

## THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM AND THE MEDIA REWRITING HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes this evening talking about two events that have happened in our country recently. One of them is national and the other is very local.

The national event was the decision of two of three members of the Ninth Circuit Court in San Francisco that the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag, including the words "under God," can no longer be used in our schools with those two words; that if we are going to say the Pledge of Allegiance in our schools, we have to take "under God" out.

The second event is a very local event. It is in the town of Frederick. I live just 5 miles from there on a farm. We have a little memorial park in Frederick across from the armory. We have there memorials to our soldiers in all of the wars with their individual names on these memorials. There is also in that park a replica of the Ten Commandments on the two stones. A senior student in one of our schools; interestingly, a student in one of our schools wrote asking, is it really appropriate to have the Ten Commandments in this memorial park because the park is owned by the city and the city is a part of what we call the State, and certainly, there is this big wall of separation between church and State?

Now, this has caused quite a dither in Frederick. The ACLU came out and they said, yes, that is right, the Ten Commandments should not be there. Why do we not just sell the park for \$1 to the American Legion and then the problem will go away? But if you do not do that, then we are going to sue.

Most of our institutions are, I guess all of them, are creatures of our culture. We remember from history that the Supreme Court pre-Civil War handed down the Dred Scott decision. Now, I suspect there are very few people today who believe that that was a correct decision handed down by that Court. So our courts today are creatures, at least to some extent, of our culture. These two events would have been absolutely unheard of in my childhood, that a court would say that one could not say under God in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag and that one could not have the Ten Commandments in a memorial park for our service people who fought and bled and died for this country.

Now, how did we get here? What has happened to this Nation? I can clearly remember 60 years ago. I can remember writing 1933 on my school papers, so I can easily remember 60 years.

There are three great lies about in our Nation today, and they are the re-

sult of, well, of two things. They are the result of an educational system that has, in large measure, tried to rewrite our history. These three lies are also the result of a media which has joined with our educational institutions in educating the American people to a history which really is not true. These three great lies are that our Founding Fathers were atheists and deists. Now, everybody knows what an atheist is. It is a person who does not believe there is a God. A deist believes there is a God. He believes that God created the Earth, but then God stood back and he placed in effect a number of physical laws and health laws, and there is no use praying to him, because these laws are going to determine what happens to us.

So the first great lie is that our Founding Fathers were atheists and deists. The second great lie is that they sought to establish a non-Christian Nation. They did not want God associated with this country. As a corollary to this, they sought to erect a wall of separation between church and State. They wanted to make sure that there was never, ever any discussion of religion in the State.

To understand how we got here, I think we need to put this in some context. It all started, of course, in 1776. We read that Declaration of Independence which, by the way clearly, three times, perhaps four, refers to God. I wonder if the courts will declare our Declaration of Independence unconstitutional because it has very clear references to God and our creator.

This was a very radical document. We read it without really concentrating on what it is and what it says. It said that all men are created equal. Now, we take that for granted, but that was not the society from which our forefathers came. Now, of course, unless you are a descendant of an American Indian, you are the child of an immigrant and today, our citizens come from forefathers have come from all parts of the world. But in 1776, essentially all of our Founding Fathers had come from England and the European continent. And in England and on the continent, essentially every country was ruled by a king or an emperor who incredibly claimed and was granted divine rights. What that says is that the rights came from God, divine rights, rights came from God to the king and he would then give what rights he wished to his people.

Our Declaration of Independence made a radical departure from that, because it said that all men are created equal. Then they set about the task of writing a Constitution that embodied the promise of the Declaration of Independence. It took them 11 years to do this. It was not until 1787 that the Constitution was ratified. And in that Constitution they sought to embody all of those promises made in the Declaration of Independence.

The story is told of Ben Franklin coming out at the constitutional con-

vention and being asked by a lady, Mr. Franklin, what have you given us? And his reply was, A Republic, madam, if you can keep it.

Now, I hear my colleagues and most everybody in this country talking about this great democracy that we have. Yet, when Ben Franklin was asked, What have you given us, he says, A Republic, Madam, if you can keep it, if we think back through that Pledge of Allegiance to the flag, we will note that it refers to a Republic.

Why is this important? It is important to the subject that we are discussing this evening.

I heard an interesting definition of a democracy. It was two wolves and a lamb voting on what they were going to have for lunch. And someone noted that an example of a democracy was a lynch mob, because clearly, in a lynch mob, the will of the majority is being expressed. Are we not glad, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a Republic where one respects the rule of law, regardless of what the majority would like at that moment?

Now, clearly, we can change the law against which all other laws are measured, which is the Ten Commandments, and we have done that 27 times; but this is a considered event. It takes two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate; it bypasses the President and goes directly to the State legislatures and three-fourths of them must ratify it.

Our Founding Fathers were not certain that the promise of the Declaration of Independence was, in fact, made crystal-clear in the Constitution, so before the ink was hardly dry on the Constitution, they started 12 amendments through the process of two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate, and three-fourths of the State legislatures. Ten of them made it through that process, and we know them as the Bill of Rights. If we read down through the Constitution, it is a little book that has had a big, big effect. If we read down through that, we will see that their primary aim in this Bill of Rights was to make sure that everybody understood what was implicit in the Constitution was explicit in these 10 amendments.

□ 2000

That is that they really wanted most of the rights to reside with the people. Remember, they had come from monarchies, from empires where the king or the emperor said that all the rights came to him. In the Declaration of Independence, they said that all men are created equal, and they wanted to make sure that it was very clear that essentially all of the rights remained with the people.

Now, our Founding Fathers came to this country not to get wealthy; as a matter of fact, many of them left wealth to come here. They came here for freedom. They came here to achieve freedom from two tyrannies.

One was the tyranny of the church. In England, it was the Episcopal

church; and on the continent, it was the Roman church. For both of those churches, power had been given to them by the state, so they wanted to make sure that never, ever in this new country would the state ever give power to a religion so that it could oppress the people.

I guess our Founding Fathers could be excused for some shortsightedness before they wrote the Constitution, because in old Virginia, Roman Catholics could not vote. In colonial Maryland, I understand that both Roman Catholics and Jews could not vote.

But to their great credit, when it came time to write the First Amendment, they recognized that that is really not what they came here to achieve; that they really wanted freedom of religion, which is very different, as Ronald Reagan pointed out, from freedom from religion, which is what the courts now want to achieve.

It was a Roman Catholic, Charles Carroll, for whom Carroll County is named, one of the counties in the district I represent; Carroll Creek runs through Frederick City, not far from the Ten Commandments in that little memorial park. So it was a Roman Catholic who was a major architect of the establishment clause in the First Amendment.

In the Second Amendment, they addressed their concerns of the tyranny of the state. This is a subject for another day, but let me just read it in that context: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

Abraham Lincoln understood that this was a new experiment and that it might not succeed. In his Gettysburg Address, we remember, Four score and seven years ago, and if we go back 87 years, we will come to 1776; "Four score and 7 years ago, our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and," and note, "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." He recognized what a radical departure this was from the norms of the time, and he knew that this experiment might not succeed.

He said, we are now engaged in a war "testing whether this Nation or any Nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

Then he ended that Gettysburg Address with almost a prayer: "that this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the Earth."

I am going to use four sources to refute these three lies. Again, the three lies are that our Founding Fathers were atheists and deists; that they wanted to establish a nonChristian Nation; that they wanted a wall of separation between the church and the state. To do that, I am going to let our Founding Fathers speak for themselves. I am going to quote from some court decisions. I am going to note

some actions of Congress. Then we will take a brief look at our schools. I will use a number of quotes this evening, and I would like to make two comments regarding those quotes.

The first is that not everyone will agree to the specific wording of these quotes. No one argues that these are the kinds of things that these men, these courts, that the Congress would have said or would have done; but Members may find some dispute as to the exact wording. I will tell the Members my references, and Members can talk to those on whom I depended for these quotes.

One is David Barton, who probably is the most knowledgeable person in America today on the Christian nature of our Founding Fathers. He has thousands of original documents. He conducts a fascinating tour through the Capitol building here, stopping at statue after statue and reading from original documents their quotes.

The second source for my quotes this evening is Dr. Richard Fredericks, who is the pastor of the Road to Damascus Church in Montgomery County.

The second observation I want to make about the quotes this evening is that there will be a lot of references to Christianity and Jesus Christ. I would submit that when these quotes were made, that these words were more synonymous with the words that we would use today which would probably be "God-fearing." They meant no affront to other religious persuasions who worshipped the same God.

I just want to note that there will be lots of references to Christianity and Jesus Christ, if Members would simply hear "Judeo-Christian" and "God-fearing" when these quotes are read.

Freedom is not free. It is said that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. That is just as true today as it was then. Certainly, our national freedom was very costly. Five of the 55 signers of the Declaration of Independence were captured and executed by the British; nine of them died in battlefields of the war; another dozen lost their homes, possessions, and fortunes to British occupation. Our birth as a Nation was not cheap for these men.

Let us first look at this wall of separation which our courts today talk so much about. That does not appear anywhere in our Constitution. It does not appear in the First Amendment. As a matter of fact, those three words, "separation," "church," and "state," do not appear, but they do appear in one constitution. It is the Constitution of the United Soviet Socialist Republic, the USSR.

Let me read from that Constitution. It is Article 124: "In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the USSR is separated from the state and the schools from the church."

Let me let the Founding Fathers speak for themselves now, and then Members decide whether they think they are atheist or deist.

Patrick Henry, often called the "firebrand of the American Revolution," I want to quote his words spoken in St. John's Church in Richmond on March 23 in 1775. Those words are very well known: "Give me liberty or give me death," and they are still memorized by most students. But I will challenge the Members to go to their child's school and look in their history books and see if these words are put in context.

Here is what he said, in context: "An appeal to arms and the God of hosts is all that is left us, but we shall not fight our battle alone. There is a just God that presides over the destinies of nations. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone. Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Now, those words have a whole lot different meaning when we place them in that context, and I will wager that Members will have great difficulty finding any textbook in our current schools that puts them in that context.

Benjamin Franklin is widely noted by our history books today as being a deist. Was he a deist? Let us let him speak for himself. The time was June 28, 1787. We will recognize that that is during the Constitutional Convention.

Benjamin Franklin was 81 years old. He was the Governor of Pennsylvania, and perhaps the most honored member of the Constitutional Convention. The convention was deadlocked over several issues, and one of the key issues was the balance of State and Federal rights.

When Franklin rose and reminded them of the Continental Congress in 1776, just 11 years prior, this is what he said: "In the days of our contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had our daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of superintending Providence in our favor. To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity to establish our Nation. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Do we imagine that we no longer need his assistance?" And then I love these words: "I have lived, sir, a long time. And the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that a new nation can rise without his aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing that except the Lord build a house, they labor in vain that built it. I therefore beg leave to move," and this began a precedent that we follow today; we begin every day in the House with prayer, and every day in the Senate.

This is what he asked: "I therefore beg leave to move that henceforth,

prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to any business." Thanks to Mr. Franklin, we still do this.

The following year, in a letter to the French minister of state, Franklin, speaking of our Nation, said "Whoever shall introduce into public office the principles of Christianity will change the face of the world."

And now to that second person who is very often noted as being a deist, and by the way, did Members think these are the words of a deist, these words of Benjamin Franklin; that God created a world and then let it run on its own, with just the physical laws and the biological laws that he developed guiding it?

Thomas Jefferson was a great student of Scriptures who honored Christ as his greatest teacher and mentor, but doubted his divinity. On the front of his well-worn Bible Jefferson wrote, "I am a real Christian; that is to say, a disciple of the doctrines of Jesus. I have little doubt that our country will soon be rallied to the unity of our creator, and I hope to the pure doctrine of Jesus, also."

And note his words relative to slavery. See if this sounds like a deist. "Almighty God has created men's minds free. Commerce between master and slave is despotism. I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and his justice cannot sleep forever." These are certainly not the words of a deist.

George Washington, called the Father of our Nation, listen to his heart on the Christian faith in his farewell speech September, 1796; the only President, by the way, unanimously elected by the Electoral College not once but twice, and perhaps the first ruler in 2000 years to voluntarily step down from power.

"It is impossible to govern the world without God and the Bible. Of all the dispositions and habits that lead to political prosperity, our religion and morality are the indispensable supporters. Let us with caution indulge the supposition that is the idea that morality can be maintained without religion. Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that our national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

What did Washington mean by religion? Was he a true Christian? Let me excerpt several lines from his personal prayer book: "Oh, eternal and everlasting God, direct my thoughts, words, and work. Wash away my sins in the immaculate blood of the lamb, and purge my heart by thy holy spirit. Daily frame me more and more in the likeness of thy son, Jesus Christ, that living in thy fear and dying in thy favor, I may, in thy appointed time, obtain the restoration justified onto eternal life."

In Mount Vernon, and we can go there today, just down the river, we

can see on the little crypt the benediction that George Washington asked to be put there over his grave and his wife's grave. It is John 11:25: "I am the resurrection and the life. He that believes in me shall live, even if he dies."

□ 2015

And you may wonder why as you tour through Washington and go to our monuments that you see so many references to scripture. It is because that is the milieu in which these men lived.

John Adams, our second President, also served as chairman of the American Bible Society started by our Congress, by the way. In an address to military leaders he said, "We have no government armed with the power capable of contending with human passions, unbridled by morality and true religion. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other."

John Jay, our first Supreme Court Justice, stated that when we select our national leaders and preserve our Nation, we must select Christians. This is what he said, "Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers. It is the duty as well as the privilege and interest of our Christian Nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers."

In fact, 11 of the 13 new State constitutions were also ratified in 1776. All required leaders to take an oath similar to this oath in Delaware. This is the oath in Delaware: "Everyone appointed to public office must say, I do profess faith to God, the Father, and in the Lord, Jesus Christ, his only son, and in the holy ghost and in God who is blessed forevermore. I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures, both Old and New Testaments, which are given by divine inspiration."

The time of our Nation's bicentennial in 1976, political science professors at the University of Houston began to ask some questions. Why is it that the American Constitution has been able to stand the test of time? We have the longest enduring republic in the history of the world. Why has it not gone through massive revisions? Why is it looked on as a model by dozens of nations? What wisdom possessed these men to produce such an incredible document? Who did they turn to for inspiration?

So they looked at the writings of our Founding Fathers and they catalogued 15,000 documents. They found the Founding Fathers quoted most often three men, Baron Charles Montesquieu, Sir William Blackstone, and John Locke. Yet, most importantly they found that the Bible itself was directly quoted four times more than Montesquieu, six times more than Blackstone and 12 times more than John Locke. In fact, 34 percent of all the quotes and the writings of the Founding Fathers were direct word-for-word quotes from the Bible. Further, another 60 percent of their quotes were

quoting from men who were quoting the Bible. So that an incredible 94 percent of all of the quotes in these 15,000 documents were direct quotes or references to the Bible.

So how did they produce a document that has withstood the test of an evolving government and growing Nation for 226 years now? The answer, they were steeped in the word of God. They understood their need of its constant direction, and they established a Nation based on its underlying principles.

John Quincy Adams, the son of John Adams, was the sixth President of the United States. He was a Congressman, the U.S. minister to Russia, France and Great Britain, Secretary of the State under James Monroe. He was also the chairman of the American Bible Society, as was his father. As a matter of fact, he felt that chairmanship of that society was a more important function and a higher honor than being President of the United States. I might note that the Continental Congress bought 20,000 copies of the Bible to distribute to its new citizens. And for 100 years at the beginning of our country, taxpayers' money was used to send missionaries to the Indians.

Mr. Speaker, 104 years later, the 30th President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge reaffirmed this truth on March 4, 1925. "America seeks no empires built on blood and forces. She cherishes no purpose save to merit the favor of Almighty God." He later wrote, "The foundations of our society and our government rest so much on the teachings of the Bible that it would be difficult to support them if faith and these teachings would cease to be practically universal to our country."

Let us turn now to the Supreme Court. We have let our Founding Fathers speak for themselves. I think it is very clear they were not atheists or deists. It is very clear that they did not attempt to establish a nonChristian nation. Let us look now at the Supreme Court. For 160 years the court consistently and categorically ruled in favor of church and State united hand in hand, but never the State empowering the church, a single church, so that it could oppress the people.

The first ruling came in 1796, *Runkle v. Winemiller*. The Supreme Court ruled, "By our form of government, the Christian religion is the established religion of all sects."

The Supreme Court consistently ruled for Christian principle as the foundation of our American laws. In 1811 in the *Peoples v. Ruggles*, Mr. Ruggles' crime was that he publicly slandered the Bible. What would happen today if somebody publicly slandered the Bible? Let me read the decision the court made then. In 1811 he was arrested and his case went all the way to the Supreme Court. This was their verdict. "You have attacked the Bible. In attacking the Bible, you have attacked Jesus Christ. And in attacking Jesus Christ, you have attacked the roots of our Nation. Whatever

strikes at the root of Christianity manifests itself in the dissolving of our civil government."

The Justices sentenced him to three months in prison and a \$500 fine. That is one year's wage in those days. You might contrast that today with convicted rapists who on average serve 85 days in jail.

In 1844, *Vida v. Gerrard*, a public school teacher decided she would teach morality without using the Bible. Incredibly she was sued and it went to the Supreme Court and this is what they said. "Why not use the Bible, especially the New Testament? It should be read and taught as the divine revelation in the schools. Where can the purest principles of morality be learned so clearly and so perfectly as from the New Testament?"

And then the Justices went on to cite 87 different legal precedents to affirm that America was formed as a Christian Nation by believing Christians.

This was in a court case in February 29, 1892, against the claims of the cult called the Church of the Holy Spirit that Christianity was not the faith of the people. The Supreme Court made a decision saying that it clearly was and they marshalled 87 different legal precedents to affirm that America was formed as a Christian Nation by believing Christians. They even spent the first 100 years' tax dollars for Christian missionaries, which I mentioned previously.

Regardless of how we feel about it today, the historical fact is there was no separation of church and state. There was a clear denial of the right of the state to empower any one religion so that it could oppress the people. But never, ever could our Founding Fathers ever imagine that we would interpret that establishment clause of the First Amendment as requiring freedom from religion. They certainly meant it to assure freedom of religion.

Let us move across the street from this House to the Supreme Court. As humanism and Darwinism began to rise in the 19th century, some made challenges to the idea that America was a Christian Nation. Both houses of Congress spent one year, from 1853 to 1854, studying the connection of America and the Christian faith.

In March 27 of 1854, Senator Badger, from the Senate, issued the final report. Let me quote very briefly from that final report. "The First Amendment religion clause speaks against an establishment of religion. What is meant by that expression? The Founding Fathers intended by this amendment to prohibit an establishment of religion such as the Church of England presented or anything like it. But they had no fear or jealousy of religion itself. Nor did they wish to see us an irreligious people."

I really like these next words. They are so picturesque. "They did not intend to spread all over the public authorities and the whole public action of the Nation the dead and revolting spec-

tacle of atheistic apathy." And I continue the quote, "In this age there can be no substitute for Christianity. By its general principles, the Christian faith is the great conserving element on which we must rely for the purity and permanence for our free institutions." And it goes on and on to quote more and more in this vein.

Based on his report in May of 1854, in joint session of Congress, this resolution was passed by our Congress. "The great, vital and conserving element in our system of government is the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and divine truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ." This was a resolution of the Congress in May of 1854.

Let us move from Congress to our public schools. For over 140 years after the First Amendment was passed, we spent tax dollars to educate students in public schools that were distinctly Christian. In 1782 the United States Congress voted this resolution: "The Congress of the United States recommends and approves the Holy Bible for use in our schools." That was this Congress. All of our institutions, even our Congress, is at least to some extent the product of a culture, creatures of a culture.

In grammar schools from 1690 until after World War II, two books were the dominant teaching schools. The first and oldest was the New England Primer, used for 200 years. The basics of alphabet were taught as follows:

"A, A wise son makes a glad father but a foolish son is heaviness to his mother."

"B, Better is little with the fear of the Lord than abundance apart from him."

"C, Come unto Christ all you who are weary and heavily laden."

"D, Do not the abominable thing, which I hate, sayeth the Lord."

"E, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God."

The second great teaching tool for 100 years was the McGuffey Reader, and not too many years ago it was called back to some of our schools because when students used that reader, they learned to read. Now we have graduated about a million from our high schools who literally cannot read their diploma.

William Holmes McGuffey was the Professor of Moral Philosophy at Jefferson's University of Virginia and the first president of Ohio University. President Lincoln called him the School Master of the Nation.

In the introduction to teachers in the beginning of his textbook, McGuffey laid out his rationale. "The Christian religion is the religion of our country. From it are derived our notions on the character of God, on the great moral Governor of the universe. On its doctrines are funded the peculiarities of our free institutions."

"From no source has the author drawn more conspicuously than from the sacred Scriptures. For all these extracts from the Bible I make no apology."

Of the first 108 universities founded in this country, 106 were distinctly religious. The first of those was Harvard, named for a very popular New England teacher, Pastor John Harvard. In the original student Harvard handbook, it said that the students should come knowing Greek and Latin so they could study the scriptures. Now a direct quote. "Let every student be plainly instructed and earnestly pressed to consider well, the main end of his life and studies is, to know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life, John 17:3; and therefore to lay Jesus Christ as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning."

For over 100 years, more than 50 percent of all of Harvard's graduates were pastors.

In 1747, the Supreme Court in *Emerson v. The Board of Education* deviated from every precedent for the first time and in a limited way affirmed a wall of separation between church and state and the public classroom. Now they did this ignoring 160 years of precedence. And I have read several decisions during 106 years and there are many, many others. There is no decision of the Supreme Court today relative to this issue that will go back to precedents before 1947 because there are none. For 160 years, clearly the Supreme Court ruled 180 degrees different than the way it is ruling today.

In 1962, less than 40 years ago, in *Engle v. Vitale*, the Supreme Court removed prayer from the public schools. Since the founding of the Nation, public school classrooms have begun their day with prayer. Now that was declared unconstitutional and an arbitrary use of the word.

I have mentioned God is three or perhaps four times in our Declaration of Independence. Will our courts now declare that unconstitutional?

Then things happened fast. On June 17, 1963, the Supreme Court ruled in *Abington v. Schemp* that Bible reading was outlawed as unconstitutional in our public school system. Remember that our Congress had recommended it for use in schools before that.

What has happened in America in these past 40 years? When we were true to our roots, we were the greatest Nation in the world, the dream destination of millions in every country. But starting in 1963, the Bible was banned as psychologically harmful to children.

□ 2030

That year, 1963, was the first year an entry about the separation of church and State ever appeared in the World Book Encyclopedia under the United States.

What have we reaped? America 100 years ago had the highest literacy rate of any nation on Earth. Today we spend more on education than any other nation in the world; and yet since 1987, as I mentioned before, we have graduated more than 1 million high school students who cannot even read their diploma.

We spend more than any other nation in the industrialized world to educate our children; and yet SAT scores fell for 24 straight years before finally leveling off in the 1990s.

Has this protection from religion produced better students? Morally have things changed? Are things better in this new climate of protection from the dangers of religion?

In 1960, a survey found 53 percent of America's teenagers had never kissed and 57 percent had never necked. Necking is hugging and kissing, if my colleagues wonder what that meant then; and 92 percent of teenagers in America said they were virgins.

Just 30 years later, in 1990, 75 percent of American high school students were sexually active by 18. In the next 5 years, we spent \$4 billion to educate them how to have safe sex and it worked. One in five teenagers in America today lose their virginity before their 13th birthday, and 19 percent of America's teenagers say they have had more than four sexual partners before graduation.

The result? Every day 2,700 students get pregnant, 1,100 hundred get abortions and 1,200 give birth. Every day, another 900 contract a sexually transmitted disease, many incurable. AIDS infection among high school students climbed 700 percent between 1990 and 1995. We have 3.3 million problem drinkers on our high school campuses, over half a million are alcoholics and any given weekend in America, 30 percent of the student population spends some time drunk.

A young woman in a high school in Oklahoma wrote this poem as a new school prayer. Let me read it for you: Now I sit me down in school where praying is against the rule For this great Nation under God finds mention of Him very odd. If scripture now the class recites violates, it violates the Bill of Rights. And any time my head I bow becomes a Federal matter now.

Our hair can be purple, orange, or green, that's no offense, it's a freedom scene. The law is specific, the law is precise! Only prayers spoken out loud are a serious vice. For praying in a public hall might offend someone with no faith at all.

In silence alone we must meditate, God's name is prohibited by the State. We are allowed to cuss and dress like freaks, and pierce our noses, tongues and cheeks.

They've outlawed guns but first the Bible. To quote the Good Book makes me liable.

We can elect a pregnant senior queen and the unwed daddy our senior king.

It's inappropriate to teach right from wrong; we're taught that such judgments do not belong.

We can get our condoms and birth controls, study witchcraft, vampires and totem poles.

But the Ten Commandments are not allowed, no word of God must reach this crowd.

It is scary here I must confess; when chaos reigns the school's a mess.

So Lord, this silent plea I make: Should I be shot, my soul please take!

Our Nation, which wishes to lead the world in every arena, now leads the world in these areas: We are number one in violent crime. We are number one in divorce. We are number one in teenage pregnancies. We are number one in volunteer abortion. We are number one in illegal drug abuse. We are number one in the industrialized world for illiteracy. What happened?

First of all, Christianity went to sleep. Forty years ago, the church gave up the public arena to an increasingly secular government and said we would focus on the souls of men. Actually, the first leader to call for that division was not one of our Founding Fathers. His name was Adolph Hitler, who told the preachers of Germany, "You take care of their souls and I will take care of the rest of their lives."

Here is a million dollar question. Are we better off today? Since we banished God from all our public life and systems and allowed a vocal group of humanist activists to tell us our faith is dangerous to the liberties of this Nation, are we better off? Are we satisfied with what is happening in America?

Alexis de Tocqueville was a famous French statesman and scholar. Beginning in 1831, he toured America for years to find the secret of her genius and strength which was marveled at throughout the world. He published a two-part book entitled "Democracy in America," which is still hailed as the most penetrating analysis of the relationship of character to democracy ever written.

Here is how de Tocqueville summed up his experience: "In the United States, the influence of religion is not confined to the manners, but shapes the intelligence of the people. Christianity therefore reigns without obstacle, by universal consequence. The consequence is, as I have before observed, that every principle in a moral world is fixed and in force."

"I sought for the key to the greatness and genius of America in her great harbors; her fertile fields and boundless forests; in her rich mines and vast world commerce; in her universal public school system and institutions of learning. I sought for it in her democratic Congress and in her matchless Constitution."

"But not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because America is good; and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great!"

Let me close by suggesting the answer offered by President Abraham Lincoln in the address he gave calling for April 30, 1860, seeking a national day of humiliation, fasting and prayer.

"We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven. We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and powers as no other Nation has ever grown.

"But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious Hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own.

"Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving Grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us! It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

That was Abraham Lincoln.

Today, we have an entire population that has no clue as to its true American heritage. They have not forgotten. They never knew.

Our textbooks have been bled dry of all of this aspect of the founding of our Nation. Abraham Lincoln said this to our Nation. We need to hear it again, and this also comes from his Gettysburg address.

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

The three great lies are our Founding Fathers were atheists and deists. We let them speak for themselves. They clearly were not.

The second is that they sought to establish a non-Christian Nation. We let them speak. We let the courts speak. We let the Congress speak. We listened to what was said in our schools. Clearly, this was not the case.

That wall of separation never intended that religion should not be in government. It was intended that government should not empower any religion so that it could oppress the people.

What do we do now that our textbooks have been bled dry, that so few, even those in leadership positions, understand the true beginnings of our Nation? What we need to do is to make sure that all of our people, especially our leaders, become familiar with the milieu in which our Nation was born. We need to symbolically shout it from the housetop so that none can refuse to hear it.

The two events that I started this little discussion with, the Ninth Court ruling in San Francisco and the question of whether the Ten Commandments should be taken down from Memorial Park in Frederick, these two things would have been unthinkable in the Nation that I grew up in. I can remember very well 60 years ago, and they should be unthinkable today, and since all of the institutions of our country are at least to some extent creatures of our culture, before we

change our institutions, we need to change our culture. Mr. Speaker, every one of us has a responsibility and an obligation and the privilege to do that.

#### MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend the time this evening talking about the need for a Medicare prescription drug program and also highlight the fact that more and more of my constituents, and I know this is true all over the country, are concerned about the price of prescription drugs and their inability to buy the medicine or prescription drugs that they feel that is necessary.

I have been to the floor, to the well here many times over the last 2 years, basically saying that we need on the one hand a benefit, a Federal benefit under Medicare to provide prescription drug funding for seniors through Medicare, through the Federal Government and through the Medicare program. But at the same time I have said that we need the coverage that would come from a Federal benefit, we also need to deal with the issue of price because prices continue to go up.

I know that many times during the debate that we had a few weeks ago over prescription drugs, when the Republican leadership would talk about their initiative, their bill that ultimately passed the House, and compare it with the Democratic proposal, which they did not allow to come to the floor, that there had been a hot and heated discussion about the differences between the two bills.

Of course, I have been very critical of the Republican proposal because it is not Medicare. It does not provide a guaranteed benefit, and it does not address the issue of price; and essentially, what the Republicans did when they passed a prescription drug bill a few weeks ago is that they decided to give some money to private insurance companies to essentially subsidize private insurance companies in the hope that they would offer drug-only or medicine-only policies to seniors that the seniors would find affordable.

My major concern over the Republican proposal is that like HMOs, which are private health insurance, that these private insurance companies simply would not offer a prescription drug plan, that there would be many areas in the country where there would be no coverage or even if there was a private insurer that decided to provide a prescription drug-only policy, that it would not be affordable and that essentially we would be passing a program that would never work and no one would be able to take advantage of as a senior citizen, or at least the average senior citizen.

I contrasted that and I continue to with the Democratic proposal, which, as I said, the Republicans never allowed us to bring up; but the Democratic proposal was simply an expansion of Medicare. We have a great Medicare program that almost all seniors participate in, covers their hospitalization, covers their doctors' bills. And what the Democrats said is we would simply add another plank, or provision, to Medicare so that seniors could pay \$25 a month in a premium. After the \$100 deductible, would get 80 percent of their prescription drug costs paid for by the Federal Government under Medicare, and after \$2,000 out-of-pocket expenditures for these seniors with higher drug bills 100 percent of the costs would be paid for by the Federal Government under Medicare.

It is a very simple process, expansion of Medicare. The price issue was addressed by the Democrats, unlike the Republicans, because the Democrats said that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who basically administers the Medicare program now, would have the bargaining power of 30 to 40 million American seniors under Medicare, and he would be mandated by the Democratic bill to negotiate to reduce prices substantially, maybe 30, 40 percent.

So we had a price provision in there, too. The Republican bill, of course, could not do that kind of negotiation essentially with the Republican bill because it is with private insurance companies. It is not Medicare, and all the seniors would not be covered; but just in case there was some concern about trying to reduce price, the Republican bill specifically had a noninterference clause that said that the administrator of the program could not set up a price stricture or negotiate lower prices.

So we know the Republicans were not seeking to address the price issue. They wanted to make sure, in fact, that it was not addressed at all.

During this whole debate, a lot of my colleagues said to me, even some constituents said to me, why would the Republicans want to put forth this sham? Why would the Republicans want to pretend that they are putting forth a prescription drug plan that no private insurance company will offer or that no senior would be able to take advantage of? And why do they not want to address the issue of price?

The answer to that is fairly simple, and that is because of the special interests, because the brand-name companies do not want a Medicare benefit. They are afraid that if there is a Medicare prescription drug benefit like the Democrat's proposal and they are afraid that if there is an effort to address price, that somehow they will lose profits. I do not believe that because I think if they cover everybody under a universal program, they will be selling more medicine and they will make more money.

□ 2045

Even if the price does come down individually for the senior, the overall fact that so many more seniors are in the program should make the drug companies happy.

But they do not feel that way. They are opposed to the Democratic proposal, and they are doing whatever they can financially to make sure that the Republican proposal passes and the Democratic proposal does not. They have been taking out ads, they have been financing a huge ad program, they have been giving a lot of money to Republican candidates, Congressmen, and Senators, but I will go into that as part of this special order this evening a little later.

What I really want to point out is that this effort on the part of these large pharmaceutical brand name companies to do this, in my opinion, is very much linked to the overall problem we have in this country that has been highlighted in the last few weeks of corporate irresponsibility. We know that many of the corporations, and I do not have to go through the list, Enron, WorldCom, there are so many out there now, that basically doctored the books at the request of certain CEOs or financial officers, used accounting systems to basically doctor the books and show that they had profits when they were actually operating at a net loss or at a lot less profit than they reported. And so nationally, and here in the Congress, in the House of Representatives, we are getting a lot of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle coming up and talking about the need for corporate responsibility; the need for companies, large corporations, to be responsible in their actions.

I would suggest to my colleagues that the effort of the prescription drug industry to mask what they are doing, to give large contributions to candidates, to run massive ad campaigns where they did not even indicate they are paying the cost of them in order to support candidates or to support the Republican bill, is another example of what I call corporate irresponsibility. They need to be held to task.

Now, I want to talk a little tonight, if I could, Mr. Speaker, about some of the things that these pharmaceutical companies have been doing to promote the Republican proposal and to oppose the Democratic alternative. As we know, the other body, this week or next, will be taking up a prescription drug bill. And since the other body is dominated by the Democrats, the proposals that are out there are Medicare prescription drug programs, very much like the House Democratic bill. So we will probably have the opportunity at some point in conference to see the House Republican version and the Democratic version from the other body. So these efforts by the pharmaceutical companies to kill the House Democratic bill will obviously extend over the next few weeks in an effort to kill the Democratic majority bill in the other House as well.