

can read. When I read literally the words of the Constitution, I believe what our Founding Fathers were trying to do is to make sure we don't establish in this country a church that somehow is sanctioned by the Government. They just didn't want to go there. Seeing what happened in some other countries, they didn't want to have any part of that.

Having said that, our Founding Fathers were a religious people. They were people of faith, and they drew on their faith, frankly, in drawing up this document and trying to resolve their differences in reaching the core on this Constitution.

The Pledge of Allegiance, I don't believe, existed when those folks were working on the Constitution. In fact, the words "under God" were only added, I believe, in 1954, some 51 years ago. I would ask, given the reliance on faith and people calling on their faith in 1787 when drafting the Constitution, how would they feel about a Pledge of Allegiance that said, "one nation under God"? My guess is they would feel pretty good about it. Rather than saying that we ought to strike that language "under God," they would probably say we ought to keep that in, and I would have to agree with them.

We will hear more about this issue going forward, I am sure. Hopefully, when we do, we will think back not just about the Constitution and what the words actually say in the first amendment, but we will also think back to the way people comported themselves and how they drew on their faith in 1787 as they wrestled with drafting this document and coming to consensus on this document. I think they would want the words "one nation, under God" to be in the Pledge of Allegiance if we were to have one.

We have all said it hundreds, probably thousands, of times. I think we got it right in 1954, and I think we ought to leave it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The Senator from South Carolina.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Delaware speaking about our Constitution and religious freedoms because I would like to follow up on his remarks. This week, Americans watching the confirmation hearings of Judge John Roberts witnessed something unique about his character, something we had seen before but that is now undeniable—his humility. I believe humility is a virtue that we should all feel as Americans. We should be humble in light of the blessings that we have in this great country, humble in light of the courage of our Founders, and humble in light of the wisdom of the drafters of the Constitution.

This country was founded on religious freedom by our Founding Fathers, many of whom were deeply reli-

gious. They wanted to create a place where they could worship without fear of persecution. Unfortunately, the Federal district court declared yesterday that the phrase "under God" in our Pledge of Allegiance was unconstitutional. This is deeply troublesome and is no less irrational than it would be to declare the Constitution itself unconstitutional.

The ruling by the Federal court in California is yet another example of the hostility by many activist judges toward a time-honored tradition. This tradition has been defended by numerous Justices, including Justice O'Connor, who said that eliminating such references would sever ties to a history that sustains this Nation even today.

The Pledge of Allegiance began in 1892 as a patriotic exercise, expressing loyalty to our Nation. It is a part of an American tapestry of time-honored and historically significant traditions that have come under attack in this country. By international standards, we are a young country. Yet we seem so quick and so willing to throw out parts of our heritage that our Founders recognized as important. "One nation under God" is no more the establishment or endorsement of religion than our national motto, "in God we trust," which is here above our door and above the Speaker's chair on the other side of the Capitol; or the phrase "God bless America," the closing words often used by the President when making public comments or speeches.

The Declaration of Independence states that our rights are inalienable for one reason, because we are endowed by our creator with these rights. All of our references to God are the ways the Government properly and constitutionally acknowledges our religious heritage.

We are a great nation, but we are also one nation under God. We are filled with people who know how fortunate we are and how different our lives could be elsewhere.

This is why it is important that we are reminded and that our children are reminded to be humble. Reciting that the United States is one nation under God is a statement of humility, a way of acknowledging that even as a world superpower, we recognize there is something bigger than we are, that our freedoms in this country come from God—not from Government. If we expel God from our public life, and if we lose humility that comes with the belief in a creator, our children and grandchildren will inherit an arrogant nation that has little hope for the future.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHURCH AND STATE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have followed with interest the remarks of the Senator from Delaware about the Founding Fathers. Like him, I am unburdened with a legal education, but like him I believe I can read the English language, and that I have spent some time studying not only the Constitution but the history behind it. In the spirit of the remarks that have been made here, I add a few comments of my own.

It is very clear to me from studying the history of the first amendment that the primary concern of the Founders was to prevent the creation of State churches in the various States. There was never any movement to have a national church, but there were movements on the part of some of the individual States to have State churches. One of the reasons for the fact that there was not a national movement was that different States were dominated by different religions.

For example, the Puritans who came to what became the State of Massachusetts came to flee persecution they found in Europe. Then once they had established their colony in Massachusetts, they proceeded to persecute those who didn't agree with them. One of them, Roger Williams, went over to found what is now the State of Rhode Island, and created in Rhode Island a bastion of religious liberty about which the Senator from Rhode Island instructed a group of us at noon today. I found his presentation to be very interesting and worthwhile.

So a national religion covering all 13 States united in the United States of America was never in the cards. But there were some who felt that individual States might adopt a State church in that particular State, in one particular State or another. The Founding Fathers in the first amendment made it clear that there must not be a State church in any of the individual States. That was the driving force behind the words in the first amendment.

There are those in today's society who read the first amendment and its prescription of freedom of religion to mean that the Government should guarantee everyone freedom from religion, that the Government should vigorously put down any reference to religion that takes place in the public square.

I think that is a misreading of the Founders' intention, and I think that particular notion is behind the recent court ruling that has given rise to the speeches we have heard here on the floor.

I want to make one other observation about this, as long as I have the floor. America is known as a religious country. As I travel abroad and deal with some of our European friends, I find many of them to be perplexed by that. Indeed, one religious commentator said to me that if you are religious in Europe, you will be treated with disdain.

Europe has now entered its post-Christian era.

That is a very interesting statement, to think that Europe went through a pre-Christian era, then a Christian era, and now it is in a post-Christian period.

When you go throughout the great cities of Europe and look at the many churches, you find that most of them have been turned into concert halls, or tourist attractions, and they are not used for religious purposes anymore.

So why is Europe turning away from religion where America remains a strongly religious nation? I am sure there are many reasons, but the one that strikes me as cogent is the fact that we have never had a State church here in America. That means religions in America have had to compete for adherence in the public square on the basis of their doctrine, on the basis of their humanity and compassion, on the basis of their attractiveness to those who might want to affiliate with them, whereas in Europe you are required by law to join a particular church in a particular country.

When the government and the church become intertwined together in that fashion, even to the point where the government provides funds for the church, that makes it unnecessary for the church to appeal to its adherents sufficiently that they will support it out of their own pocketbook, you get a corruption of both.

It was very interesting to me to travel to Russia after the Soviet Union collapsed and spend some time talking with Russian officials about this very issue. The Russian Parliament had passed an act which I believed was violative of the notion of freedom of religion and I went over to visit with them to talk to them about it.

After having visits with members of the Duma as well as members of the Yeltsin administration and their justice department, I was assured they would lean on the concept of freedom of religion and that the law would not be used in any way to persecute certain religions that had come in from outside, once the Iron Curtain was over and religions were made welcome there.

But the interesting conversation out of all of that in the context of what I am saying here came from some individuals who were talking about the role of the Russian Orthodox Church in Russian life. After the fall of the Soviet Union, the Russians were making an effort to identify themselves once again as something other than Communists, trying to figure out who they were, asking the fundamental question: What does it mean to be a Russian? Of course, the members of the Russian Orthodox Church hierarchy said being a member of the Russian Orthodox Church is important to being a Russian, but they also said we do not want to be a State church again. We have been there, and we know how debilitating it is for the church to have gov-

ernment involvement in our affairs and to have government financing our affairs.

As we have this debate over the words that go into the pledge—a debate that I think will ultimately be settled in the courts one way or the other, and if the precedent is as it has been, the words “under God” will be retained in the pledge—let us take the occasion to remember why we have such religious strength in this country. It is the fact that we have had freedom of religion, and we have had different denominations competing in the public square for their various adherents and not depending upon the Government for funding or direction, unlike many of the countries in Europe.

America is not in its post-Christian era the way Europe is, and, ironically, I think one of the reasons is because America has never had a government dictation of what that would mean, what religion ought to be. But again, even as we celebrate freedom of religion, I hope we don't go so far as to have Government dictate freedom from religion and tell us that we must in some way or other, however subtle, persecute people of faith.

I had the honor of receiving an honorary degree at one of our universities, and the commencement speaker was the Catholic bishop of the area served by that university. He made the point that he respects, and it is required by our Constitution to respect, all of those who disagree with him and have made the choice not to worship anyone. But he said, I only ask in return that they extend to me the same respect for the fact that I have chosen to worship and that they do not use Government affairs to persecute me for having chosen to believe, just as I say we must not use Government agencies to persecute those who have chosen not to believe.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I am here today to discuss a resolution, strongly disapproving of the recent decision by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California that the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional. I am hopeful that the Senate will pass this resolution later today.

The Pledge of Allegiance is a record of American values and history and the words of the Pledge still resonate in the convictions of Americans today.

For more than 50 years, the Pledge of Allegiance has included references to the flag, to our country having been established as a union “under God,” and to this country being dedicated to securing “liberty and justice for all.” The Senate believes, as recognized in a resolution passed unanimously in 2003, that the Pledge is a fully constitutional expression of patriotism.

However, some of our courts have either no respect for or understanding of these American traditions.

Several years ago—June 26, 2002—in what has become an infamous case, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San

Francisco ruled the Pledge of Allegiance to be unconstitutional when recited voluntarily because it uses the phrase “one nation under God.”

On June 14, the Supreme Court at least temporarily preserved the phrase “one nation under God,” in the Pledge of Allegiance, ruling that the plaintiff could not challenge the patriotic oath because he did not have standing in the case. This procedural ruling did not directly address whether the pledge recited by generations of American schoolchildren is constitutional. It left the Pledge vulnerable to another challenge.

Not unsurprisingly, on January 3, 2005, the same plaintiff and four others filed a second suit in the Eastern District of California challenging again the words “under God” in the Pledge.

Yesterday, the Eastern District of California refused to dismiss the case, holding instead that the Ninth Circuit's ruling in 2002—that the words “under God” were unconstitutional—was still good law. The effect of the court's ruling is that the Pledge has been deemed unconstitutional in three Sacramento-area school districts. This issue will likely be appealed to the Ninth Circuit again.

We are a nation of many faiths and beliefs. Tolerance for dissent is one of our great American values. But so is our common conviction that America is a nation that seeks the will and enjoys the protection of Divine Providence. The fact that some might disagree with that conviction is not a reason to deprive the rest of us of our right to affirm it in the Pledge.

I hope this body will join me in expressing support for the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance by passing this resolution that the Senate strongly disapproves of yesterday's decision by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

HURRICANE KATRINA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in a few hours President Bush will speak to our Nation about Hurricane Katrina, a catastrophe that has devastated the gulf coast and left all Americans deeply shaken.

For nearly a week, the entire world watched in horror as tens of thousands of American citizens trapped by the floodwaters pleaded for rescue, for food, water, and medicine. This didn't happen only in New Orleans. It happened in Slidell, in Jefferson Parish, in Pass Christian, LA, in Biloxi and Gulfport, MS, and countless other communities along the gulf coast. The devastation was so widespread.

We watched in stunned disbelief—hard to imagine that we were viewing our country, our neighbors as a great American city was turned into a toxic lake by a disaster that had been predicted for years. We saw families clinging desperately to roofs, pleading