standards and performance standards in Head Start, the very quality standards and performance standards that have made this the best program in the Nation with room for improvement, that the States need not adhere to that. There is no requirement that they do so. They can generally meet or exceed those standards.

That is the beginning of the end. That is the reason we have so carefully evaluated this program, because you are not going to find those standards in the States. They do not exist. They do not have the achievement standards that we have in this program, and they do not have the success that we have in this program.

What they really do is, they say if the States put up some additional money and the States have a pre-K program somewhere in the State, they can make application and that application is deemed to be accepted. Then the State is on its way. It can serve a different population of children. It can serve more children. It just cannot have more money. So by the end of the third year, we see that for the first time children who were otherwise eligible to be served will be cut back from this program.

They talk about how they are going to meet or exceed the commitment to comprehensive services, but when we read the legislation, we find out that that is not true. Again, they must generally meet or exceed, but in this case, they can provide the services or they can provide a referral to services.

Well, it will not take the governor long, unlike the State of Delaware, it will not take a lot of other governors long to figure out that they do not have to provide those services or all of those services or the comprehensive nature of those services, and they can then serve more children; and we start to see the dilution of the program, the dilution of the quality of the program, and that is the concern.

A great effort has been made by this Nation to maintain the integrity and the quality of the Head Start program, and that is what is threatened by the block grant. This is not a question of whether one is for improving or against improving Head Start. This is not a question of whether or not you think we can do it better or not. This is a question of setting in motion a process that, just as sure as rain, will bring about a diminution in the integrity and the high quality of this program.

This amendment provides for striking that block grant program. They can say, well, it is just a demonstration, it is just an experiment. It conceivably could be as high as 30 to 40 percent of the children in the Head Start program.

I appreciate that they say, we are going to fund the program for 5-years and they ran around and told their moderates and others, this program will be funded for 5 years; but there is a huge loophole. If that program does not comply with the State plan in any fashion, there is no guarantee of that funding taking place. What you read and what you they say turn out to be two different things.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), who is the former chairman of the State Board of Education and a tremendous asset to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for his work as a governor and as a leader, for his work on this committee and for his hard work on this bill.

When I was a little boy, and I heard something that I was not quite sure was correct, I used to always go to my daddy and I would say, Pop, is this right? Being the kind of guy that wanted me to learn how to find out for myself, he would say, Son, why do you not go look it up? So tonight I have heard that we are going to serve less people with demonstration grants, that the standards are not being held to as in title I. I heard there were not any new things. I heard it was an experiment.

So I decided to go look it up, and just for a second, please indulge me.

I want to read on page 66, subparagraph (g), the required services of the block grant. With the funds under this section, the States shall provide services described in Section 641(a) which is every required service, standard and audit of title I, and at least as extensive as were provided previously and to at least as many low-income children, families in each fiscal year. And then, further, it adds a page of new requirements and new standards which I guess are the experiments.

I do not think a 4-year-old pre-kindergartener is an experiment. I do not think physical development, health and nutrition is an experiment, and I do not think social development is an experiment. I do not think parental engagement and involvement is an experiment.

I think what we need to look at here tonight is what is really trying to be done.

Title II allows States, on their own volition, to apply for grants in such cases only when they already offer a 4-year-old pre-kindergarten program and other services. It requires them to invest more money, not less; serve at least as many children, not less; and

meet every standard that existed under 641(a). That is what it says. I looked it up in the book.

Let me tell my colleagues what else it does. Out in America today somewhere there are 3-year-olds soon to be eligible or currently eligible for Head Start named Jose and Maria, Willy and Bob. There is probably a little Johnny who cannot read somewhere out there, and if they could write, which they cannot because they are three and they are impoverished, or if they could call you, but they really cannot because their parents do not have the money for a phone, I will tell you what they would tell us.

□ 2230

They would say, gosh, if you could, take all the benefits of Head Start in title I and add to it a dimension of things like Even Start, where my mom and I can learn to read together, and a 4-year-old prekindergarten program that has, as this bill requires, an early reading, early cognitive skill, and early language development requirement aligned with the State requirements for criteria and for curriculum in grades K through 12.

Now, it is not a block grant because it does not waive the standards of 641(a), which is what is required on title I. If that is true, then title I is a block grant. It is not an experiment. Education is not an experiment. It is the great enabler. It is the great empowerer.

Yes, I do know that all those children that it needs to serve are those who started out with a disadvantage far worse than the ones that I did. But the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) in his original remarks said that this bill turned back the clock. Well, if it turned back the clock, that means it went to the year preceding Head Start, which was 1964, where there were very few publicly funded kindergartens much less prekindergartens, where nutrition programs were just beginning to develop, where in my part of the country Brown v. Board of Education and its promise of equal access to education had just really begun.

This bill does not turn back the clock. It addresses the challenges of the 21st century. It is permissive for challenging our States to reach for the stars, to help those most impoverished to do better, and to see to it that we take a program that has proven it can do well and give States that want a chance to improve it through academic enrichment and collaboration.

I close with this. My State developed a 4-year-old prekindergarten 10 years ago under Governor Zel Miller. Today, 600,000 4-year-olds have gone through that program, and 68,000 will enter this August. We have an Office of School Readiness where we collaborate with the Atlanta Symphony that has an inner-city and minority classical musical program for 3- and 4-year-olds based on the scientifically based brain research to enrich the cognitive skills of children.

Should we not say to those States that want that opportunity that they have the chance, just as long as they spend more money, meet every standard as required in 641(a), serve every child, or at least every one they did before? I think we want to say that. And I say we say "no" to the substitute and "yes" to the bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Miller amendment and in opposition to H.R. 2110.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. In my district, 11 Head Start agencies, five of which are tribal programs, have served 12,683 children up to 5 years of age over the past 5 years. Yet, due to inadequate funding, half of all eligible children in my district are not served by Head Start and Early Start.

Ever since people began hearing about this bill, there has been an out-pouring of support for Head Start from early childhood experts, Head Start teachers, and Head Start families throughout my district. They all say the same thing: Head Start has produced countless success stories; it should not be restructured in the name of so-called reform.

Listen to Susan Woidyla, a Head Start teacher who serves children in two counties in my district. She described the success of the Early Head Start program's curriculum for prenatal women. The program serves 10 pregnant women, many of whom are teenagers who will be first-time mothers. Woidyla wrote to me about one teenage mother who is homeless and in an abusive relationship. As the only social service program in her life, Head Start is not only providing her with critical information about the brain development of her unborn child and the potential effects of periodontal disease, but the program is also helping this young woman find the services she needs to care for herself and her developing child.

Julia Kicker, another constituent of mine, shared her family's experience with Head Start. Although Julia and her husband knew that their first son, Jacob, was lagging behind other children in his social development, they were told differing information from local day care providers. Some day care providers insisted that he was fine; others believed he needed to be medicated; and still others suggested parenting classes for the Kickers.

Then they enrolled Jacob in Head Start. The staff identified his needs, and they encouraged special education professionals to become involved with assessments and other services for Jacob, who is now enrolled in kindergarten. He has a one-on-one para-professional helper in the classroom and has been diagnosed with sensory delay and emotional behavior disorder.

Not only did the program help Jacob, it helped Julia as well. It was the support that Head Start has routinely offered parents and families that gave Julia the self-confidence to run for and be elected to the Policy Council for Head Start, the board of directors of the Community Action Council, and the City Council.

The very strength of Head Start is in its comprehensive services. Head Start improves academic achievement in very large part because, in addition to academics, it also addresses basic health, mental health, nutritional, dental, and other social needs of low-income children, which facilitate learning.

We cannot expect underprivileged children to thrive academically along with their privileged peers, when their learning is seriously undermined by the devastating effects of poverty.

I will not for legislation that guts Head Start's comprehensive services and parental involvement and unravels a successful program that HHS itself has said is working. Instead, Head Start should be adequately funded to meet the needs of all eligible children.

I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 2210.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Georgia is right, we should look it up, because when it says at least as extensive, what it does is it exempts you from the regulation. So you offer health care services because health care is provided under the law. But what you are exempt from is the legislation that requires screening for all the children in 45 days.

So what happens in my district? Some 150 Head Start children are diagnosed with speech and language impairments, and with this knowledge we can immediately provide the services because those are the regulations and that is the screening that is required. But it is not required under the block grant.

My colleagues can use euphemisms, they can play with the language; but the fact of the matter is there is a huge credibility gap between what they say the bill does and what the bill does. That is what we all have to understand.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), a member of the committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member from the committee for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the chairman as well.

I rise again before my colleagues today to express my opposition to the Republican plan to destroy Head Start and in support of the substitute.

Head Start, a successful Federal program for nearly 40 years, has never been a partisan issue. This year, though, my Republican colleagues have hijacked the issue and it now risks becoming the victim of a social political agenda, nothing to do with education. Head Start has become part of the plan to eliminate social programs from Federal responsibility. This cynical "not my problem, let 'em eat cake" agenda ignores our shared responsibility for poor children in this country. Yes, a shared responsibility to these children, a shared responsibility to fight poverty, and a shared responsibility to provide equal opportunity to all children regardless of their parents income.

Mr. Chairman, it is simply irresponsible to neglect these children when we

can do so much to help them. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2210 and "yes" on the substitute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE).

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

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Head Start and in support of the Miller substitute.

Head Start gives children the tools that they need to break the cycle of poverty. Each child deserves an equal opportunity to be the best that he or she can be. That opportunity can only come when every child has equal access to education.

Educating our children is not only our moral obligation; it is a smart investment. Head Start focuses on the whole child. Children receive balanced nutritional meals, basic health care, dental, medical, vision screenings and vaccinations. It is a fact that Head Start children are less likely to be held back in school, more likely to graduate, and five times less likely to end up in jail as adults.

There are more than 2 million Americans in prison today, and the evidence shows that Head Start children are five times less likely to end up in jail. Head Start reduces the likelihood that children will become one of those 2 million incarcerated.

Unfortunately, Head Start serves fewer than 1 million children at this time, only helping one out of five needy children in Georgia and across this Nation. When it comes to our children, we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Taxpayers are supporting twice as many prisoners as Head Start students.

Just look at the costs. We spent less than \$7 billion on Head Start this year while we spend more than \$74 billion a year on the prison system. It costs only \$18 a day to place a child in Head Start and more than \$50 a day to keep someone incarcerated in jail. This is not fuzzy math; it is crystal clear.

We must make sure that each and every child has the opportunity to succeed, and Head Start is the smartest investment we can make in our future. We are spending \$1 billion a week in Iraq. We should do no less for the children of America. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Miller amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), a strong proponent for the children of our country.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2210 and to oppose the Democrat substitute. Mr. Chairman, I am probably the only Member of Congress who has ever worked in a Head Start program, and that happened in 1964, the first year of Head Start. I worked as a volunteer in the summer when the program first started. So I really know

firsthand the tremendous benefits Head Start has delivered to children; and I love the Head Start program, and I only want it to be better.

I have gone out to visit the Head Start programs in my community and found them to be great schools. But to listen to some of my colleagues and their notions of Head Start, you would actually think the sky is falling. Let me make this clear. There really is no new block grant in this Head Start authorization. There really is no lowering of the standards or shrinking of Federal responsibility. There is no massive restructuring, and there is no falling sky.

What there is in H.R. 2210 is a straightforward reauthorization with some improvements for 42 of the 50 States in the Union. For the other eight States, there is a new pilot program, a pilot program which is voluntary, maintains high standards, and is limited to the highest-quality States that have exhibited the strongest commitment to early childhood learning. So why is that so frightening? For those eight States with the strongest programs, there is an option of trying something slightly new for 5 years. That is what pilot projects are designed to do, to try something new that may work a little bit better.

Yes, the Head Start program is, in my view, one of the most successful programs in history. But does that success rule out the possibility of improvement and need for progress and opportunity to make it even better? I do not think so. I will admit that when this reauthorizing bill first was introduced earlier this year, I had a few misgivings. Like many Members who have spoken this evening, why tinker with a program that works was what crossed my mind. But I must admit that many of my concerns later were addressed both in the improved legislation that came out of the committee and in the substitute amendment that the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has proposed that we are voting on tonight.

The State pilot program has the potential to make Head Start even better, and that is why these changes are in the bill. For instance, States must match a sizable proportion of the Head Start funds they receive from the Federal Government with State funds, and Head Start funds may not be used for any other purpose. These are good solid safeguards that will allow for progress and improvements while preventing abuses and unintended consequences.

In contrast, the Democrat substitute offers no incentive for States to improve their early childhood programs, nor does it give local Head Start centers the opportunity to coordinate with other programs to make Head Start better. The Democrat substitute says Head Start is good and cannot and will not be made better.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Democrat substitute and support the improved H.R. 2210.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), a member of the committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we have had bipartisan support for the Head Start program since it was founded in 1965, so it is extremely unfortunate that here tonight that bipartisan support is being sacrificed for an ideological agenda of block granting.

As we have heard tonight, we agree on two things. We all agree Head Start has been a great success story for millions of American children. We also all agree that it can be improved, that it can be strengthened.

So here is the great irony. Our committee did strengthen and improve Head Start in one part of this bill, the first part of the bill. That is what we need. We improved the coordination, and that would help millions of children in the Head Start program. Yet in the other part of the bill we take those improvements away. We take the higher performance standards away. We take away the benefits of the Head Start program, so that what we have provided and strengthened on the one hand we take away with the other.

It is a bad deal for America's children. We can do much better. I urge us all to adopt the Miller substitute amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), where they have the university that stole their football uniforms from the University of Delaware, I might add.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, there is an incredible amount of misunderstanding about the bill, and apparently about football uniforms as well.

Mr. Chairman, let me clarify a few points. I find so many people misunderstand the intent dealing with faith-based organizations receiving Federal funding. This is not money that is going to religious groups to proselytize students or kids or indoctrinate them. This is money provided to organizations who, in seeking to carry out their religious faiths, are trying to help their communities by establishing institutions that serve the people of their community. Head Start is just one example of that. There are many other examples of charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, which do good for the community.

My community is almost a poster child for that. We have the second largest private mental hospital in the world in my community. It is a faith-based organization. People come from all over this country and even from some other countries to get the service there because it is so extremely good. We have the largest adoption agency in the world headquartered in my district. It started there by a faith-based organization to serve with adoptions.

□ 2245

These are not people who are trying to proselytize. They are people who are

trying to serve and serve in the name of God. That is what we are talking about.

I heard a reference from the gentleman from Massachusetts earlier about this is awful, that we are taking unbelievers' money and giving it to faith-based institutions. I would remind the gentleman that religious people pay taxes as well, and I can guarantee you that the amount of tax money collected from believers is considerably greater than the amount of money going to faith-based institutions. That statement simply makes no sense.

We have a long history in this Nation of supporting faith-based institutions. I taught at a State university. I have taught at a private religious college. The grants I received from the Federal Government were the same at both institutions. The Federal Government treats them evenhandedly.

I believe it is very important that we continue the faith-based practice outlined in this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my deep concern over the proposed Head Start legislation on which we will be voting this evening. Almost 1 million low-income children will be served by Head Start this year and 2,000 of them reside in my district. It is well established that Head Start gets children off to a positive start in life by providing them with an improved vocabulary, better writing skills and enhanced social skills, all tools they need in order to succeed.

The reauthorization of Head Start was meant to help correct problems within the existing program, but this bill goes way beyond that. Title II of this bill would allow block-granting of Head Start in eight States without requiring any of the Federal Head Start program performance standards or guarantees as to the distribution or allocation of Federal funds by the States. This action will turn a program that has been a proven success over to States in fiscal crisis with unproven expertise in coordinating these types of services.

The bill also lacks any real funding for teacher training and retention. Although the bill does take the positive step of requiring 50 percent of Head Start teachers to have a bachelor's degree, it does not provide the money and resources needed for them to achieve the requirements that we have set forth for them. This is a good requirement, but one that will be very difficult to achieve absent significant additional funding. The average salary of a Head Start teacher in my district is less than \$20,000 a year. How will a Head Start program attract highly qualified teachers if the funds are not available to pay competitive salaries?

Similarly, how will current staff achieve a bachelor's degree if funds are

not available to support their return to school?

H.R. 2210 is fundamentally flawed. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2210 and "yes" on the Miller amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), clearly a person very concerned about Head Start.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I urge my friends in the Chamber to oppose the substitute that is being proposed because it does not offer us the opportunity for the flexibility that we need.

Let me say at the outset, and this has been repeated over and over, that the proposal before us does keep standards, it ensures standards, it has fire walls to protect standards and it even increases standards as we heard from the previous speaker, because for the first time we will have teachers who have qualifications to teach our most disadvantaged students.

We increase funding. There is no diminution of funding in this legislation. The red herring that at some point funding will be decreased or diverted is not possible under the provisions of this legislation. Most importantly, we do improve quality.

I described earlier the problem that I face. I have some wonderful Head Start programs. I represent some small areas and some large metropolitan areas and some of the Head Start programs are great. I have been to them; I have seen what they can do. But the substitute before us would eliminate the flexibility that we need in some of our other areas.

I described two Head Start programs, one with 200 children, one with 300 and not enough to support 34 noninstructional personnel that are required under the standards that we cannot get any flexibility on. We have pleaded to try to have that flexibility, to give these students a chance. So here we have for the first time the opportunity to improve the quality.

Let us talk about the students that we have, the children that we have in these programs. These, Mr. Chairman, are our poorest children. These are our most disadvantaged children. These are our children that maybe are social problems throughout their lives. Here is an opportunity to improve the quality. They have come from homes where they cannot have that advantage, and Head Start can give them that advantage. We can do more even with less money.

I measured the amount of money we are spending in this one program that is over two counties. It is \$8,439. I have no problem with spending that. I would double the amount if the program is effective. The best prep school, preschool program in my district costs, ironically, \$8,400. I could save \$39 and send them to that and I am not even proposing that. I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this opportunity for flexibility and quality, improving the lives of our most needy children.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentlewoman that she should remove the badge while she is addressing the Committee.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

For months now we have heard statements from politicians on both sides of the aisle arguing about what works best for Head Start. I have been listening here all night, and I have been hearing you talk about children who are in households in poverty. I think most of you do not know about that, or households where no English is spoken or households where parents have no education, where parents do not know how to access the education system, or with children who have a speech and hearing problem.

Or imagine somebody who sits in a home like that and has all of that and then you can imagine what I looked like 40 years ago. See, I know about these kids, because I am one of those kids. It hurts to hear you talk about how we are not successful, or how we are losers. But we are very successful. We have had a lot of successes with Head Start. All you have to do is ask us. You do not have to imagine it. We write to you about it all the time.

Let us keep Head Start the way it is.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), head of the Subcommittee on Select Education in the Committee on Education and the Workforce and a strong force on our committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk again about the right that is taken away in this substitute, the right of religious organizations to retain their religious character while receiving Federal funds. It takes away something that even Al Gore supports. Al Gore during the campaign said that "faith-based organizations can provide jobs and job training, counseling and mentoring, food and basic medical care. They can do so with public funds, and without having to alter the religious character that is so often the key to their effectiveness."

Churches should be allowed to compete for Federal social services funds and to remain churches while doing so. The only way a church can remain a church is if it can staff itself, to the extent it desires, with those who share the same faith. The underlying bill, unlike the substitute, provides for the equal treatment of religious organizations.

Members of faith-based organizations should enjoy the same rights to associate with others sharing their unique

vision as other nonreligious groups currently enjoy. To deny them that right is to discriminate against people simply because they are religious and have a religious, rather than a purely secular, way of looking at the world. The underlying bill provides for equal treatment. The amendment singles out religious people for adverse treatment, and that is wrong.

The Supreme Court has upheld the title VII exemption for religious organizations. In fact, the Supreme Court decided the Amos case on grounds that support the constitutionality of the title VII exemption as applied to employees of religious organizations that receive Federal funds.

In *Corporation of the Presiding Bishop v. Amos*, the Supreme Court unanimously upheld the exemption permitting religious organizations to staff on a religious basis in matters concerning employment. Finding that the exemption did not violate the establishment clause, the Supreme Court has made clear that it is a permissible legislative purpose to alleviate significant governmental interference with the ability of religious organizations to define and carry out their religious missions.

Even where the content of their activities is secular, in the sense that activities do not include religious teaching, proselytizing, prayer or ritual, Justice Brennan in the Amos case recognized that the religious organization's performance of such functions is likely to be "infused with a religious purpose." He also recognized that churches and other religious entities "often regard the provision of such services as a means of fulfilling religious duty and of providing an example of the way of life a church seeks to foster."

Perhaps one of the greatest liberal Justices, then, recognized that preserving the title VII exemption when religious organizations engage in social services is a necessary element of religious freedom.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. As I approached the podium here, I removed my sticker that said "Head Start Works," but that is where I would like to begin my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California for his extraordinary leadership on behalf of children of America in every aspect of their lives, their health, their education, the economic security of their families, the environment in which they live. Tonight, I particularly want to thank him for his leadership on this Head Start legislation. His amendment to eliminate the block grant segment of this bill is a very important one.

I also want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for her stewardship of her amendment

through the process, another very important antidiscrimination addition to tonight's debate.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, Head Start Works is the motto of the effort this evening. I first saw Head Start work as a young mother over 30 years ago on the playgrounds of New York. As I wheeled my babies to the playground and played there every day, we saw a Head Start program. My oldest child was born in 1964, the same year Head Start was born, but this would be like a couple of years after that.

We saw the Head Start program right there and the facility next to the program day in and day out. We would see children come, children learn, children thrive and parents participate. It was pretty exciting because it was a new experience for them, made a difference in their lives personally; and it was a new experience for our country, and it made a tremendous difference not only to those children but to all of our children. Lifting up children, all children in America, is good for our entire country.

And so imagine how exciting it was for me over 20 years later to come to Congress, go to the appropriations committee and serve on the Labor-HHS subcommittee which funds Head Start. Year in and year out our committee reviewed the Head Start program, always seeking to improve it, always, always, anything we do, looking at every initiative to make it better, greatly assisted by the superior work of the authorization committees, of course. On both committees, on appropriations and on authorization committees, the work was always bipartisan and in good spirit.

For decades, Head Start worked and for decades Head Start has been helping children arrive at school ready to learn. Head Start children do better in vocabulary, letter writing, letter recognition and social behavior. They are less likely to need special education services, repeat a grade and are more likely to graduate from high school and go on to college. Again, it ensured that children got not only education but nutrition and the medical treatment they needed for a head start.

I saw in the Committee on Appropriations, reviewing not only these issues, but others, that the best way to undermine a program, to really begin the end of it, was to turn it into a block grant. Central to the Head Start successes were its standards. So once you block-granted this and undermined the standards, you were changing the very nature of the program and undermining the excellence of it.

□ 2300

The block grants that are contained in H.R. 2210 will dismantle Head Start in eight States because it creates new block grants programs for eight States without requiring any of the Head Start performance standards. It would allow States to run Head Start programs with lower educational stand-

ards, minimal comprehensive service, less oversight and accountability, no evidence that they do an equally good or better job than Head Start, and relieves States of providing comprehensive services currently provided by Head Start and are proven to improve school readiness, to name but a few of the concerns that I have about the block grants.

So as I said before, I worked on the Committee on Appropriations, which I was pleased to serve with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), others who have spoken here. It was always bipartisan when it came to Head Start and, as I said earlier, not so today. The majority has put forth a bill that dismantles Head Start by eliminating, as I say, the quality standards that are the foundation of its success.

The Republican bill will not strengthen academic standards. Instead, the bill removes minimum standards, and I keep repeating that, on curriculum content, class size and child/staff ratios. The Republican bill eliminates the comprehensive health, nutritional, and social services available both to parents and children through Head Start.

The bottom line is that the Republican bill undermines opportunity. It undermines the aspirations of hard-working parents who want the best for their children, parents who dream of their children making the honor roll, going to college.

Head Start is about giving every child an opportunity to succeed. Head Start is about all Americans having the opportunity to fulfill their dreams. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will prepare to put my sticker back on that says "Head Start Works" and in doing so again commending the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), and all of the members on the Democratic side of the committee for the fight that they are making to preserve Head Start.

I urge my colleagues to support the Miller substitute and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2210. Since 1965, Head Start has successfully provided comprehensive child development and family support services for more than 20 million low-income preschool children and their families. Programs are designed locally and are administered by a network of 1,500 public and private nonprofit agencies. Each year this program serves more than 900,000 students, ensuring that these

children are better prepared when they enter kindergarten. It is an extremely effective and popular program, one that we should be working to strengthen. We should be working to strengthen the educational component for the children and their parents. We should be continuing the health care, not referrals away from the Head Start center sites. We should strengthen accountability and cover more children.

We have great examples in my own congressional district that I represent of successful public school- and Head Start-provided cooperation, putting both Federal dollars and public dollars, and local State dollars to effectiveness, serving more children. We do not need to block grant it. I have watched States this year reduce educational funds. We do not need to do that to Head Start. This is not reform. This bill deforms Head Start.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act.

Since 1965, Head Start has successfully provided comprehensive child development and family support services to more than 20 million low-income preschool children and their families.

Programs are locally designed, and are administered by a network of about 1,500 public and private nonprofit agencies. Each year, this program serves more than 900,000 students, ensuring that these children are better prepared when they enter kindergarten.

This is an extremely effective and popular program, and one that we should be working together to strengthen.

We should be strengthening the educational component and better health care effort but that is not the focus of H.R. 2210.

Instead, H.R. 2210 seeks to dismantle the program by moving it closer to a State block grant, despite evidence that these are lower-quality, less comprehensive programs.

Despite claims that the legislation we are considering today is improved from previous versions, this bill still allows States to weaken educational standard by increasing class size, increasing child-teacher ratio, shortening program duration, cutting off 3-year-olds from services, and using unproven curricula.

The bill would undermine the comprehensive nature of the program by eliminating parent-classroom involvement, health and mental health screenings and services, adult literacy services, vision and dental services, and health and nutrition education.

This bill would also allowing States to use Head Start funds to supplant other Federal funds. I don't know about you, but I don't want Head Start funds to be paving highways and building bridges.

And as my colleague from California will point out, this legislation repeals longstanding civil rights protections for employees of Head Start programs operating through faith-based organizations. This bill would allow taxpayer dollars to be used to support discrimination in hiring based on religion.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the Head Start program isn't perfect, but rather than working toward bipartisan improvements to the program, this bill is a partisan effort at dismantling this program.

Our children deserve better. I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 2210.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a long awaited appearance.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have about four pages of things that I wanted to say, including statistics about Head Start, but I would like to just put it in the context of personal experience. Fifty-three years ago, a 6-year-old boy was sent to school by his parents. I was born on a farm, and in Texas one has to go to school when they are 6 years old. The problem was that we only spoke Spanish in my house. So about 10 other kids and I were moved to kindergarten from first grade because the teacher did not speak Spanish, and we did not speak English. That did not work too well; so they decided that we were holding back the kids of kindergarten; so they devised a new grade that was called prekindergarten at that time. That was 53 years ago.

So those that are wondering why we are apprehensive about the changes that they want to make in a program that works, if that program had been in place 53 years ago, I and nine other brothers and sisters that followed me would have been much better off. We made it, but how many kids do not make it? And if we change Head Start, Head Start that is working today, shame on all of us as Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the so-called "School Readiness Act." This bill is a direct attack on the Head Start program. Head Start has been serving low-income children from birth to age 5 and their families since 1964 in order to increase their school readiness. Passage of this bill will lead to the dismantling of the program as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, the Head Start Center in my district of El Paso, TX, serves 3,803 children and their families, 94 percent of whom are of Hispanic decent. There are even more children who can benefit from what Head Start has to offer. This bill does not do nearly enough to increase the number of needy children served. This bill also leaves behind children of migrant and seasonal farm workers who are currently not being targeted. This is unacceptable.

Under this bill, States would be allowed to run Head Start programs, thus allowing for children to be held at lower educational and child care standards. Accountability for these programs are key to their success. Mr. Chairman, Head Start programs are already held to high developmental and performance standards that were created by this body. We need to be taking steps forward when preparing our children for school. Passage of this bill will be a step backward.

This bill would also allow for Head Start providers to discriminate in their hiring practices on the basis of religion. Under this bill, faith-based organizations will be allowed to provide this service and again not be held to the same Federal accountability standards.

I urge my colleagues to support the children of their districts and oppose this bill. I also

urge my colleagues to support the substitute provided by Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for yielding me this time.

I have about three or four pages of written comments; so I have to say my comments within a minute.

I am opposing H.R. 2210. I was a classroom teacher and a principal. And my wife has been a kindergarten teacher since 1965. So most of us here, we talk about Head Start from personal experiences and from professional experiences rather than sitting in the board rooms of school board members and other things, volunteers to these programs; and I am not going to question the motivations of those who are proposing this bill. But I have to say from my gut that you are wrong. You are wrong about the direction you are headed with Head Start. We understand because we lived it, and we understand it because we worked with the youngsters and we saw it work.

I had two primary schools. I established two Head Start programs. Our teachers worked with youngsters who spoke Cambodian, Vietnamese, Spanish; and our kindergarten teachers and first and third grade teachers said it works. If it ain't broke, why do you want to adjust it?

Mr. Chairman, as a former teacher and principal, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.R. 2210, the Republican Head Start Reauthorization bill.

We should be increasing funding for Head Start, so that all eligible children can enroll. We should be increasing the salaries of Head Start teachers, and providing the necessary resources to improve teacher quality. We need to continue to impose the high standards that Head Start has been required to meet for the past 38 years.

Instead, Republicans are advocating for the exact opposite. They support trillion dollar tax cuts, but refuse to provide resources for disadvantaged children. The Head Start Reauthorization bill would dismantle this critical program by shortchanging teachers, denying services to eligible children, and weakening accountability.

Republicans shortchange Head Start teachers. Currently, Head Start teachers only make about half of what kindergarten teachers make. Common sense tells us that increasing salaries is imperative for attracting and retaining highly qualified teachers.

However, Republicans only provide an annual increase of \$49 for teacher salaries and education next year—this is over \$300 million short of what is needed in 2004, and \$2 billion short of what is needed over the lifetime of the bill.

As vice chairman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I am particularly alarmed by how these Republican cuts will hurt APA communities. Nationwide, over

25,000 APA children are served by Head Start.

In California alone, over 6,000 APA children are enrolled in Head Start, with over half of them coming from homes where English is not the primary language. By cutting funding for Head Start, Republicans deny these children the opportunities they richly deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to put the needs of children first, and vote against the Republican's proposal to destroy the Head Start program.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute because Head Start is very dear to me. I love Head Start. Thirty-eight years ago I helped to organize one of the first Head Start programs in the Los Angeles area. Head Start happened to change my life, and I have seen what Head Start can do for families and for the children.

They talk about wanting to make Head Start better. Let me tell the Members, Head Start created new ways by which to deal with education for poor children. Five children to every one adult. In the public schools they still do not have the right ratios, classrooms all over this country, 25 and 35 and 45 children to one adult. Nutrition for every child, parental involvement for every child. All kinds of services. Physical examinations. They are going to help make Head Start better?

We have the President and people on other side of the aisle talking about Leave No Child Behind. They need to put some money into the public schools so they can receive these children from Head Start who are doing better, who are ready to learn.

This is a sad moment for me. I never thought I would come to the Congress of the United States and be involved with the demise of the Head Start program. Shame on you, Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. You don't fix what isn't broken. Head Start has achieved tremendous successes in helping the most vulnerable of our children. It does not need a legislative fix. It needs funding so that Head Start can reach the 40 percent of eligible children it does not presently serve.

With this bill, the Republican party is undermining our efforts to help these children get an education and break the cycle of poverty that plagues so many of them.

This bill is just the latest example of Republicans choosing to leave our children behind. They have consistently underfunded the President's so-called signature education program, Leave No Child Behind. And, they refuse to pass a child tax credit that would benefit millions of children.

Now, they seek changes that would ruin the most successful early childhood education program we have. It is a crime and every Member of Congress should oppose this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are two fundamental flaws contained in this bill. The first is the block grant provision that will ruin the program. Block granting will gut the high quality, comprehensive services that are the hallmark

of Head Start and weaken the program's educational performance standards. It also will weaken oversight and evaluation of the program.

But what I fear the most, is that block granting will significantly weaken the important role of parents in their children's education. We all know that teaching effective parenting strategies and involving parents in their children's education is strongly related to children's achievement in school.

The Castle substitute purports to provide for parental involvement while the original Republican bill did not. What is clear is that the Castle substitute is not as strong on parent involvement as the existing Head Start program. Why should we recklessly experiment when we have a Head Start program that effectively involves parents in their children's education? We should stick with what works.

In fact, experts have often cited the Head Start-parent partnership as one of the most successful aspects of the Head Start program. To retreat from our emphasis on the importance of this relationship, would be to turn back the clock on our commitment to improving the lives of adults. It also would be a profound insult to the millions of parents who have been inspired to improve their parenting skills, volunteer in the program or return to school.

My other concern is with section 654, which would allow Head Start programs run by faith-based organizations to discriminate on the basis of religion.

Mr. Chairman, this is appalling. One of the greatest strengths of Head Start is the diversity of individuals who participate in, and work, for the Head Start program. Yet, if the Congress supports this provision, one of the historic foundations of Head Start will crumble. Teachers will not be hired or parents will be unable to volunteer simply because they do not share the views of the religious organization's teachings. This provision will severely hamper the program and goes against what we stand for as Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the groups that understand children, who understand the struggles of low-income families, all oppose this bill. The scope of groups that oppose H.R. 2210 is truly breathtaking. Civil rights groups, labor, business, teachers, the National Head Start Association, early education experts—they all oppose this bill because they understand that the holistic approach that Head Start employs works. And it works very, very well.

We have heard it before, but I'm going to say it again: "Head Start ain't broke, so don't try to fix it."

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), another distinguished member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) for his leadership on improving the educational opportunities for our poorest children and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), former Governor of Delaware, for his passion and dedication to this issue.

I strongly support the improvements to the Head Start program and the

School Readiness Act as the husband of a school teacher, as a parent, and as a new grandparent since March 14. We cannot allow fear of change to keep children from reaching their full potential. I hope we can all work together to help low-income children to be better prepared to learn as I learned from State superintendent of education Barbara Nielson.

First, the School Readiness Act requires children to be taught early reading, math, and writing skills. It also directs that 50 percent of the Head Start teachers have a 4-year degree by 2008. Second, through an eight-State pilot program, States like South Carolina that already are committed to educating pre-K children will be able to combine efforts with Head Start to maximize resources and experiences to provide comprehensive, coordinated services that must generally meet or exceed Head Start services.

The School Readiness Act does not dismantle Head Start. It reinvigorates and improves it by focusing on academic skills and allowing States to be innovative.

Our military has proven that tactics must be constantly examined and improved to be successful in combat. The School Readiness Act brings this same philosophy to a 40-year program for one purpose: to better prepare our country's poorest children to succeed in schools. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Miller amendment and support the underlying bill.

God bless our troops.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, Head Start works. Despite the warnings from the National Academy of Sciences that, under this bill, the poorly designed tests of young children can have a negative impact on their education, under this legislation the Head Start Bureau is plowing forward with plans to give a significantly flawed test to these children starting in the fall. The use of this test will jeopardize the integrity of Head Start, as teachers skew the test to focus on the few skills that those children will be tested upon.

We risk labeling these children as failures before they even get on track to advance in other equally important developmental domains. We are negligent in our responsibilities under this legislation when it comes to putting politics, not science, ahead of our discussions. Under this bill, we put politics ahead of what the National Academy of Sciences says is what is right when it comes to educating our young people.

I support the Miller substitute and oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2210 and in oppo-

sition to the substitute. I wish to emphasize the important work that religious organizations do and to support their right to staff on a religious basis.

The landmark Federal law prohibiting religious discrimination in employment includes an explicit exemption for religious employers in section 702(a) of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and nothing in title VII provides that a religious organization loses its exemption because it receives Federal funds.

Any Federal legislation governing Federal social service funds should continue to protect the rights of religious organizations to hire and staff on a religious basis when they take part in Federal social service efforts. To do otherwise would deny religious organization rights they have enjoyed for decades under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

As the New Republic's legal critic, Jeffrey Rosen, has made clear: "Preserving churches' ability to fire or refuse to hire people who reject their religious values is . . . necessary to protect religious autonomy and State neutrality."

□ 2315

Faith-based organizations cannot be expected to sustain their religious drive without the ability to employ individuals who share the tenets and practices of their faith, because it is that faith that motivates them to do the good work they do.

Faith is an idea, not an immutable characteristic. Faith is not tied to the color of one's skin, to one's genetic makeup, or to one's ethnic ancestry. It is a unique blend of emotion and intellect that can be shared by anyone.

I strongly support a religious organization's right to staff on a religious basis, and I commend them for the good work that they do and the good work they will do in regard to Head Start.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I think that the most important work that our faith-based organizations could perhaps do on behalf of this Nation is to pray for the soul of our country. If we would come at this hour and block grant Head Start to States, it would appear that we have blocked out of our heads the historical circumstances in our States in terms of the way they treated the academic development of poor children.

What State in our country will we put on the honor roll in terms of providing an adequate educational opportunity for poor children, where they insisted that these children get qualified teachers and decent classrooms? In 45 of our 50 States there has been litigation by thousands of our school districts about the inadequacy of the provision of public education.

Why did the Federal Government get in the business of Head Start? Was it

because States were rushing to help poor children get ready for school? Why did we get involved in school lunch programs and summer job programs, in title I? We have gotten involved because States have never sought to provide for poor children what they need to prepare for their future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) will control the balance of the time of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his leadership and for making sure we have a way to make sure that the world knows what we are trying to stop tonight.

Head Start has a proven record of preparing low-income children for school and for life. It has been successful because Head Start understands that education is not just about reading and writing; it understands that all children need a sound body if they are to have a sound mind. Just as much as they need education and learning, Head Start understands that they need nutrition and health care.

Recent studies show the congressional districts represented by Congressional Black Caucus Members have almost twice as many children in Head Start as other congressional districts. That means if this bill goes through, children in our districts will be disproportionately hit.

Mr. Chairman, block granting is a recipe for disaster. It guarantees that thousands of Head Start students will start their life well behind. It is the beginning of the end of Head Start. By supporting the Miller substitute, however, we are recognizing that Head Start works. Let us keep it working.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will ask the gentlewoman to remove her badge.

When Members are being recognized, they are not to wear badges to communicate a message.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a representative of another area of this country which has successfully utilized Head Start to improve the readiness of our children for school and help parents improve their own lives and provide a more stable and nurturing family environment for them, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2210 and for the Miller substitute.

H.R. 2210 would begin the dismantling of a program that is of vital importance to the welfare of our country.

Head Start is not just an early education program, but deals with the whole child and all that is important to his or her optimal development.

One of those areas is health care. I have done health screenings at Head Start, and I can tell you we find many potential disabilities, hearing, sight, speech, lack of immunization and others, which can be corrected if we find them early. We know poor parents often do not have transportation costs to go where referred as H.R. 2210 wants them to do.

This would hurt our children, weaken our families, undermine our communities, and really weaken our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, let us not destroy this program and the hope that it has provided for so many to build their families and lives upon. Oppose H.R. 2210 and support the Miller substitute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will take off my badge that said "Head Start Works," but I do want to start, as the leader did, by saying that Head Start does work, and I thank the distinguished gentleman for his amendment to bring reality into this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about a frivolous issue tonight on the floor. It is almost midnight here on the east coast. The parents of Head Start children are beginning, probably some of them, to just be able to lay their heads down. Many of them will rise in the early morning. Many of them are on hourly jobs. Some of them are the parents of children who are in fact impacted by migrant and seasonal work. Sixty percent of the eligible children are served; 40 percent are not. Nineteen percent of the migrant and seasonal worker children are served; the rest are not served. Three percent of infant and preschool children are served only; the rest are not served.

This is a bill that is a bad bill. This particular amendment puts Head Start back where it needs to be, serving all of the children of America, not just a few. This is a bad bill. Support the Miller amendment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a member of our committee.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and the gentleman from Delaware (Chairman CASTLE), and also the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for his thoughtful amendment. I think his amendment does represent some improvement.

I would like to just briefly discuss eight State demonstration programs. That seems to be the crux of the problem right now. I can point out that no State has to join the demonstration program. This is totally optional.

We may have all 50 States say, Let's keep the thing like it is. I do not be-

lieve any State will join unless it feels it can actually better serve children. So what is the fear? Why are we concerned about this? Is it the argument of a camel's nose under the tent, maybe it will work and then it might spread? I do not think this is a dangerous issue at all.

So it only makes sense that two programs that are now existing side by side, a State program and Head Start, can be better coordinated, can serve more children, and can do a better job than what we are doing at the present time.

So I recommend that we defeat the substitute and pass the Head Start reauthorization.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic substitute to protect Head Start and oppose H.R. 2210.

Basically, one of the reasons why I am behind it is because we are talking about monies going into block grants right now. We are talking about monies that are going to be going there, because States are in a deficit right now. It is a time we should pour monies into education, invest more money into education; and Head Start should receive a lot more money.

Let me tell you, a lot more kids are receiving help when they go into Head Start. It builds their self-esteem, it gets them involved, it builds their confidence, it allows them an opportunity to progress and advance in education.

I can talk about my personal experience. I was put in a slow-learners' class. I was not put in the regular classes during that periods of time. Had there been a Head Start class, I would have been able to build my self-esteem, my confidence and my ability to go on and learn. It is important that we do.

The Republicans now are saying we want to reach out to the Hispanic community. Well, you are not reaching out to the Hispanic community. You say we want to include you; we want to leave no child behind.

You are going to leave more children behind, because what you are doing right now is you are cutting off support for them, giving them the ability to learn, giving them the ability to progress by putting it into block grants, putting it into States that have deficits right now, and making those decisions.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, the work we do here in Congress is all about priorities, and the decisions we

make are a measure of what we value as a Nation.

What this bill shows us very clearly is that low-income children are again not a priority for our President and the Republican leadership. We have spent \$350 billion in another tax cut for our wealthiest families, yet we cannot afford to provide Head Start services to two out of every five eligible preschool children.

Mr. Chairman, instead of expanding the libraries in Head Start classrooms, this bill will take books out of the hands of our most at-risk children. Rather than providing teachers additional resources, we are jamming even more students into the crowded classrooms.

This legislation jeopardizes funding, slashes critical health services, weakens educational standards, and repeals civil rights protections.

I am outraged by the Republican bill, but I am not surprised. The Republican leadership constantly extols family values, yet its legislative agenda so clearly fails to value American families.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the author of the bill, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education Reform.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to this argument all night, and there is some great success stories in Head Start, and there are a lot of us that are very devoted to what Head Start has done. But I hark back to about 15 or 16 years ago when I was Governor of the small State of Delaware, and we started welfare reform before anybody here in Congress had talked about it. We started it by having classes, mandatory classes. You had to go to classes, or you would not get your welfare.

I went to that first class after they had been there for about 2 months. I walked in there; I remember there were 19 people there, one man and 18 women. I was stunned, because I thought they would want to run me out of the place. Instead, they thanked me for giving them an opportunity.

We have done what you had to do with welfare in Delaware, and now in the United States. We have reduced welfare by 50 percent. The time has come in the United States of America to do more with Head Start.

There are some wonderful success stories for Head Start, no question about it. But there are also in-bred problems that we need to deal with if we are going to make Head Start better, and some of those we need to talk about right now.

First of all, I do appreciate the support for title I, because we did make a lot of changes. That is everything but the State demonstration and the faith-based business.

Secondly, we have increased spending. Since 1995, we have doubled spending. But if you look at these results for just 1 year, and I showed these charts before, ironically, that was about an hour and a half ago, nobody has come forward to show me anything different, any study, any chart, any test whatsoever, to show that Head Start results are better than this.

This shows that the increases are rather marginal, in fact, in some instances no increases at all as far as Head Start is concerned, averaging in the low twenties. This means these are kids that are going to have difficulty in school. Some are going to be higher and they are going to do all right; but for the most part, they are going to have difficulty in schools because we simply have not gotten them to where they should be, which is as close to the median level, 50 percent, as we can get them. We have to raise that.

What does the State demonstration make? The State demonstration that people are so concerned about, what does it do with respect to this? Well, it fences in all of the Federal money, all of local money, it adds more local money to what we are doing here, and it makes sure that the State merges it in with all of the other programs and projects which they are trying to do to help children.

Some of the comments which I have spelled out before from people on the outside, for example, the San Diego Union said: "The strident opposition to President Bush's modest pilot proposal to fine-tune Head Start is nothing more than partisan sniping, pure and simple. Bush is looking to close the achievement gap for poor youngsters. He would do so by merging Head Start into often overlapping State programs and opposing new academic standards on the combined program."

That is positive. That will help educate young people.

Then the Des Moines Register said: "The eight States selected for the 5-year pilot project just might do better. The eight-State pilot project is a chance to see what States can do on their own. Meanwhile, Head Start is working to improve early literacy and math preparation. When the 5-year experiment is over, Congress can decide whether a state-by-state or national framework better serves the interests of young children."

□ 2330

That is not taking apart Head Start, that is not block-granting anything. That is affording opportunities to young people to be able to be educated.

The Council of State School Officers has come forward and has indicated that they believe in this proposal and we need to do something about it. This is a council of State school officers which has done that, people who believe in education. The Brookings Institution, certainly a middle-of-the-road operation, has come forward and said that we need to do something. It

said, given the immensity of the task and the modest success achieved thus far, new ideas are worth trying.

This is a new idea. This is not dismembering anything. This is affording opportunity. This is taking eight States and saying, we are going to give you, the best States in the country, who are willing to put in extra money and who are already running programs that are going to help in early education with these young children, the opportunity to do more to lift the standards of where we are going with Head Start. Everything else will be done in Head Start.

And Lord only knows, it does some wonderful things, and we have heard that said by a lot of people here tonight. But this is unacceptable; we have to do better educationally. That is what this is all about.

Please support the underlying legislation and defeat the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, Head Start works. It has for 38 years. Providing comprehensive child development, literacy, family services to more than 18 million preschoolers. One million children and their families are served every single year, unquestionably, the most effective early childhood development program ever developed.

Why do we want to change it? What is the reason for it?

The bill that underlies this amendment tonight, it would shift the responsibility of the program to the States. In essence, what we would see, we are going to pave the way for what the founder of Head Start, Dr. Edward Zigler, has called 50 Head Start programs run by 50 governors. It is going to these States untested and unproven. They lack the high standards, the accountability that is already found in the Head Start program. And the sole problem with this program is that only three out of five eligible preschoolers and only 3 percent of eligible infants and toddlers can participate in Head Start because of the funding constraints.

Farming the program out to cash-strapped States will not improve matters. Do not deny our children opportunity. Do not deny them success. Support the Miller amendment and let us do something right for the youngsters of this country.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, tonight we have a choice. We have a choice about whether or not we can build upon the continued and improving success of the Head Start program, and whether or not we can provide the kind of quality assurance and performance standards that this generation of children, of impoverished children, of many children who have not had opportunity up until the

day they walked through the door of a Head Start center, whether we can provide that kind of quality program and performance standards to assure that they will, in fact, have the opportunity to exercise the education that they will be given.

The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) pointed out the chart that showed these children were improving a few percentiles during their time in Head Start; then he suggested in his earlier remarks, not in these remarks but in the earlier remarks, that these children were performing so poorly that for all intents and purposes, they are done educationally. Well, that obviously does not jive with some of our colleagues who talked about their own success as Head Start students and our own experiences in our congressional districts; nor does it jive with the rest of the study which the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) cited, which is, by the end of kindergarten, these children are performing at about average.

What does that suggest to us? It suggests to the researchers that Head Start, in fact, did lay down the foundation, did lay down the basis by which these children, compared to other children in kindergarten, are able to achieve in that 1 year the average of those children. That is against all children in that kindergarten.

How does Head Start work against their peers, other poor children who do not have the opportunity? We see that these children have substantial gains, IQ gains over the children who did not get to participate in Head Start. Their reading, writing, and math skills are superior to those children who did not get to participate; a much higher level of high school graduation. They are not doomed because they are not doing as well as we would like in Head Start; they are doing better than their peers. Special education, many fewer held back in school, and fewer put into special education and, of course, a lower incidence of participation in crime.

So it is working against their peers, and it is providing them an educational opportunity against the average children.

We have already agreed, and we have said on both sides of the aisle, that there is much improvement in this legislation. But again we go back to the fundamental principle that the improvements that we make in title I, the improvements in the performance standards and in the law, are then undermined by the block grant.

It is interesting that the gentleman from Delaware, and I can understand his experience, because his State has basically adopted the Head Start performance standards for State pre-K programs, as has Ohio, the chairman; and I guess, apparently, of Oregon.

But in this block grant, the very things that strengthen and provide for the success that the gentleman from Delaware talks about are not included, because when you say it is extensive, you do not have to take the body of

regulations that have provided the quality and the continuous improvement of this program over 35 years. The States do not have to take that, and that is the big difference. And that is what we see when we talk about the erosion that the block grant leads to.

We can take the block grant and we can reduce program hours. We can exclude 3-year-olds. We can increase child-teacher ratios. We can provide unproven curricula. We have spent a fortune trying to get Head Start doing something with the massive amounts of research that we have been involved in, and yet we can cast that aside and go out to some vendor who promises us something for these children. We can run half-year programs and we can serve more children by running the half-year program.

These are the core elements that have separated Head Start from so many other State-run programs where they do not have the quality and they do not get the results. That is why there is such a strong adherence by our communities to the Head Start program. That is why there is such strong adherence by the Members of Congress to the Head Start program, because we understand that they are being measured by their compliance, by their compliance to those standards.

Yes, many of them are out of compliance in one fashion or another, but we also know that many of those are just minuscule, tiny, tiny factors that they are out of compliance with. Because in that same study, again, 85 percent of them were high quality.

And then it comes to the question of the comprehensive services and the direct access, and the body that we have built up, services that are not provided in many of the State programs. That is why we ask our colleagues to accept this bill and all of the hard work that has gone into title I and to reject title II.

Finally, let me say that all of this improvement and all of these children that are supposed to be served are all essentially going to be served with less money in a few years because of the capped authorization in this legislation. For the first time, this Congress will reauthorize a bill that will not allow for the expansion over the period of that reauthorization of this program. That is the first time any Congress has done that, and that is the first time any administration, Republican or Democrat, has suggested that that is the right way to go.

We know it is not the right way to go. We are only serving 60 percent of the children, and yet we are going to knock out in the next few years some 5,000 to 10,000 of those children because the authorization does not provide sufficient funding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment, and rejection of the block grant and the undermining of the Head Start program.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the author of this bill, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the subcommittee chairman, for the brilliant job that he did with the subcommittee to bring this bill together and to bring it to this point.

Also, I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for all of his efforts, and all of the members of our committee who have worked hard and come together from the right wing to the more moderate wing to help craft a bill that will help poor children get a better start in life.

I also want to thank the staff of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), including Sara Rittling and Paul Leonard. I want to thank the committee staff: Kate Houston, Amanda Farris, Melanie Looney, Julian Baer, Parker Hamilton, Krisann Pearce, Dave Schnittger, Jo-Marie St. Martin, and Sally Lovejoy and others who were so helpful in putting this bill together.

Head Start has done a lot for a lot of children all across the country. There is not one Member in this room, not one, who does not believe that Head Start cannot be improved.

Now, the question is, how do we improve it? In title I of the bill, there is basic agreement on the changes that will bring a more academic component to Head Start.

The big issue was over title II, the eight-State pilot project. We have heard it called a block grant, we have heard it described as the dismantling of Head Start. Please. There are some States out there who are doing magnificent things, and to give them the opportunity to better coordinate Head Start with their own pre-kindergarten programs, their own early childhood development programs, their own child care programs, States can, in fact, provide a comprehensive package that we believe could be of great help to poor children and their parents in terms of helping improve this program.

And to just say "no," we are not going to try it, we are never going to go there, frankly, is not fair. It is not fair to the 3- and 4-year-olds in America who need our help.

So we have in this bill this eight-state demonstration project, but only for those States who would hold themselves to high standards, only those States who will make a big commitment to early childhood development, and only States who really want to take this project on.

I believe that we have got a good bill before us. I want to ask my colleagues to reject the Miller substitute and to vote "yes" on final passage.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for introducing this necessary substitute. This Head Start bill is an outrage!

H.R. 2210 it turns a program that is a proven success at improving the lives and futures of low-income children into some kind of Federal experiment. And, for the first time in this

Nation's history, it repeals a law which protects employees against religious discrimination, and Mr. MILLER's substitute fixes both of these issues.

We know that children who complete Head Start are less likely to become delinquents and are more likely to graduate from high school than their peers from similar economic backgrounds. We know this and we know that voting for these amendments will ensure that low-income children can continue to get the Head Start they need to succeed in school and in life.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. WOOLSEY of California; amendment No. 2 in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. MILLER of California.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 231, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—199

Abercrombie	Becerra	Boucher
Ackerman	Bell	Boyd
Alexander	Berkley	Bradley (NH)
Allen	Berman	Brady (PA)
Andrews	Berry	Brown (OH)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine
Baird	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Capuano
Ballance	Boswell	Cardin

Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Pomeroy
Carson (OK)	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Case	Kaptur	Rahall
Clay	Kelly	Rangel
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Conyers	Kildee	Rodriguez
Cooper	Kilpatrick	Ross
Costello	Kind	Rothman
Cramer	Klecza	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Lampson	Rush
Davis (AL)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Sabo
Davis (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	T.
DeFazio	Leach	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Lee	Sanders
DeLaunt	Levin	Lucas (KY)
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Lucas (OK)
Deutsch	Lofgren	Manzullo
Dicks	Lowey	Marshall
Dingell	Lynch	McCotter
Doggett	Majette	McHugh
Dooley (CA)	Maloney	McInnis
Doyle	Markey	McIntyre
Edwards	Matheson	McKeon
Emanuel	Matsui	Mica
Engel	McCarthy (MO)	Miller (FL)
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Miller (MI)
Etheridge	McCollum	Miller, Gary
Evans	McDermott	Moran (KS)
Farr	McGovern	Murphy
Fattah	McNulty	Musgrave
Filner	Meehan	Myrick
Ford	Meek (FL)	Nethercutt
Frank (MA)	Meeks (NY)	Neugebauer
Frost	Menendez	Ney
Gonzalez	Michaud	Northup
Gordon	Millender-	Norwood
Green (TX)	McDonald	
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	
Harman	Miller, George	
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	
Hill	Moore	
Hinche	Moran (VA)	
Hinojosa	Murtha	
Hoeffel	Nadler	
Holden	Napolitano	
Holt	Neal (MA)	
Honda	Nestar	
Hoolley (OR)	Obey	
Hoyer	Olver	
Inlee	Ortiz	
Israel	Owens	
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	
Jackson-Lee	Pascrell	
(TX)	Payne	
Jefferson	Pelosi	

NOES—231

Aderholt	Chabot	Gibbons
Akin	Chocola	Gilchrest
Bachus	Coble	Gillmor
Baker	Cole	Gingrey
Ballenger	Collins	Goode
Barrett (SC)	Cox	Goodlatte
Bartlett (MD)	Crane	Goss
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bass	Cubin	Graves
Beauprez	Culberson	Green (WI)
Bereuter	Cunningham	Greenwood
Biggett	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutknecht
Bilirakis	Davis, Tom	Hall
Bishop (UT)	Deal (GA)	Harris
Blackburn	DeLay	Hart
Blunt	DeMint	Hastert
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayes
Bonilla	Doolittle	Hayworth
Bonner	Dreier	Hefley
Bono	Duncan	Hensarling
Boozman	Dunn	Herger
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hobson
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Hoekstra
Brown-Waite,	English	Hostettler
Ginny	Everett	Houghton
Burgess	Feeney	Hulshof
Burns	Ferguson	Hunter
Burr	Flake	Hyde
Burton (IN)	Fletcher	Isakson
Buyer	Foley	Issa
Calvert	Forbes	Istook
Camp	Fossella	Janklow
Cannon	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	John
Capito	Gallagher	Johnson (CT)
Carter	Garrett (NJ)	Johnson (IL)
Castle	Gerlach	Johnson, Sam

Jones (NC)	Nunes	Shays
Keller	Nussle	Shimkus
Kennedy (MN)	Osborne	Shuster
King (IA)	Ose	Simmons
King (NY)	Otter	Simpson
Kingston	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Kirk	Paul	Smith (NJ)
Kline	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Pence	Souder
Kolbe	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
LaHood	Petri	Sullivan
Latham	Pickering	Sweeney
LaTourette	Pitts	Tancred
Lewis (CA)	Platts	Tauzin
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
Linder	Porter	Taylor (NC)
Lipinski	Portman	Terry
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Thomas
Lucas (KY)	Putnam	Thornberry
Lucas (OK)	Quinn	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Radanovich	Tiberti
Marshall	Ramstad	Toomey
McCotter	Regula	Turner (OH)
McHugh	Rehberg	Upton
McInnis	Renzi	Vitter
McIntyre	Reynolds	Walden (OR)
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Walsh
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Wamp
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
Moran (KS)	Royce	Whitfield
Murphy	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Musgrave	Ryun (KS)	Wilson (NM)
Myrick	Saxton	Wilson (SC)
Nethercutt	Schrock	Wolf
Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Ney	Sessions	Young (FL)
Northup	Shadegg	
Norwood	Shaw	

NOT VOTING—5

Davis (TN)	Notierrez	Pastor
Gephardt	McCrery	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 0004

Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. JANKLOW changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TANNER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the next vote will be a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 229, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

AYES—200

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Nadler
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Alexander	Harman	Neal (MA)
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Andrews	Hill	Olver
Baca	Hinche	Ortiz
Baird	Hinojosa	Owens
Baldwin	Hoeffel	Pallone
Ballance	Holden	Pascrell
Becerra	Holt	Payne
Bell	Honda	Pelosi
Berkley	Hooley (OR)	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berry	Inslee	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Israel	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Boswell	(TX)	Rodriguez
Boucher	Jefferson	Ross
Boyd	Johnson (CT)	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Johnson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Rush
Capps	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kaptur	Sabo
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sanchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kildee	T.
Carson (IN)	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (OK)	Kind	Sanders
Case	Kleczka	Sandlin
Clay	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lampson	Schiff
Conyers	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cramer	Larson (CT)	Shays
Crowley	Leach	Sherman
Cummings	Lee	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Levin	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Solis
Davis (TN)	Lucas (KY)	Spratt
DeFazio	Lynch	Stark
DeGette	Majette	Strickland
Delahunt	Maloney	Stupak
DeLauro	Markey	Tanner
Deutsch	Matheson	Tauscher
Dicks	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Dooley (CA)	McCollum	Towns
Doyle	McDermott	Turner (TX)
Edwards	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Emanuel	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Engel	Meehan	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Velazquez
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Evans	Menendez	Waters
Farr	Michaud	Watson
Fattah	Millender-	Watt
Filner	McDonald	Waxman
Ford	Miller (NC)	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Wexler
Frost	Mollohan	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Moore	Wu
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Wynn
Green (TX)	Murtha	

NOES—229

Aderholt	Bradley (NH)	Crane
Akin	Brady (TX)	Crenshaw
Bachus	Brown (SC)	Cubin
Baker	Brown-Waite,	Culberson
Ballenger	Ginny	Cunningham
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Davis, Jo Ann
Bartlett (MD)	Burns	Davis, Tom
Barton (TX)	Burr	Deal (GA)
Bass	Burton (IN)	DeLay
Beauprez	Calvert	DeMint
Bereuter	Camp	Diaz-Balart, L.
Biggart	Cannon	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bilirakis	Cantor	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Dreier
Blackburn	Carter	Duncan
Blunt	Castle	Dunn
Boehlert	Chabot	Ehlers
Boehner	Chocola	Emerson
Bonilla	Coble	English
Bonner	Cole	Everett
Bono	Collins	Feeney
Boozman	Cox	Ferguson

Flake	Knollenberg	Renzi
Fletcher	Kolbe	Reynolds
Foley	LaHood	Rogers (AL)
Forbes	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Fossella	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Gallegly	Linder	Royce
Garrett (NJ)	Lipinski	Ryan (WI)
Gerlach	LoBiondo	Ryun (KS)
Gibbons	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Schrock
Gillmor	Marshall	Sensenbrenner
Gingrey	McCotter	Sessions
Goode	McHugh	Shadegg
Goodlatte	McInnis	Shaw
Goss	McIntyre	Sherwood
Granger	McKeon	Shimkus
Graves	Mica	Shuster
Green (WI)	Miller (FL)	Simmons
Greenwood	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Gutknecht	Miller, Gary	Smith (MI)
Hall	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Harris	Murphy	Smith (TX)
Hart	Musgrave	Souder
Hastert	Myrick	Stearns
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Hayes	Neugebauer	Sweeney
Hayworth	Ney	Tancredo
Hefley	Northup	Tauzin
Hensarling	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Herger	Nunes	Taylor (NC)
Hobson	Nussle	Terry
Hoekstra	Osborne	Thomas
Hoefttler	Ose	Thornberry
Houghton	Otter	Tiahrt
Hulshof	Oxley	Tiberi
Hunter	Paul	Toomey
Hyde	Pearce	Turner (OH)
Isakson	Pence	Upton
Issa	Peterson (PA)	Vitter
Istook	Petri	Walden (OR)
Janklow	Pickering	Walsh
Jenkins	Pitts	Wamp
John	Platts	Weldon (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Weldon (PA)
Jones (NC)	Porter	Weller
Keller	Portman	Whitfield
Kelly	Pryce (OH)	Wicker
Kennedy (MN)	Putnam	Wilson (NM)
King (IA)	Quinn	Wilson (SC)
King (NY)	Radanovich	Wolf
Kingston	Ramstad	Young (AK)
Kirk	Regula	Young (FL)
Kline	Rehberg	

NOT VOTING—6

Buyer
Gephardt
McCrery
Oberstar
Pastor
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 0012

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There being no other amendments, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Accordingly, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SWEENEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2210) to reauthorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 336, he re-

ported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR.
GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Grijalva moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2210 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 2, line 23, strike “\$6,870,000,000” and all that follows down through line 26 and insert “\$7,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 2004, \$7,119,000,000 for the fiscal year 2005, \$7,232,904,000 for the fiscal year 2006, \$7,370,329,000 for the fiscal year 2007, and \$7,554,587,000 for the fiscal year 2008.”.

Page 4, strike lines 10 and 11 and insert the following:

(2)(A) By inserting, after “13 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year” in subsection (a)(2) the following: “or increase such reservation to 15 percent in any year in which the amount appropriated hereinafter under section 639(a) exceeds the amount appropriated under such section for fiscal year 2003, increasing such reservation only from such excess.”.

(B) By inserting “, consistent with the last sentence of this paragraph” after “except in subsection (a)(2)(A).”.

(C) By striking “1998” in subsection (a)(2)(A) and inserting “2003”.

(D) By amending the last sentence of subsection (a)(2) to read as follows: “For any fiscal year in which the amount appropriated hereinafter under section 639(a) exceeds the amount appropriated under such section for fiscal year 2003, the Secretary, from such excess amount, shall increase the amount made available under subparagraph (A) for programs described under such subparagraph to not less than 3 percent for Indian Head Start programs and 5 percent for migrant and seasonal Head Start programs.”.

Page 5, line 16, after “the following” insert “before the last sentence”.

Mr. GRIJALVA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 0015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr.

GRIJALVA) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the motion.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), who is also chair of the Education Task Force for the Congressional Hispanic Conference.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this Grijalva motion to recommit. Migrant children whose parents do the most back-breaking work in the Nation in order to put food on our tables deserve better than crumbs when it comes to early childhood education.

I would especially like to recognize the leadership that my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), has shown on this issue. Migrant children have no better friend than this gentleman from Arizona.

We began the reauthorization process thinking we could come to a bipartisan solution to the access gap in Head Start programs for the children of migrant and seasonal farm workers. But the majority has steadfastly refused to provide the financial resources needed to expand the program. Their bill will only increase the migrant Head Start children from 19 percent served to 20 percent.

When these families do not have access to the program, parents have no alternative but to take their children to the fields, or perhaps leave them unattended in the labor camp. We are fooling ourselves if we think that we can provide Head Start services to the 80 percent of children we have left behind. Vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), a great advocate for education and a former member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to rise to support the Grijalva motion to recommit. I want to also state to the Members here tonight that I have heard a lot of discussion and debate about Head Start. I want to point out the family here that I represent in my district. They are actually recipients of the WIC program, the Women, Infant and Children program.

These young children are not even eligible for Head Start yet, but you are already determining their fate by cutting out program services when you propose legislation that would block grant these services. I am talking about real people, people who need help, who are not looking for a handout but want to see educational improvements in their lives.

When we help to educate a mother, we help to educate her children and her family. But when we deny her that

ability to take her children somewhere so that they can be taught appropriately to learn the language, to become assimilated to this society, to be able to seek assistance from this government, because they also pay taxes, this is also a working family, and let us not lose sight of that. This is not something about people who were looking for handouts.

Right now in the State of California there are over 103,000 children who will not be eligible under the Republican proposal; 6,500 in the 32nd Congressional District that I am very proud to represent in East Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley, where 60 percent of the students enrolled in Head Start are Hispanic. They look like this family. My colleagues are telling them that they are not going to have a future. You are telling them and their mother that the mother will not be able to participate in their education.

We need to help these families. We need to help provide support for migrant education programs. These are families that are coming and seeking a better tomorrow, the American Dream. They are immigrants seeking a better tomorrow. I support the motion to recommit, and I support full funding for the migrant seasonal education program as well as the efforts of my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to provide a ray of hope to thousands upon thousands of the poorest of the poor, the children of migrant and farm worker families.

The child in this picture is eligible for migrant and seasonal Head Start services, yet he wanders in a field in North Carolina with his parents while they work all day. He is exposed to pesticides, hazardous equipment, extreme heat, and other health dangers. The sad part of this situation is that he is not alone. Over 130,000 children are in the exact same situation in the richest country in the world. These children are neglected because Congress has chosen not to provide the funds to give them services.

If you have not seen these children, you have seen their families' hard work. Every day you see their hard work on your dinner table, in your restaurants, and in your grocery stores. With just 19 percent of migrant children being served, this program is so drastically underfunded that providing new money is the only clear and real solution.

Republicans are rearranging the money in Head Start, claiming that they are providing relief to these children. This is simply untrue. Strategies that steal from Peter to pay Paul are unfair. Only 2,200 of the 130,000 neglected children will be served with this new funding scheme, and it ignores the Native American children all together.

There are deadly weapons in this Nation: ignorance, intolerance, injustice,

neglect, and denial of opportunity. These children are the victims. These are weapons we can find and we can destroy, and this is your opportunity.

Let us extend to these children the American Dream. Let these children who are the sons and daughters of farm workers feel that they too have a stake in this country. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to use their consciences and support the motion to recommit and vote "no" on final passage.

It is time we start speaking for children that have no voice in this House. The children of farm workers deserve our support and our care.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would kindly ask all Members to turn off electronic equipment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the gentleman who has led our efforts with Members on both sides of the aisle to help seasonal migrant workers.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and it is my pleasure to rise and defend this bill, and particularly the provisions in it regarding seasonal and migrant workers.

The migrant and seasonal children of this country have special needs and should get special help, and I do not disagree with the minority on that part. They need special help because they are often moved from place to place, and they have special conditions that have to be dealt with.

For example, in my community, they attend Head Start programs from early summer to mid-fall. Obviously, this is not the standard school year. But that is just one of the many ways in which they have to be treated specially. And I am personally very familiar with their problems because in my youth I lived in a small farming community in the great State of Ohio. I worked on a produce farm. I worked side by side with migrant workers, in the fields and in the packing sheds, and even in transporting produce to markets.

It is very important for us to provide the services for these children. When these children are not served properly, parents will often bring them to the fields and sometimes even have the slightly older ones working. They certainly can be exposed to harmful conditions that way. Today, migrant and seasonal Head Start serves close to 35,000 children in 39 States in every region of this country. But in contrast to the standard Head Start program, the part that serves the migrant and seasonal serves only approximately 19 percent of the eligible children. That is dramatically lower than the 60 percent of eligible children served in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be able in the committee to offer an amendment that was approved by the committee that allows all migrant and seasonal Head Start grantees to operate early Head Start programs. Not every Head Start program is allowed to operate early Head Start, but this amendment allows all migrant and seasonal Head Start grantees to operate these.

Why is that important? Because frequently migrants have small children and they need the early Head Start program, or they are going to be taken to the fields. That is one great improvement.

Another is that my amendment will require the Secretary to ensure that migrant and seasonal Head Start programs are included in the planning and coordination of the State systems of training and technical assistance. In addition, part of my amendment, in combination with a change that has been made in the substitute, will provide at least 25 percent of any remaining technical assistance funds which are used in migrant and seasonal Head Start programs. And the bill specifically makes 1 percent of the technical training assistance funds available in this category. This means we will have an additional \$17.4 million in fiscal year 2005 and an additional \$1 million in 2008. This will provide an additional 2,300 slots for children to receive services and up to 2,500.

This is not just a magic authorization improvement. This is money that will be there. These are slots that will be there. These are children that will receive service. It is not simply increasing authorization; it is producing additional spots for the kids to go in.

We have covered a good deal of this problem in this bill through this amendment. Let us vote for this bill, let us reject the recommittal motion, and let us go on and get this bill into effect and help all the seasonal and migrant children of this Nation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 227, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

AYES—203

Abercrombie	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Ackerman	Hall	Neal (MA)
Alexander	Harman	Oberstar
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Andrews	Hill	Olver
Baca	Hinche	Ortiz
Baird	Hinojosa	Owens
Baldwin	Hoeffel	Pallone
Ballance	Holden	Pascrell
Becerra	Holt	Payne
Bell	Honda	Pelosi
Berkley	Hooley (OR)	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berry	Inslee	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Israel	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Boswell	(TX)	Rodriguez
Boucher	Jefferson	Ross
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Kaptur	Rush
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kildee	Sabo
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kind	T.
Carson (IN)	Kleczka	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (OK)	Kucinich	Sanders
Case	Lampson	Istook
Clay	Langevin	Janklow
Clyburn	Lantos	Jenkins
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
Costello	Leach	Scott (VA)
Cramer	Lee	Serrano
Crowley	Levin	Sherman
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Solis
Davis (TN)	Majette	Spratt
DeFazio	Maloney	Stark
DeGette	Markey	Stenholm
DeLaunt	Marshall	Strickland
DeLauro	Matheson	Stupak
Deutsch	Matsui	Tanner
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Dooley (CA)	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McGovern	Tierney
Edwards	McIntyre	Towns
Emanuel	McNulty	Turner (TX)
Engel	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Evans	Menendez	Velazquez
Farr	Michaud	Visclosky
Fattah	Millender-	Waters
Filner	McDonald	Watson
Ford	Miller (NC)	Watt
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Waxman
Frost	Mollohan	Weiner
Gonzalez	Moore	Wexler
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Green (TX)	Murtha	Wu
Grijalva	Nadler	Wynn

NOES—227

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Davis, Jo Ann
Akin	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Bachus	Burgess	Deal (GA)
Baker	Burns	DeLay
Ballenger	Burr	DeMint
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bartlett (MD)	Buyer	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Doolittle
Bass	Camp	Dreier
Beauprez	Cannon	Duncan
Bereuter	Cantor	Dunn
Biggart	Capito	Ehlers
Bilirakis	Carter	Emerson
Bishop (UT)	Castle	English
Blackburn	Chabot	Everett
Blunt	Chocola	Feeney
Boehlert	Coble	Ferguson
Boehner	Cole	Flake
Bonilla	Collins	Fletcher
Bonner	Cox	Foley
Bono	Crane	Forbes
Boozman	Crenshaw	Fossella
Bradley (NH)	Cubin	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brown (SC)	Cunningham	Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Gerlach	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
Gibbons	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Gillmor	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Gingrey	Lipinski	Royce
Goode	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	Lucas (OK)	Ryun (KS)
Goss	Manzullo	Saxton
Granger	McCotter	Schrock
Graves	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Green (WI)	McHugh	Sessions
Greenwood	McInnis	Shadegg
Gutknecht	McKeon	Shaw
Harris	Mica	Shays
Hart	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Hastert	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Hayes	Moran (KS)	Simmons
Hayworth	Murphy	Simpson
Hefley	Musgrave	Smith (MI)
Hensarling	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Ney	Souder
Hoekstra	Northup	Stearns
Hostettler	Norwood	Sweeney
Houghton	Nunes	Tancred
Hulshof	Nussle	Tauzin
Hunter	Osborne	Taylor (NC)
Hyde	Ose	Terry
Isakson	Otter	Thomas
Issa	Oxley	Thornberry
Istook	Paul	Tiahrt
Janklow	Pearce	Tiberi
Jenkins	Pence	Toomey
John	Peterson (PA)	Turner (OH)
Johnson (CT)	Pickering	Upton
Johnson (IL)	Pitts	Vitter
Johnson, Sam	Platts	Walden (OR)
Jones (NC)	Pombo	Walsh
Keller	Porter	Wamp
Kelly	Portman	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (MN)	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (PA)
King (IA)	Putnam	Weller
King (NY)	Quinn	Whitfield
Kingston	Radanovich	Wicker
Kirk	Ramstad	Wilson (NM)
Kline	Regula	Wilson (SC)
Knollenberg	Rehberg	Wolf
Kolbe	Renzi	Young (AK)
LaHood	Reynolds	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Gephardt	Pastor	Sullivan
Myrick	Petri	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 0043

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 216, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Bass	Boehlert
Akin	Beauprez	Boehner
Bachus	Bereuter	Bonilla
Baker	Biggart	Bonner
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Bono
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Boozman
Bartlett (MD)	Blackburn	Bradley (NH)
Barton (TX)	Blunt	Brady (TX)

Brown (SC) Hastert
Brown-Waite, Ginny Hastings (WA)
Burgess Hayworth
Burns Hefley
Burr Hensarling
Burton (IN) Herger
Buyer Hobson
Calvert Hoekstra
Camp Hostettler
Cannon Houghton
Cantor Hulshof
Capito Hunter
Carter Hyde
Castle Isakson
Chabot Issa
Chocola Istook
Coble Janklow
Cole Jenkins
Collins Johnson, Sam
Cox Jones (NC)
Crane Keller
Crenshaw Kelly
Cubin Kennedy (MN)
Culberson King (IA)
Cunningham King (NY)
Davis, Jo Ann Kingston
Davis, Tom Kirk
Deal (GA) Kline
DeLay Knollenberg
DeMint Kolbe
Diaz-Balart, L. LaHood
Diaz-Balart, M. Latham
Doolittle Lewis (CA)
Dreier Lewis (KY)
Dunn Linder
Ehlers LoBiondo
Emerson Manzullo
English McCotter
Everett McCrery
Feeney McHugh
Ferguson McInnis
Flake McKeon
Fletcher Mica
Foley Miller (FL)
Forbes Miller (MI)
Fossella Miller, Gary
Franks (AZ) Moran (KS)
Gallegly Murphy
Garrett (NJ) Musgrave
Gerlach Myrick
Gibbons Nethercutt
Gilchrest Neugebauer
Gillmor Ney
Gingrey Northup
Goode Norwood
Goodlatte Nunes
Goss Nussle
Granger Osborne
Graves Ose
Green (WI) Otter
Greenwood Oxley
Gutknecht Pearce
Harris Pence
Hart Peterson (PA)

NOES—216

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

Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud

NOT VOTING—2

Gephardt Pastor

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 0057

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 0100

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, subject to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1308. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the manner as other taxpayers were entitled immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides fam-

ilies of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not off-set by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

5. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman's statement will appear in the record.

PHARMACEUTICAL MARKET
ACCESS ACT OF 2003

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 335, I call up the bill (H.R. 2427) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations for the re-importation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2427 is as follows:

H.R. 2427

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Americans unjustly pay up to 1000 percent more to fill their prescriptions than consumers in other countries.

(2) The United States is the world's largest market for pharmaceuticals yet consumers still pay the world's highest prices.

(3) An unaffordable drug is neither safe nor effective. Allowing and structuring the importation of prescription drugs ensures access to affordable drugs, thus providing a level of safety to American consumers they do not currently enjoy.

(4) According to the Congressional Budget Office, American seniors alone will spend \$1.8 trillion dollars on pharmaceuticals over the next ten years.

(5) Allowing open pharmaceutical markets could save American consumers at least \$635 billion of their own money each year.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To give all Americans immediate relief from the outrageously high cost of pharmaceuticals.

(2) To reverse the perverse economics of the American pharmaceutical markets.

(3) To allow the importation of drugs only if the drugs and the facilities where they are manufactured are approved by the Food and Drug Administration, and to exclude pharmaceutical narcotics.

(4) To require that imported prescription drugs be packaged and shipped using counterfeit-resistant technologies approved by