the U.S. Government a strong Patent Office and an efficient Patent Office to protect us and to make sure that our people are serviced well, which is a function, a proper function of Government.

This is an attempt to harmonize our law, and those who support H.R. 400 will tell us that we need to harmonize our law with the rest of the world. No, we need to strengthen the protections of the American people.

I ask for the support of my colleagues for H.R. 811 and 812 in opposition to H.R. 400.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the introduction of legislation by Representatives NITA LOWEY, CAROLYN MCCARTHY, and myself which would prevent the purchase or possession of a firearm by a nonpermanent resident alien. Unfortunately, this legislation comes too late to prevent the tragedy which occurred at the Empire State Building last month, when a man who had been in the United States for just 3 weeks shot seven tourists, killing one, and then killed himself. Such a violent crime under any circumstances is shocking but the fact that the gunman had been in this country for such a short time and had established residence at a Florida hotel was unbelievable. My colleagues and I have introduced this legislation in the hopes that we can prevent future crimes committed by individuals who are, essentially, tourists.

Current Federal law requires that legal aliens live in a State for a least 90 days before purchasing a firearm. I applaud the President's recent directive which strengthens the law by mandating that legal aliens must produce a photo ID and documentation to prove they have been in country for at least 3 months before purchasing a weapon. However, I fail to understand why a nonpermanent resident alien should be allowed to own a gun under any circumstances.

The Lowey-Engel-McCarthy legislation is very simple. If you are not a permanent resident of our Nation you quite simply should not be allowed to buy a gun. We must have strong comprehensive Federal legislation which prevents tourists from visiting our country to hunt down our citizens. The Empire State Building gunman was able to slip through the cracks of a system which does not adequately address the problem of violent criminal aliens. It now falls to us to ensure that our citizens are protected from violent predators who seek to abuse the laws of our Nation in order to harm law-abiding citizens.

DEFINING DEVIANCY, UP AND DOWN

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, we just took a vote on the Ten Commandments and a controversy that is occurring in Alabama. I heard ridicule from a lot of Members saying, gee, is this the only thing that the House of Representatives can do? This is a trivial little matter. It is something that just does not really make a big difference.

But I am here to tell the Members that I think it is an extremely important thing we just voted on. If nothing else, it shows there are a group of us that are ready to say enough is enough to the radicalism of the past 30 years. It has created a valueless void that I believe has torn down our civilization.

To reject the radicalism of the past 30 years, the first thing we have to do is recognize what has happened. We have had what has been called by many, defining deviancy down and defining deviancy up. To define deviancy up, what you do is try to make conventional behavior seem radical and radical behavior seem conventional, so just putting the Ten Commandments of God up on the wall in a courtroom in the United States of America is suddenly a radical, dangerous concept.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to these ACLU members and to other Americans that would call that a radical notion, I would say to them, read the writings of James Madison. He, after all, is the father of the Constitution that these radicals claim to be protecting.

As he was drafting the Constitution, James Madison, the father of the Constitution, wrote:

> We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of Americans to govern themselves, control themselves, and sustain themselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.

How can they claim that the Ten Commandments are a radical part of our heritage, and how can they claim that they must strip the Ten Commandments from public life to protect the Constitution, when the father of the Constitution and the fourth President of the United States of America said that American civilization's future is based upon this, as we are drafting the Constitution?

How could they say that when the father of our country, George Washington, in his farewell address, speaking to a young America, said: It is impossible to govern this country or any country in the world rightly without a belief in God and the Ten Commandments. How could they say it?

How could they say that a judge in the State of Alabama or in California or in Massachusetts has absolutely no right to decide whether the Ten Commandments goes on the wall, when our Framers said it was an issue that States could address?

We had Justice Joseph Story, who wrote one of the first commentaries on the Constitution for a sitting justice of the Supreme Court. He wrote that:

> The whole power over the subject of religion is left exclusively to the State governments, to be acted upon according to their own sense of justice and the State Constitutions.

Thomas Jefferson wrote the same, saying that the 1st amendment and the 10th amendment combined left matters regarding religion to the States. Jefferson wrote, ''Certainly no power to prescribe any religious exercise or to assume the authority in any religious discipline has been delegated to the general government.'' It must, then, rest with the States.

I am sure many people, including some on the school board in my hometown, would consider radical the words of Abraham Lincoln if he said these words in our school system, where in my hometown a political set of guidelines has driven any mention of faith from the schools.

What would these radicals say to Abraham Lincoln's 1863 proclamation, while President:

> We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other Nation has ever grown, but we have forgotten God. 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.

Is that radical? Were the words of Madison, the father of our Constitution, radical? Were the words of Washington radical? If so, Mr. Speaker, I admit, maybe some of us today are considered radical. We have to reverse what happened in 1947 with Everson, and rewrite what has happened.

ECONOMIC EQUITY FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a special order that my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and I are cohosting for the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. We are the cochairs of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, a bipartisan organization of the women Members of Congress, and in recognition of Women's History Month, we are holding a series of four special orders on four different subjects of great concern for women.

Today we turn to the issue of economic equity. I am going to start by talking about the contributions of women during Women's History Month in the area of our economy in today's world.

Women today are making an extraordinarily valuable contribution to all sectors of our economy, and in particular, to the dynamic growth of small businesses. Women are opening new businesses at twice the rate of men.