

day in an effort to squelch the exchange of views.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE COVERAGE A TOP PRIORITY

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I first associate myself with the remarks of my colleague in terms of the opportunity to talk about issues that come up and do it at the beginning of the day. I think the 1-minutes are a useful tool, and helpful to the public in terms of following the debate here.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to fight for working families, and there is no issue more important to the health of families than the health and well-being of their kids. Expanding health care coverage for the 10 million uninsured children in this Nation must be at the top of our legislative agenda.

There are kids without health insurance in all kinds of families. The vast majority, 90 percent, are the children of working parents. But their parents either lack health insurance themselves or their health plans do not cover their kids.

Children living without health insurance are hurt in so many ways. They are less likely to have a family doctor, less likely to receive preventive care, less likely to receive treatment, even for serious illness, and thus are less likely to grow up healthy and to be productive adults.

I urge the leadership to move the expansion of children's health care to the top of their legislative agenda, so we can make sure that the 10 million uninsured kids in this country have a chance to grow up healthy, ready to learn, and to succeed in life.

SUPPORT THE CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Conservation Reserve Program, or CRP. Originally it was used as a supply management and conservation tool. Over time, it has become the conservation program of choice for most producers. In addition, it has gained the full-fledged support of many different conservation, environmental, and sportsmen's groups.

The 1996 farm bill gave the U.S. Department of Agriculture broad authority to develop a CRP policy that would provide the Nation with the most conservation benefits for each of the dollars invested. USDA has worked hard to develop such a policy, and I applaud their efforts.

However, many of my constituents, like me, are concerned with the untimely manner in which the rule was

issued. Many farmers in my district are agonizing over whether their land will be accepted into the CRP or if they should prepare to plant a crop.

I will be keeping a very close eye on how USDA handles the sign-up process, and will be more than ready to act should things not go as planned. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

END VOODOO ENVIRONMENTALISM IN YELLOWSTONE PARK

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is time to hold the Park Service accountable for its management of Yellowstone National Park. For 30 years Yellowstone has been managed with a hands-off policy called natural regulation: a 1960's idea that scientists last week in testimony described as both foolish and misguided.

We have a crisis brewing in Yellowstone Park. As a result of overgrazing, the beaver population, deer population, even the endangered grizzly bear's habitat have been severely damaged. Tall willows have been reduced by 95 percent. Aspen trees are disappearing. Stream banks are eroding 100 times faster inside the park than outside its boundaries.

Bison, however, are so numerous they have overgrazed available pasture land. This winter over 1,000 bison starved to death or fled the park looking for food, and officials at the Department of the Interior say the cruelty of starvation is good for the herd. One of every two bison now carry a disease that causes abortion in cattle and death in humans.

Mr. Speaker, this plan, a "let it starve" version of the old "let it burn" policy, can be replaced. We can do better. Let us stop this voodoo environmentalism, and preserve and protect Yellowstone Park.

REASONS TO SUPPORT THE WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, employees want more flexibility and choice in their work schedules. Unfortunately, there is a provision in the Federal law which prevents employers from being able to provide their employees with flexibility in one area: giving them the choice of paid comp time or cash wages for working overtime.

The Subcommittee on Workforce Protections recently heard testimony from witnesses in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act, which would allow employers to offer employees their choice of time or money.

As Peter Faust, an employee with the Opportunity Village in Iowa said,

"There are a lot of ways to make money in this country and lots of ways to spend it, but there's only one way to spend time with yourself, family, or friends, and that's to have time to spend."

Linda Smith, an employee with the Bascom Palmer Eye Institute in Miami, FL, testified that she could save her overtime hours up for furthering her education, taking care of a debilitated parent or spending time with her young daughter.

Please support the needs of these employees and others by supporting H.R. 1, the Working Families Flexibility Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall vote, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, March 5, 1997.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1997 AND THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1997

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, March 5, 1997, the Speaker be authorized to entertain motions to suspend the rules and agree to the following resolutions:

House Concurrent Resolution 17, congratulating the people of Guatemala on the success of the recent negotiations to establish a peace process for Guatemala; House Concurrent Resolution 18, congratulating the people of the Republic of Nicaragua on the success of their democratic elections; and Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, commending and thanking the Honorable Warren Christopher for his exemplary service as Secretary of State.

And that on Thursday, March 6, 1997, the Speaker be authorized to entertain a motion to suspend the rules and pass the following bill:

H.R. 513, the District of Columbia Council Contract Review Reform Act of 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REGARDING THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 31) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the display of the Ten

Commandments by Judge Roy S. Moore, a judge on the circuit court of the State of Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 31

Whereas Judge Roy S. Moore, a lifelong resident of Etowah County, Alabama, graduate of the United States Military Academy with distinguished service to his country in Vietnam, and graduate of the University of Alabama School of Law, has served his country and his community with uncommon distinction;

Whereas another circuit judge in Alabama, has ordered Judge Moore to remove a copy of the Ten Commandments posted in his courtroom and the Alabama Supreme Court has granted a stay to review the matter;

Whereas the Ten Commandments have had a significant impact on the development of the fundamental legal principles of Western Civilization; and

Whereas the Ten Commandments set forth a code of moral conduct, observance of which is universally acknowledged to promote respect for our system of laws and the good of society; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Ten Commandments are a declaration of fundamental principles that are the cornerstones of a fair and just society; and

(2) the public display, including display in government offices and courthouses, of the Ten Commandments should be permitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY].

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 31, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT. I want to commend Mr. ADERHOLT for introducing this resolution and the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman HYDE, for agreeing to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary so that the House may consider this resolution without further delay.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Ten Commandments are a declaration of fundamental principles and that the public display of the Ten Commandments should be permitted.

There is a situation in the district of the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, in which the State circuit court judge has been ordered by another circuit court judge to remove the hand-carved rendition of the Ten Commandments displayed in his courtroom and to cease inviting clergy to lead juries in prayer prior to their hearing cases.

Our purpose here today is not to pressure any court to rule one way or another in any particular case; rather our purpose is to state our support for the display of the Ten Commandments and to acknowledge that the Ten Commandments are the foundation for the legal order in the United States and throughout western civilization.

Of course, as we all know, the Ten Commandments have, both for Jews and Christians, great religious significance, significance which far transcends their role in the development of our laws. But that certainly does not mean that we should censor or prohibit their display in public places.

There seems to be some confusion about what the Constitution requires with respect to the display of items or documents with some religious significance. The first amendment, contrary to what some people believe, does not require us to drive every such document or symbol from the public square.

As Justice Rehnquist has stated, "The Establishment Clause does not require that the public sector be insulated from all things which may have a religious significance or origin."

The U.S. Supreme Court has never ruled directly on the constitutionality of displaying the Ten Commandments in the courtroom. Only one lower Federal court has addressed this issue. In that case, Harvey versus Cobb County, a Federal district court judge ruled a copy of the Ten Commandments could not lawfully be displayed in the Cobb County courthouse unless the Commandments were part of a larger display that included other documents of historical and educational significance.

The Ten Commandments, held by Moses the Lawgiver, are found in the chamber of the U.S. Supreme Court. Moses is one of the 23 marble relief portraits of the lawgivers displayed over the gallery doors of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if you will look back at the back of the Chamber, you will see Moses displayed prominently looking down over this Chamber. There are several other religious symbols and items on the Capitol grounds which time does not permit me to name. In addition, we begin our daily business in this Chamber, as we did today, with prayer, either by a chaplain paid for by the House or by an invited member of the clergy.

In conclusion, let me say the Constitution does not require and the people of this Nation do not desire Government officials to strip all documents of historical significance which enshrine standards of morality from public view simply because they have a religious basis or origin. I urge the passage of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, our religious freedom is the foundation of our free society. This country was established on the high ideals of allowing everyone to practice the religion of their choice without interference of government. This resolution, unfortunately, represents a retreat from that very principle that has made us a great and tolerant Nation.

□ 1415

This case we address today involves a judge whose refusal to obey a court

order is being reviewed by an Alabama Supreme Court. This is not a matter on which we have jurisdiction. The rulings to date are completely consistent with the precedents that have been long established by the courts. This case is still pending and we should not interfere with these proceedings.

If the hanging of these Ten Commandments is unconstitutional, then it really does not matter what we think. We should abide with the law. If they are constitutional, then let the process go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the important factors is that one's religious beliefs should not be a factor in whether or not one will receive justice in America's courts. This is the issue presented by this amendment. It is not about the Ten Commandments or one's feelings about the Ten Commandments. It is about a courtroom remaining a fair place for all religions. The courtroom loses its neutrality when it endorses a specific religious doctrine. Despite my own beliefs in favor of the Ten Commandments, I do not believe that my personal views should be forced on others seeking the objective forum of a court of law.

The first amendment reads in part, therefore, that Congress should make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. The posting of the Ten Commandments in the courtroom is an intentional governmental establishment of religion. The courts have already spoken on this issue.

In Stone versus Grahm, the Supreme Court struck down a Kentucky law requiring the posting of the Ten Commandments in public schools. At least one Federal court has already decided that the posting of the Ten Commandments in a courtroom is unconstitutional, and there is no precedent to suggest that this resolution could possibly be constitutional.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT], the sponsor of this resolution.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution [Mr. CANADY] for his support of this resolution, as well as the numerous friends and colleagues who have approached me in support of Judge Moore in Gadsden, AL.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution guarantees freedom of religion. This resolution does not endorse any one religion but, rather, states that a religious symbol which has deep-rooted significance for our Nation and its history should not be excluded from the public square.

When Alexis de Tocqueville came to the United States in 1831 to study how our democracy was working, he was

struck by how religious America was. He was impressed that a system of government that allowed such freedom was able to maintain order.

The Founders wisely realized that in a free society, it is imperative that individuals practice forbearance, respect, and temperance. These are the very values taught by all the world's major religions. The Founders devised a Constitution that depended on religion serving as a civilizing force in societal life. John Adams, our second President, and one of the intellectual forces behind the formation of our Nation, said that "our Constitution was designed for a moral and religious people only. It is wholly inadequate to any other."

But strangely today, there are those who seem determined to drive all trace of religion from the public sphere. They ignore the religious traditions on which this great Nation was founded and work to drive religion and religious people out of public life.

Many of my colleagues are aware Judge Roy Moore, a circuit court judge in Gadsden, AL, which is located in my district, has been ordered to take down a two-plaque replica of the Ten Commandments displayed in his courtroom. This case is currently pending before the Alabama Supreme Court.

Many of my colleagues have noted before that this House Chamber contains the face of Moses and the words "in God we trust" above the Speaker's chair. Each day we open with prayer in this great body, as was done a few minutes ago, and yet a small courtroom in Gadsden, AL, cannot hang a simple display of the Ten Commandments on the wall without running the risk of a lawsuit.

Yet this resolution today is not just about Judge Moore and it is not just about the display of the Ten Commandments in Gadsden, AL. It is about our national heritage and the role that religion has historically played in our national life. Our Nation was founded on Judeo-Christian principles.

The migration westward across the Atlantic, which began in the early 17th century, was due primarily to religious conviction. One of the most notable examples of this was Roger Williams. Roger Williams was the one who first used the phrase "wall of separation" in reference to religious liberty. He argued that the reason there needed to be a separation between the church and State was to protect the church, not the State. It is no small irony that the father of our religious liberty is about to be removed from the Capitol rotunda.

The phrase "wall of separation" was also used by Thomas Jefferson in his letter to the Danbury Baptist Association. In this letter Thomas Jefferson argued that the goal of this "wall of separation" was to protect religious liberty, not to protect the workings of government from the influences of religion.

The Ten Commandments represent the very cornerstone of western civili-

zation and the basis of our legal system here in America. To exclude a display of the Ten Commandments because it suggests an establishment of religion is not consistent with our Nation's heritage, let alone common sense itself. This Nation was founded on religious traditions that are an integral part of the fabric of American cultural, political, and societal life.

How can we promote integrity in our leaders and improve the moral fiber of our people without a basis in some absolute standard?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult resolution. I have had long, long feelings that political figures should not use religion for political gain, and it bothers me when I see something come to the floor, with no committee hearings by either Judiciary, on which I do not serve, or on Transportation and Infrastructure, on which I do serve.

If someone wants to have the Ten Commandments in their government office and there is no interaction with the public, that is certainly a right they can have under the first amendment.

And Moses, of course, begins the lawgivers of history over our center door. He is the first one I point to when constituents are brought into the House Chamber by me. And he was a great lawgiver.

But the Constitution, I think, is very clear. We have an article III judiciary that is independent of the legislative and the executive branches. And the judiciary is independent with good reason. And yet here we are intervening, or attempting to intervene, despite all of the protestations I will hear, we are intervening in a State court case which has not even reached the Federal courts, and it has certainly not been reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, the Chief Justice is not simply Chief Justice presiding over the Supreme Court. The Constitution designates him as Chief Justice of the United States. He heads the article III judiciary which is an independent branch of government.

When you have this resolution include courthouses, you make a major mistake. You tread on the article III judiciary. If you are in Detroit, where there are many Arabic citizens or in Long Beach where there are many Cambodian citizens, and you are in a court case, and you walk into the courtroom, where you are involved in a case, and you see—under this resolution—the Jewish and Christian code on the wall, you might ask "Where is the Islamic—or the Confucian—or the Buddhist—code of morality?"

Mr. Speaker, there are many great religions in this world, Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Judaism,

and Islam. We have all studied them, many of us in this Chamber, and it is wrong to single out two religions and carve what they believe on the walls.

Mr. Speaker, those are wonderful moral precepts. I would hope that most of us in this Chamber follow them, and I certainly follow them myself. On the other hand, I do not think it is the role of the Congress under article I to tell the article III judiciary what your courtroom should look like. That courtroom ought to be a place of neutrality, where the issues can be fought out without any prejudgments having been made. And my feeling about this resolution suddenly coming to the floor, popping out of nowhere—as if Peter Pan was floating around the Chamber dropping resolutions here and there to be acted upon. Such a procedure violates every tradition of this House in terms of reference to committee, careful consideration and thinking through the implications of an action before we simply use religion to advance political careers.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], a valued member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from my neighboring State of Alabama for having the courage and the backbone to introduce this resolution in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, today, March 4, is the anniversary of the first day that the Constitution of the United States of America went into effect in 1789, and it is, therefore, I believe, Mr. Speaker, an especially appropriate day, though any day is an appropriate day, to stand up for freedom of religion and to stand up for an exposition of the rule of law in our society, but this is an especially important and significant day to do that.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps if Judge Moore had in addition to the Ten Commandments a directive on that wall that everybody that comes in must bow down and pay homage or fealty to those, that might be different. There is nothing mandatory and this Congress certainly knows an awful lot about mandatory, the mandated this, that and the other things that we have passed over the years, unfunded mandates. What Judge Moore is doing is no more mandatory than any one of us standing up here as I stand here today and say in God we trust, and in God we do trust. And I do not think that the vast majority of Americans think there is anything whatsoever wrong in having their elected representatives believe and trust in God.

Thank goodness, I suppose, in light of the arguments on the other side that Judge Moore did not have the audacity to include the Declaration of Independence on his wall. Maybe he did, and maybe they will now object to that, because in the Declaration of Independence itself, we find references to God,

and a creator, with a capital C and with a capital G.

There is nothing mandatory in terms of forcing religion in this document than there is in those Ten Commandments hanging on the wall which speak so eloquently about the rule of law that would make it unconstitutional in any way, shape or form. Indeed, what could be unconstitutional is the efforts made to take it down as an abridgment of the constitutional right to freedom of speech in this country.

I say to Judge Moore: Carry on, Judge. Carry on as we will do here in this Chamber despite the constant efforts by the other side to demoralize, deemphasize this society, and stand here proudly and say in God we trust and, Judge Moore, we are glad that in God you trust, and I certainly hope that more of the defendants that appear in your courtroom also hear that message because they will leave that courtroom then better citizens than when they came in, and that is indeed something that all of us here should be applauding, not denigrating.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know some have wondered why the pace of the House has been so slow this year. Here we are in March and we have not done any serious legislating, and I guess people who have been worried about that can now take heart. We are indeed legislating. We are in a congratulatory legislative mode. This week we will be congratulating Guatemala, Nicaragua, Warren Christopher, and Moses.

□ 1430

What we do I think is get 3 out of 4 right, because as the gentleman from California who preceded me noted, what we have here is an effort to enlist religion into a political battle. No one thinks that this resolution will have any influence on the outcome of a court case. Indeed, we would hope it would not. There is going to be a judicial proceeding.

How often does Congress take sides by resolution in a pending court case? The answer, fortunately, is not very often. It does it apparently when we have people in control of the House of Representatives who are lacking a legislative agenda, who are unhappy about a vacuum, and therefore put this into it, as has been noted by my colleague from California, without any hearing, without any chance to amend it.

For instance, some people might want to vote for this, for all but section 2. Some people might, feeling the need, want to talk about what a wonderful thing the Ten Commandments is, or are, I am not sure of the grammar, but why do we have to vote without a chance to amend on section 2? Section 2 is relevant.

The notion that this is freedom of religion seems to me wholly without any intellectual respectability. We are

talking here about a sitting judge presiding in a courtroom into which people are brought, one assumes sometimes against their will. His freedom of religion as a citizen is not at issue here. His freedom of religion in his home and any private premises he maintains to put whatever he wants up is untrammelled. His freedom to speak as he wishes as a citizen is untrammelled.

The question is, Do you bring people into a courtroom who have to be there and say to them officially, we feature this religious statement, because it is there as a religious statement. Indeed, in defending this religious statement by the judge some of the people on the other side would trivialize it. He is not putting the Ten Commandments up there as an interesting historical factor. He, I believe, himself has acknowledged it is up there as an expression of the importance of religion. It is not just religion in general, which in itself I believe would be unconstitutional, but it refers to specific religions, Judaism and Christianity, which support the Ten Commandments. And it is not simply the principles of, that would not be objectionable, it is that specific religious expression.

It is simply inappropriate constitutionally in this country to tell people that the price of justice in Alabama or anywhere else is to be acknowledging the superiority of 2 religions over others. People have said, well, you know, the separation of church and state was to protect religion, not government. That is right, and what you do not understand is how you undermine religion. What you are saying is that the Ten Commandments are not in themselves strong enough to command respect. Religion cannot propagate them sufficiently. We have to take a sitting judge, with all of the powers of a sitting judge and all of the authority vested in that judge and allow that judge to be the medium of educating people about the Ten Commandments while he is doing his judicial duty.

That is a denigration of religion. That is an assumption that religion cannot make it on its own, and it is an inappropriate assumption and it violates the constitutional right of people to say I do not believe in the Ten Commandments or I believe in 8 commandments or 13 commandments. We are clearly here for political purposes seeking the capturing of the Ten Commandments, not to inculcate respect for them but to deal with a political problem.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Aderholt resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the display of the Ten Commandments. James Madison once declared,

We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but on the capacity for each of

us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, and to sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.

Thomas Jefferson said,

I consider ethics as well as religion as supplements to the law and the government of man. Clearly our Constitution and the Bill of Rights are built on the foundations of ethics and morality found in the Ten Commandments.

Jefferson's concepts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness found in the Declaration of Independence also have roots in the principles put forth by the Ten Commandments. It is unreasonable for anyone to contend that our forefathers did not use the Commandments and God's word as the models in which to pattern a new nation, a nation based on the protection of individual liberties.

Yet today, there are those who under the cloak of separation of church and state argue that the public display of our Ten Commandments in government offices, courthouses, schoolhouses, is a threat to those liberties.

In my own State of Alabama there are efforts to prevent Judge Roy Moore from hanging the Ten Commandments in his courtroom. The Constitution's main purpose is to preserve everyone's inalienable right to worship as they see fit. Public servants like Judge Moore do not wish to promote any particular religious beliefs by displaying the Ten Commandments; instead, they only wish to post a reminder of what our society generally agrees is right or what is wrong. The display of the Ten Commandments is a poignant reminder.

As elected officials, we have a responsibility to take a stand. We must protect and preserve the principles that form the foundations of our society and our Nation. I believe that the Ten Commandments should be allowed to hang in our public buildings as a reminder of the fundamental principles of our Nation.

The Commandments remind us that the Constitution was created to protect the weak from the strong, not to promote the tyranny of the strong. They remind us that we all have a moral obligation to respect the rights of others.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my friend and colleague, Congressman ADERHOLT, to preserve the moral and ethical foundations of this great country. Please support the passage of this very important resolution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Virginia for yielding me this time to debate this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I had the fortune of being born and reared in a house that adjoined the churchyard of the Mount Olive Presbyterian Church in Charlotte, NC, the church that I happen to be still a member of, and grew up with a full understanding of what the Ten Commandments said and trying to honor those Commandments.

Imagine the surprise yesterday when I received a phone call and had a message waiting for me when I arrived in Washington saying that somebody wanted to talk to me about a resolution that was coming to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in support of the Ten Commandments. I thought surely this must be a mistake. I thought the Ten Commandments were to be supported or not supported in a religious context, not in the Halls of the Congress of the United States.

Imagine my surprise this morning when I pulled out this and found it to be the calendar for the day. One item. No business yesterday on the floor of the House, no business today with the exception of one item; no business tomorrow with the exception of 3 congratulatory bills, congratulating people for something; no business the next day in the House. I thought maybe this is April Fool's that we are doing on the American people this week, but this is not April.

I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Until I got the call yesterday from a constituent saying there is something coming on the floor of the House about the Ten Commandments, we had seen no sight of this resolution, no debate in the Committee on the Judiciary, no debate in any committee.

I guess I should not be surprised, however, because I got the statistics last week that showed that we are only up to 25 bills on the floor of the House this session as compared to 175 or thereabouts at this time of the session 2 years ago. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves for parading this resolution out here as if it was some kind of serious business.

This is not about whether you support freedom of religion or not. If you support freedom of religion, then you would really be supporting the right of every American citizen to either be religious or not be religious, support one religion or the other; you would not be bringing a resolution here supporting just one form of religion.

There are people in our country who have no allegiance to the Ten Commandments. And yet, here we are, all of the issues that we have as a country pressing upon us, debating whether we ought to support the Ten Commandments or not. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves, and we ought to vote this resolution down. It should never have been here in the first place.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this joint resolution. In 1644 a Scotsman named Samuel Rutherford penned a work entitled "Lex, Rex" or "The Law and the Prince." This book made quite a stir, for it challenged the divine right of kings; that is, it challenged the notion that the law was whatever the king said it was.

Mr. Speaker, Rutherford saw a basic truth: Government not predicated upon an absolute is hardly a government at all. This greatly impressed the Founders of our Nation.

Like it or not, the historical fact of the matter is that the absolutes upon which most of the law of this country is derived, everything from the right to own property to the criminal codes, are rooted in the Bible.

More specifically, much of the law can be traced to that ancient moral code we call the Ten Commandments. Thank God that the Founders understood the source of law.

I cringe that a misguided judge could so construe the Constitution as to call for the removal of the Ten Commandments from the courthouse wall. I urge a yes vote on this resolution.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this important issue up. I have to tell my colleagues, it is humorous watching people doing historical cartwheels, trying to rewrite history as radical revisionists have been doing for the past 30 years, trying to tell us that the Ten Commandments is some political gimmick. Well, if it is, it is a political gimmick that the Father of our Constitution also employed.

James Madison, in drafting the Constitution, which radicals now claim to be trying to protect, said,

We have staked the future of the American civilization not on the power of government, but on the capacity of Americans to abide by the Ten Commandments of God.

The Father of our Country, George Washington, also talked about how this country could not be governed without God and the Ten Commandments and the Bible.

Now, if the revisionists do not like that, that is fine, but please, do not insult Americans' intelligence, please do not try to do a verbal burning of our American history books. Let us talk about the simple facts.

□ 1445

Maybe that is why the Supreme Court of the United States has two copies of the Ten Commandments on the wall, while we have In God We Trust and Moses on this wall. Let us get real.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a copy of the Ten Commandments that I think will enhance our ability to conduct this debate in a civil manner.

The debate today is over how far the hand of government will stretch to remove religious symbols from the public square. Will our courts and Federal Government continue the battle to remove all religious symbols from the public square? Are the Ten Commandments so offensive that they call us not to murder, not to steal, not to commit

adultery and to be truthful that we must remove them?

They also call us to remember that we are accountable to someone other than ourselves, they call us to live lives of civility and respect to others. Is it so offensive to let people see the Ten Commandments? Let us support the resolution and the right of Judge Moore to hang the Ten Commandments in his courtroom. He should have the same rights as the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the Ten Commandments:

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

[From Exodus 20:1-17]

And God spoke all these words:

"I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery.

"You shall have no other gods before me.

"You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing love to a thousand generations of those who love me and keep my commandments.

"You shall not misuse the name of the Lord your God, for the Lord will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.

"Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your animals, nor the alien within your gates. For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.

"Honor your father and your mother, so that you may live long in the land the Lord your God is giving you.

"You shall not murder.

"You shall not commit adultery.

"You shall not steal.

"You shall not give false testimony against your neighbor.

"You shall not covet your neighbor's house. You shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his manservant or maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbor."

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

Mr. Speaker, anyone thinking that a vote for this resolution represents a show of their own support for the virtues of the Ten Commandments should take pause. This actually demeans Christianity rather than upholds it.

Benjamin Franklin once wrote, "When religion is good, I conceive that it will support itself; and, when it cannot support itself, and God does not take care to support it, so that its professors are obliged to call for the help of the civil power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one."

Mr. Speaker, Christians do not need the courts to endorse or legitimize our religion, and asking for support from a court for endorsement is self-defeating.

Mr. Speaker, when the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom was passed,

Thomas Jefferson wrote to James Madison the following: "It is comfortable to see the standard of reason at length erected, after so many ages during which the human mind has been held in vassalage by kings, priests, and nobles; and it is honorable for us to have produced the first legislature who has had the courage to declare that the reason of man may be trusted with the formation of his own opinions."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes to us without warning, without hearings, without deliberation. It has come without an explanation of why it is so urgent that, if it is constitutional, the process will work its will. If it is not constitutional, it does not matter what we think. In either case, I do not think we should position ourselves with a judge for whom a court has ruled he is breaking the law and a judge who has proclaimed that we will ignore the very law he is supposed to uphold.

Mr. Speaker, we have other things that we should be doing, juvenile justice, education, health care, employment, the budget. We should be attending to those rather than this resolution that comes, as I said, without warning, without hearings, and without deliberation.

Mr. Speaker, we should, therefore, defeat this resolution.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have here a dollar bill that says "In God we trust." Behind the Speaker it says "In God we trust." This finite example, these examples provide tangible proof of the traditional cooperation of church and state.

I say to the folks on this side, the Ten Commandments hang currently on the wall of the U.S. Supreme Court in a frieze. In fact the very chamber in which oral arguments on this case were heard is decorated with a notable and permanent, not seasonal, symbol of religion, Moses with the Ten Commandments.

In order to preserve the religious principles on which our Nation was founded, let us demonstrate today to the Nation our belief that the Ten Commandments are a cornerstone of a fair and just society.

Mr. Speaker, John Knox, the Scottish religious reformer, once wrote: "a man with God is always in the majority." We are a Judeo-Christian society. It is time we rose in support of it. Judge Roy Moore's courtroom illustrates his commitment to the tenets of the Ten Commandments. I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's founding principles and individual liberty by passing this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to rise fol-

lowing a statement that calls upon Judeo-Christian tenets and our belief in the first amendment that clearly articulates our belief in the right to freedom of religion and certainly freedom of speech.

Even as I rushed to the floor of the House because I thought this deliberation was so key, I was admonished that we begin our sessions with prayer. And, yes, we do. And so it is important that we provide comfort to those who want to participate in religious activities and we do. I believe in the Ten Commandments. But we gave an option to the honorable judge in Alabama and that was that he could have the Ten Commandments along with other artifacts that would indicate the broadness and depth of his responsibility as a jurist.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution is wrong. We have not had a hearing. It begs the question of freedom of religion. We have freedom of religion, but the negative part of this particular resolution is it has a matter on the floor of the House that has no place here. We have the right to have freedom of religion across this Nation, but those who would come into that courtroom also have the right to be acknowledged and recognized in their difference in beliefs, their difference in interpretation of the Ten Commandments, their belief or nonbelief in the Ten Commandments. That is the freedom that we seek here by opposing this resolution, the freedom to be able to believe as one would want to believe, the freedom to be able to acknowledge that we believe. I believe in the Ten Commandments, but that in the place of government, we here in the United States Congress should not be on one side versus another. We should be promoting the right to freedom of religion and freedom of expression of those who might oppose the display of the Ten Commandments as it is presently exposed.

I would simply say that our right here is to oppose the resolution, to support the first amendment and to support freedom of religion.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Throughout this debate, I have been struck by the fact that inscribed over the Speaker are the words "In God we trust." All of the arguments that are being made that the Ten Commandments should not be displayed in a courtroom are equally applicable to the display of the motto "In God we trust" here in this Chamber.

Does in God we trust here mean that we are denying people religious freedom? Does it mean that the people who come into the Chamber to watch our proceedings are somehow discriminated against if they do not believe in God? Does it mean that we are threatening the Constitution? Does it mean we are undermining the Constitution or undermining religious freedom? No. It does not.

And I would like to ask any of the Members who are opposed to this reso-

lution to state whether they wish to have these words effaced from the wall here. If they do, then maybe they would be consistent.

But if they are not willing to say that, then I think they should not oppose this resolution because displaying the Ten Commandments in a courtroom does nothing more to establish a particular religion or religion in general in this country than the display of these words on the walls of this Chamber.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to make a very brief comment in closing.

We have to look at the context in this particular case, in this particular courtroom. The context, as in the order against the judge, indicated that if he had a display similar to the one in the Supreme Court that had the Ten Commandments in the context of historical perspective where it is not specifically singled out, not endorsed, then it would be okay. The court in this case was given that option and denied it because he said that he wants to make a religious statement.

The context is such that one would doubt whether or not they would have a fair trial if they do not believe in that particular religion.

I do not think anyone thinks that their legislation may be in jeopardy based on their religious beliefs based on the statement right above your head, Mr. Speaker. They are free to state their beliefs and their position on legislation or the outcome of their legislation is not jeopardized by virtue of those beliefs.

I think it is reasonable to assume if you did not believe what the judge did, after he has stated a prayer, as he has, and the one religion singled out for display, I think you could reasonably assume that the outcome of your case may be jeopardized if you do not enjoy that same religion. It is the context in which these Ten Commandments are presented that creates the problem.

The court has been ruled out of order. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we should vote against this resolution.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say that this resolution does not State that the Ten Commandments must be displayed in government buildings. It does not force anyone to believe in God, nor does it force anyone to obey the Ten Commandments. It merely reaffirms the importance of a vital religious symbol in American societal life.

As a nation we could do worse than to affirm these principles, that these principles have a place in our society and in our legal system.

Families in Oklahoma would still be whole if the perpetrators of the bombing had followed the command "thou

shalt not kill." The streets of Los Angeles would have been peaceful last Friday if two men had followed the command "thou shalt not steal."

Ronald Reagan said it best when he stated that billions of laws have been enacted throughout history and none of them have improved on the Ten Commandments one bit.

Although this measure is a sense of Congress and it is not legally binding, I strongly believe that this resolution is an important symbolic gesture.

I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 31.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 31).

The question was taken.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 31, the resolution supporting public display of the Ten Commandments.

Mr. Chairman, some complain that displaying the Ten Commandments constitutes the establishment of religion.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Ten Commandments actually constitute the establishment of law.

The Ten Commandments are one of the earliest examples of written law that society must have to survive.

Acknowledging that the rights of people and the responsibility to establish laws protecting those rights come not from government but from the Creator only acknowledges the truth.

Acknowledging that our system of law is deeply rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition only acknowledges the truth.

The truth, Mr. Chairman, is that the Ten Commandments establish the very principles of a fair and just society.

Alabama Governor Fob James should be commended for taking whatever steps are necessary to resist the judicial tyranny which would force the removal of the Ten Commandments from Judge Roy Moore's courtroom.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass this resolution. If we as a nation are to continue to prosper, it will be as a result of the providence and blessing of God and the ideals set out in each of the Commandments.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1500

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. GRANGER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MANZULLO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. GRANGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today and on March 5 and 6.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. MATSUI.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. MILLER.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. WEYGAND.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ADERHOLT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PAXON.

Ms. MOLINARI.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. GILMAN, in two instances.

Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. MCKEON.

Mr. CRAPO.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 499. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service under construction at 7411 Barlite Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas, as the "Frank M. Tejada Post Office Building".

H.R. 668. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the Airport and Airway Trust Fund excise taxes, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On February 27, 1997:

H.R. 499. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service under construction at 7411 Barlite Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas, as the "Frank M. Tejada Post Office Building".

H.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution approving the Presidential finding that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 5, 1997, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2028. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Thiazopyr: Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-300455; FRL-5591-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 27, 1997,