

wait until after the winter months, and only now are able to continue their conquest for a National Championship.

By finishing second in the northeast regional tournament, Montauk has qualified for the national quarter finals and will play in Dallas this weekend. Entering their league in division III, they battled their way to become the 1995 undefeated division II champions and in the running for the national crown. Montauk is 1 of 16 teams in the U.S. bound for Dallas. They go into this tournament seeded third, if they win they will go on to the National Championship round in Chicago on Memorial Day weekend.

Congratulations and best of luck to the Montauk Rugby Club. May you bring back many more national titles to our neighbors in East Hampton.

U.S. HOUSING ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2406) to repeal the United States Housing Act of 1937, deregulate the public housing program and the program for rental housing assistance for low-income families, and increase community control over such programs, and for other purposes:

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I stand here in the well today in disgust. I am outraged at what we are about to do to our Nation's low income, elderly, and disabled.

Forty percent of Chicago public housing residence are my constituents. And there are thousands more waiting to get a place to shelter their families.

This Republican-led Congress has been attacking poor people with every breath they breathe and every word they speak.

There is no help for those in need in our cities—only a boot on their neck.

We are not giving these people incentive to work, we are not helping them to a transition to a self-sufficient lifestyle—this Congress is not even giving them a reason to live.

People in our Nation's public housing do not want to live there—they don't want to be reminded that they haven't obtained the American dream of owning a home.

They don't want a Federal Government to house them. They don't want the local governments to house them.

They need programs to help transition these neighborhoods to encourage residents to make their lives better.

The Republican proposals are answers that don't answer, explanations that don't explain, and solutions that don't solve.

RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE WORKPLACE

HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1996

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the interest of bringing to your attention the issue

of religious discrimination in employment. It is my pleasure to represent a district which is rich with diverse religions and great religious institutions. The December 1995 issue of *Meat & Poultry*, included an excellent article in the *Labor Report* entitled "Honor Thy Neighbor," by Richard Alaniz. I bring this article to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to read it and to stand for religious accommodations in the workplace in accordance with the Civil Rights Act.

Years of publicity and high profile litigation have made most employers aware of the various state and federal laws prohibiting discrimination based on race, sex, disability and age. What many employers don't know is that Title VII, the primary federal anti-discrimination law, also prohibits discrimination based on religion.

Due to a lack of complaints and perhaps a general unwillingness to accept such claims, religious discrimination has not been brought to the forefront of the average employer's concern. This could all change as the country leans toward conservatism and as groups such as the Christian Coalition attempt to bring religion into the mainstream.

A recent case involving one of the nation's largest employers and religious discrimination may be indicative of future trends. Wal-Mart, the Arkansas-based retail behemoth, settled a religious discrimination suit brought by a former employee. The employee claimed the retailer forced him to quit after he refused to work on his Sabbath. Rather than litigate the claim, Wal-Mart opted to settle. The settlement calls for the retail chain to train all managers in how to reasonably accommodate workers' religious beliefs as well as pay the plaintiff an undisclosed sum of money.

Wal-Mart is not the only business facing this new problem. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has brought several religious discrimination suits against other businesses, especially in the Midwest and South. While the focus has been on retail establishments, it could shift to any employer who has weekend shifts.

The basis for many of these lawsuits is that many businesses have no guidelines or policies to handle requests for religious accommodation, which often means having a weekend work-day off. Many employers feel it is easier to require everyone to work weekends rather than grant exceptions which would create jealousy and an administrative headache.

However, the courts have clearly stated employers are required to reasonably accommodate requests to observe the Sabbath or other religious days unless the request causes "undue hardship" to the business.

In order to prevent claims of religious discrimination, an employer should have a policy dealing with employee requests to observe the Sabbath or other religious days. Employers should not have blanket policies requiring weekend work unless they are prepared to justify that to grant days off would be an undue hardship on the business. Typical examples of what may constitute "undue hardship" are: difficulty to replace an employee due to a lack of notice or simply not having enough employees; importance of the employee; or economic hardship on the employer.

Scheduling problems are not the only area where employers face the possibility of religious discrimination. In many offices it's common for employees to have bibles, signs, posters or other religious articles on their desks. It's also typical for some persons to talk openly about their religious beliefs and perhaps refer to these belief in some aspect of performing their job. This raises the deli-

cate question of how an employer walks the line between allowing employees to express their religious beliefs and maintaining a professional work environment that does not invite friction between individuals of different religions.

This can be especially difficult when a supervisor or other decisionmaker is the one proclaiming his religious beliefs. The classic example is the fundamentalist Christian employer who only promotes persons of the same religion and church as the employer. This could easily be challenged as a form of religious discrimination in which the company could be liable.

A company's policy should apply equally and fairly to all individuals and religions within the organization. Religious activities that don't impose upon others, disrupt the workplace or create morale problems should be the focus of the policy. For example, this could include a bible on the desk or wearing a cross or other religious symbol as jewelry. Examples of conduct employers probably should not accommodate are proselytizing in the workplace, statements or evidence of religious favoritism, or use of company time and resources for religious practices.

Using company time and resources for religious practices can be particularly dangerous. In one well-known case, a business required employees to attend staff meetings that began with a short non-denominational talk and prayer. An atheist employee resigned, sued the company and claimed her freedom of conscience was violated by the prayer. The court of appeals ruled the plaintiff's resignation was justified and that the prayers constituted religious discrimination. The voluntary and nondenominational nature of the prayer was discouraged by the court in favor of the plaintiff's claim of a feeling of compulsion to attend and participate.

Court decisions such as these leave little room for employers to conduct similar religious practices in the workplace. No matter how generic or vague a religious practice may be, there is always the chance it will be deemed offensive by someone.

The key to avoiding embarrassing and costly litigation is to prepare a clearly defined policy addressing religion, permissible and impermissible actions and to train managers and supervisors to recognize those circumstances in which allegations of religious discrimination may arise. By taking a few simple steps and providing for "reasonable accommodation" of religious practices, a proactive company can avoid the time and expense of an unnecessary law suit.

HONORING THE HARDYS CHAPEL VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Hardys Chapel Volunteer Fire Department. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that we may all feel safer at night.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a volunteer firefighter. To quote one of my local volunteers, "These firemen must have an overwhelming desire to do for others while expecting nothing in return."

Preparation includes twice-monthly training programs in which they have live drills, study