

a politician, and he is not going to advocate positions on issues to win votes.

Returning to the case at hand, I call on my colleagues to support this resolution. The Pledge of Allegiance is a unifying force in this Nation. It draws all of us, regardless of race, religion, gender, or national origin, together in support of the common good. At a time when we should be uniting to support our troops in Iraq and our neighbors in the Gulf States affected by Hurricane Katrina, it is a shame that an activist court is seeking to divide based on the principle of "I" or "me first," instead of pursuing the selfless principle of the common good. Just last Congress this body came together to support the current Pledge of Allegiance on a 94-0 vote. I hope that we will have the same bipartisan support again for this important issue, and I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 243) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 243

Whereas on June 26, 2002, a 3-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in *Newdow v. United States Congress* that the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance violate the Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution when recited voluntarily by students in public schools;

Whereas on March 4, 2003, the United States Senate passed a resolution disapproving of the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Newdow* by a vote of 94-0;

Whereas on June 14, 2004, the Supreme Court of the United States dismissed the case, citing the plaintiff's lack of standing;

Whereas on January 3, 2005, the same plaintiff and 4 other parents and their minor children filed a second suit in the Eastern District of California challenging the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas on September 14, 2005, the Eastern District of California declined to dismiss the new *Newdow* case, holding that the Ninth Circuit's earlier ruling that the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance violate the Establishment Clause was still binding precedent;

Whereas this country was founded on religious freedom by the Founding Fathers, many of whom were deeply religious;

Whereas the First Amendment to the United States Constitution embodies principles intended to guarantee freedom of religion both through the free exercise thereof and by prohibiting the Government from establishing a religion;

Whereas Congress, in 1954, added the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas Congress, in 1954, believed it was acting constitutionally when it revised the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas the Pledge of Allegiance has for more than 50 years included references to the United States 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";

Whereas the 107th Congress overwhelmingly passed a resolution disapproving of the

panel decision of the Ninth Circuit in *Newdow*, and overwhelmingly passed legislation recodifying Federal law that establishes the Pledge of Allegiance in order to demonstrate Congress's opinion that voluntarily reciting the Pledge in public schools is constitutional;

Whereas the Senate believes that the Pledge of Allegiance, as revised in 1954, as recodified in 2002, and as recognized in a resolution in 2003, is a fully constitutional expression of patriotism;

Whereas the National Motto, patriotic songs, United States legal tender, and engravings on Federal buildings also refer to "God"; and

Whereas in accordance with decisions of the United States Supreme Court, public school students are already protected from being compelled to recite the Pledge of Allegiance: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,*

SEC. 1. That the Senate authorizes and instructs the Senate Legal Counsel to continue to cooperate fully with the Attorney General in this case in order to vigorously defend the Constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance. That the Senate strongly disapproves of the September 14, 2005, decision by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California in *Newdow, et al. v. The Congress of the United States of America, et al.*

SEC. 2. That the Senate authorizes and instructs the Senate Legal Counsel to continue to cooperate fully with the Attorney General in this case in order to vigorously defend the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this resolution that we passed is a Senate resolution expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance. Because of the significance of this matter, I would like to read some paragraphs in the resolution and then the closing resolve section:

Whereas on June 26, 2002, a 3-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in *Newdow v. United States Congress* that the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance violate the Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution when recited voluntarily by students in public schools;

Whereas on March 4, 2003, the United States Senate passed a resolution disapproving of the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Newdow* by a vote of 94-0;

Whereas on June 14, 2004, the Supreme Court of the United States dismissed the case, citing plaintiff's lack of standing.

Whereas on January 3, 2005, the same plaintiff and 4 other parents and their minor children filed a second suit in the Eastern District of California to challenge the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Whereas on September 14, 2005, the Eastern District of California declined to dismiss the *Newdow* case, holding that the Ninth Circuit's earlier ruling that the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance violates the Establishment Clause was still binding precedent . . .

Mr. President, the "whereas" clauses continue.

*Resolved,* That the Senate strongly disapproves of the September 14, 2005, decision by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California in *Newdow, et al. v. The Congress of the United States of America, et al.*

SEC. 2. That the Senate authorizes and instructs the Senate Legal Counsel to continue to cooperate fully with the Attorney General in this case in order to vigorously defend the

constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance.

This is an important Senate resolution, as is the one that follows this, S. Res. 244, which we will address shortly. Every morning in the Senate, we open with that pledge to the flag of the United States of America. It is an issue on which the Senate now speaks loudly in disagreement with the most recent findings.

The second resolution related to this issue is S. Res. 244.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE  
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 244, submitted earlier today by Senator SALAZAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 244) expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to, en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 244) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 244

Whereas Congress in 1954 added the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas the Pledge of Allegiance has for more than 50 years included references to the U.S. flag, the country, to our country having been established as a union "under God" and to this country being dedicated to securing "liberty and justice for all";

Whereas the Congress in 1954 believed it was acting constitutionally when it revised the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas this Senate of the 109th Congress believes that the Pledge of Allegiance is not an unconstitutional expression of patriotism;

Whereas patriotic songs, engravings on U.S. legal tender, engravings on Federal buildings also contain general references to "God"; and

Whereas the Congress expects that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit will review on appeal the decision of the District Court. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,*

SEC. 1. That the Senate strongly disapproves of the U.S. District Court ruling in *Newdow v. the Congress of United States of America, et al.*, holding the Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional.

SEC. 2. That the Senate authorize and instructs the Senate Legal Counsel to continue to cooperate fully with the Attorney General in this case in order to vigorously defend the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance.

PELL GRANT HURRICANE AND  
DISASTER RELIEF ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3169, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3169) to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for students who are eligible for Pell Grants who are adversely affected by a natural disaster.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3169) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FRIST. Again, Mr. President, this is one of several bills we are addressing tonight that reflect the Senate's response to those who have been adversely affected by this disaster. The bill we passed was specifically related to Pell grants, giving the Secretary of Education the waiver authority for students who are eligible for Pell grants, those students who have been adversely affected.

STUDENT GRANT HURRICANE AND  
DISASTER RELIEF ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3668, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3668) to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for students who are eligible for Federal student grant assistance who are adversely affected by a major disaster.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3668) was read the third time and passed.

TANF EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND  
RECOVERY ACT OF 2005

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3672, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3672) to provide assistance to families affected by Hurricane Katrina, through the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR  
NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) RELIEF  
FOR STATES AFFECTED BY HUR-  
RICANE KATRINA

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to raise some concerns about H.R. 3672, the TANF Emergency Response and Recovery Act of 2005 passed recently by the House of Representatives.

I regret that the House Ways and Means Committee did not have the benefit of the insights of those in Louisiana responsible for administering this critical Federal program. Because if they did, I think that the bill might have been drafted very differently. I very much appreciate the leadership allowing me this opportunity to state these concerns for the record and am hoping that we can work together in the days and weeks ahead from this point on to be certain that these concerns are addressed.

Hurricane Katrina has left the Southeastern part of Louisiana in a state of emergency which, by all accounts will have significant and wide spread impact on our State and local economy. As a result, larger than expected numbers of individuals will be left without employment and in need of the services and support provided by the TANF program. It is precisely to address these circumstances, although I am not sure Members anticipated a disaster of this magnitude that compelled Congress to create a contingency fund in the 1996 Act. The purpose of the contingency fund was for States to be able to access additional funds in a time of need. But instead of availing ourselves of the funds contained in the contingency fund to carry us through this unexpected downturn, the House bill limits the use of these funds for nonrecurring, short term benefits to persons displaced by this disaster. I am afraid that this narrow definition of eligibility will stand in the way of people in need getting the support they deserve. I am pleased that the Grassley-Baucus proposal would allow Louisiana access to these funds and allow my State to direct these funds to families in need.

In addition, it should be noted that while the House bill contemplates that some families affected by Hurricane Katrina will need some short term benefit that should be considered differently from regular welfare, it does not extend eligibility for these emergency benefits to all families in the affected States. I believe that we should extend this benefit to all families in need. I am pleased to note that the Grassley-Baucus welfare proposal would extend eligibility of "Hurricane

Katrina Emergency TANF Benefits" for over a year to affected families in Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama regardless of their circumstances prior to this disaster.

I will raise my final point in the form of a question to my good friend, the Senator from Iowa, Chairman GRASSLEY. The House bill includes a provision that provides that no penalty may be imposed against any of the States of Louisiana, Mississippi or Alabama for failure to repay a loan made to a State before October 1, 2007. Given the current financial conditions, our Governor is concerned about the State's long term ability to pay a loan of this size back in such a short time. They have been assured that the intent was for this provision to serve as a grant and that there is no penalty should they be unable to fully reimburse the Federal Government. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I understand that the Senator would like assurances that her State would not be penalized for failure to reimburse the Federal Government for funds to the State from the Federal Loans for State Welfare Program. I would point out that the House bill includes a provision that provides that no penalty may be imposed against the States of Louisiana, Mississippi or Alabama for failure to repay a loan made to a State before October 1, 2007. This provision provides that there will be no penalty for loans made during that time.

Furthermore, I appreciate the other comments from the Senator from Louisiana. While I think that the House passed bill represents a good faith effort on behalf of the House, I agree that it does not go far enough and that the delegations of the affected States should have been consulted as this bill was assembled. The collaborative process that we relied on with Senators from States directly affected by Hurricane Katrina has been invaluable as we have worked to assemble the disaster relief package that Senator BAUCUS and I announced yesterday.

I also recognize that my colleagues are concerned that the Senate's position on this issue be appropriately represented in a conference with the House.

I want to assure my colleagues these welfare provisions will be addressed during a conference with the House and that the Senate's position on these welfare provisions will be vigorously represented.

Mr. FRIST. I appreciate the comments from my colleagues. I support the chairman, and I too assure colleagues that these welfare provisions will be fully litigated in a conference with the House on a health and welfare disaster relief package.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.