

government was much smaller and took far less of our incomes, there was far less divorce and far fewer broken homes than today.

I think it is obvious that serious crime would go way down if we made government much smaller and let families keep more of what they earn.

Unfortunately, we will see even more serious crimes committed by children if we continue to see broken homes at the rate of the past several years.

One last thing, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that acts of violence and other very serious problems have become much more frequent since prayer and Bible-reading were taken out of the schools.

There has been much national publicity given to the study that showed the most serious problems in schools in the 1940s were things like chewing gum and talking in class, while today teachers have to deal with guns, knives, drugs, violence, and so forth.

I know that most children, on most days probably did not listen when we had prayer and Bible reading in the schools.

But you never knew when some child might have come to school hurting in some way because of a problem at home or something else and who might have been helped by a prayer or a particular Bible verse.

Also, it sent a daily message to our children that there was some chance of help when our problems got too big. Now, and for many years, children do not and have not received that message.

Once again, it would not solve all problems if we put prayer and Bible reading back in the schools, but it would help, and it would do much more good than harm.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S REMARKS ON SLAVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that I bring to the attention of this House a very fitting commentary by Richard Cohen, printed today in the Washington Post, March 31, 1998. It is titled, "A Fitting Apology." Might I just share partially some of the comments made in this article?

It starts off by saying, "Should President Clinton now apologize for apologizing? It seems he should. His remarks about the American role in the slave trade, neither historically inaccurate nor, you would think, all that controversial, have been denounced by no less a personage than a key member of the House GOP leadership and mocked, nay, scorned, by pundits galore. We are not, I take it, sorry about slavery, a rhetorical question.

"Clinton's words are worth setting down in their full unremarkableness."

As the author says, quoting President Clinton, "Going back to the time before we were even a Nation, European Americans received the fruits of slave trade, and we were wrong in that."

You may want to read that statement a second time, and once you have

done so, let me assure you that nothing has been left out.

Again, might I quote this statement? It says, "Going back to the time before we were even a Nation, European Americans received the fruits of slave trade, and we were wrong in that."

As the author says, and once you have done so, reading it twice, as I have done, let me assure the Members that nothing has been left out. There it is, a bland statement of regret. Yet, the august majority whip of the House of Representatives, THOMAS DELAY, blasted the President for what he said in Africa.

"Here is a flower child with gray hair doing exactly what he did back in the sixties," DELAY said, referring to Clinton's antiwar activities, according to Richard Cohen's column. "He is apologizing for the actions of the United States."

Not exactly. Clinton did not say anything about the United States, although he certainly could have. Slavery, after all, was not ended until the Civil War and the capitulation of the confederacy.

□ 1845

Until then, it was legal in the State of Texas for one human being to own another and to sell his or her children if he so chose. Our colleague further objected that Clinton said nothing about the role of Africans, such as the chieftains in Uganda who were selling blacks to slave traders. Others of an equally scholarly bent have noted that it was West Africa, not Uganda, that supplied most of the slaves to the New World.

This has not been limited, of course, to those in the United States Congress, for Patrick Buchanan added another bit of history, seemingly inaccurate and small in mind. He said, "When Europeans arrived in sub-Saharan Africa the inhabitants had no machinery, no written language," he wrote. "When the Europeans departed, most of them by 1960, they left behind power stations, telephones, telegraphs, railroads, mines, plantations, schools, a civil service, a police force and a Treasury. Now with the Europeans gone, much of sub-Saharan Africa has reverted to chaos."

I am very delighted, as a Member of the United States Congress who has had the opportunity in recent months to visit Africa, first with the presidential mission of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and recently with the President of the United States, that history tells us differently.

First of all, sub-Saharan Africa is an emerging 48 nations, along with the 53 nations of the continent, that is quite progressive. And frankly, the colonizers who came did not leave Africa in such good repair. I am delighted that this Congress passed, with the support of Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, the African Growth and Opportunity Act that will recognize Africa as an equal partner.

Mr. Speaker, I also am very saddened by the lack of acknowledgment that all of us should regret slavery, whether we live on the continent of Africa or whether we came here in the bottom of the belly of slave boat, as my ancestors did, or whether we are of European descent.

The statement by the President was not one, I believe, of a flower child; it was that of the President of the United States of America, the leader of the free world, acknowledging an era in all of our history which we would like to forget or at least acknowledge that it was a bad time for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we in the United States Congress can recognize that an apology is simply that, an acknowledgment of something that happened that was wrong. I have always taught my children, and I was always taught, that a simple apology goes a long way. And that it is.

Of course, President Clinton did not make an apology; he simply expressed regrets. And all of the press and the media and the recordings of what he said simply acknowledge a regretful period in the history of America and Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we begin a healing process. There is nothing wrong with simply admitting that was a regretful time, a time we wish not to repeat.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you and other Members of the House and talk this evening about not just a piece of legislation but something that is affecting the way that we live in this country, and what happens when a number of people who are quite unfortunately intolerant of basic values in America got the court systems to go along with them and to start silencing people who are trying to exercise free speech and trying to exercise their right under the First Amendment of freedom of religion. But unfortunately the First Amendment has been twisted against it.

Let me share, Mr. Speaker, the story of a young man in Medford, New Jersey. His name is Zachariah Hood. Now he is 8 years old, but things began for him when he was in first grade. First grade, boy, that is a joyful time. I have got five kids. They are in college and high school now, but I recall the life and the energy and the vigor of a first grader. And especially when they get a chance to do something on their own in the class, to be in charge of the class, even for a few minutes.

Well, Zachariah Hood was in first grade in Medford, New Jersey, and the class had a reading contest and whoever won the contest would get to read

a story to the class. Not only that, they could pick the story they wanted to read.

Little Zachariah was happy and he won the contest. Zachariah got the right. He was going to read a story to his classmates and he proudly brought his own book to school to read a brief story. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to share the story that he wanted to read, because, Mr. Speaker, he was told he could not do it. When the teacher saw the book that he brought in and the story that he wanted to read, the teacher told him, "Oh, no, the Constitution does not let you read this at public school."

The book was called *The Beginner's Bible*. It was not the King James, it was not the Revised Standard or any other edition. It was just a book for kids telling some Bible stories, and this is the story that he wanted to read and he was told was unconstitutional. Mr. Speaker, the story is about Jacob and Esau and here I quote from it. I quote it in its entirety:

Jacob traveled far away to his uncle's house. He worked for his uncle taking care of sheep. While he was there, Jacob got married. He had 12 sons. Jacob's big family lived on his uncle's land for many years. But Jacob wanted to go back home.

One day, Jacob packed up all of his animals and his family and everything he had. They traveled all the way back to where Esau lived. Now, Jacob was afraid that Esau might still be angry at him, so he sent presents to Esau. He sent servants who said, "Please do not be angry anymore." But Esau was not angry. He ran to Jacob. He hugged and kissed him. He was happy to see his brother again.

Mr. Speaker, that is the story. I have finished quoting it, the story about the reunion of Jacob and Esau. Esau, of course most of us know, had previously sold Jacob his birthright for a bowl of pottage. And Zachariah Hood just wanted to read a story to his classmates about Jacob and Esau and the reunion of two brothers. He thought that was a nice story, and I think it is too.

But the school system said, "Oh, the First Amendment will not let you do that." They told him, "We have something called separation of church and State." I will comment about that in a minute, Mr. Speaker, about what that really means. But the school said, "We have separation of church and State and you cannot read in public school this story out of your *Beginner's Bible*."

Zachariah's parents were not real happy. They sued the school. Now one would think over something like this the kid ought to win his case. He ought to be able to read a nice simple story about two brothers getting back together. But no, the United States District Court, basing it on rulings that our Supreme Court has been making over the last 36 years, said "Oh, the school is right. You cannot read that story at public school." The story that I just read they held was unconstitutional, that it violated the separation

of church and State, and it was prohibited by the very First Amendment which was enacted by our Founding Fathers to protect us.

What kind of malarkey is this, Mr. Speaker, when the First Amendment that is supposed to protect faith in America is being used as a weapon against it?

Now, I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the story that the *Associated Press* ran on this from the newspaper in New Jersey, the *Star Ledger*, which was printed January 29 of this year. I provided a copy to the Clerk, Mr. Speaker, and I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MEDFORD FIRST-GRADER'S BIBLE STORY STIRS
A BATTLE OVER RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

(By Melanie Burney)

The case of a New Jersey boy barred from reading a Bible story to his first-grade class is bound for a federal appeals court as the battle continues over religious expression in public schools.

The lawsuit centers on whether the Medford elementary school teacher violated the 6-year-old boy's First Amendment rights.

U.S. District Court Judge Joseph H. Rodriguez in Camden ruled last month that the teacher was justified and school officials acted appropriately.

But an attorney for the boy's family, backed by the Virginia-based Rutherford Institute, filed an appeal Tuesday with the 3rd U.S. Circuit of Appeals in Philadelphia challenging the lower court ruling.

While prayer in school has been barred for decades, court rulings have allowed some religious expression in schools. U.S. Department of Education guidelines also permit students to express their religious beliefs in some circumstances through homework, artwork and other assignments.

"This case isn't an attempt to argue that Bible-reading and prayer should be returned to school or anything of that sort," said attorney F. Michael Daily of Merchantville, who filed the appeal. . . . This case is really one of trying to obtain some equilibrium in religious rights of students.

Some legal experts say the case could ultimately land before the U.S. Supreme Court to define the boundaries for religion in public schools.

"It's potentially precedent-setting," said Douglas Laycock, a professor at the University of Texas Law School in Austin. "I think there's a need to clarify."

The controversy began in February 1996 when Zachariah Hood chose a story about Jacob and Esau from *The Beginner's Bible* to read aloud to the class. Students in the class were rewarded for good reading performances by being allowed to read a story of their choice. Zachariah initially selected Dr. Seuss' "The Cat in the Hat," but decided it was too long.

Teacher Grace Oliva instructed him to read the story to her privately first, and decided it was inappropriate, said attorney John Dyer, who represents the Medford Board of Education.

"Should a child be able to espouse a belief at any time that child wishes in a first-grade classroom?" asked Dyer. "The answer that most people would say is no because the teacher must retain control over the classroom."

"The problem is hard because the teacher tells the kids you can choose anything you want and then it turns out there are some things you can't choose," Laycock said. "Once you give kids a choice, discrimination against religion is a real problem."

The boy's family filed suit in June 1996. "I never expected it to become a lawsuit," the boy's mother, Carol, said. "We are not religious fanatics. We are very normal. We are mainstream, religious people."

The Rutherford Institute—the conservative organization representing Paula Jones in her sexual harassment lawsuit against President Clinton—is paying the family's legal bills.

The institute is pressing this case as part of its strategy to clarify the religious expression permitted in public schools, said Kim Hazelwood, eastern regional coordinator.

"We're finding that there's a lot of confusion around the country on what the boundaries are," Hazelwood said. "This case shows that there are still individual students whose religious speech is being restricted."

Zachariah left the school district shortly after the incident; the family moved to nearby Lumberton, for reasons related to the lawsuit.

The lawsuit, which names state and local school officials, seeks unspecified compensatory damages from the school board. It also calls for a new policy to "protect students who present religious views."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really important that people be able to look at this and think upon it and ponder. What has the Supreme Court done? Think about something as simple as the Ten Commandments. The decisions the U.S. Supreme Court has made have not just been against prayer in public schools, but they said that the Ten Commandments cannot be posted on the walls of the public school.

Here in the House Chamber we have, and I am facing it right now, we have the image of Moses where we can see it, and it reminds us of Moses as the great lawgiver because he brought the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has a depiction of Moses and the Ten Commandments on the wall in the chambers, the official chambers of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have right above your head, Mr. Speaker, "In God We Trust," which we have on our coins and dollar bills and other places as a national motto. But the U.S. Supreme Court said, "No, you cannot have the Ten Commandments either just posted on the wall of a public school." They did that in the case in 1980 of *Stone v. Graham*, and their reasoning they wrote in their opinion: Because if the Ten Commandments were there, students might read them, might revere them, and might obey them.

Just think of what they would be asked to obey, the values that are fundamental to us, commandments such as, "Thou shalt not kill." When we hear, Mr. Speaker, about the terrible thing that happened in Jonesboro, Arkansas just last week, would we not like to be free to teach our kids in public school that it is wrong to kill? I mean they do not get that message on television. Why, why are some intolerant people trying to separate us from our values by stripping out prayer, stripping out references to religion or the Ten Commandments, or stripping out the reunion of two brothers from our public schools, as happened to Zachariah Hood, a first grade student?

Mr. Speaker, trying to address this and similar decisions, sad distortions of the First Amendment, is the very reason that over 150 Members of this body have come together as cosponsors of the religious freedom amendment. It is a constitutional amendment, Mr. Speaker. We revere the U.S. Constitution. I hold it as a sacred document. But the U.S. Supreme Court has twisted it beyond recognition.

□ 1900

The first amendment, the very first part of it says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. It does not say you have to strip away religious references in our society. It does not say you cannot have prayer. It does not say you cannot refer to the Ten Commandments. It just says we will not have an official religion. We will not have a government-designated religion in the USA, but we are going to have religious freedom. But we are caught in a Catch 22, devised by the court. If you try to exercise freedom of religion on public property, you are told, no, we are saying that is the same as establishing a national church, and we are going to stop you.

And you have this debate that goes on about taking away our heritage. I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker, the religious freedom amendment. The full text, it is pretty straightforward, we tried to track what the first amendment really said and really intended and followed that as our pattern, but at the same time reversed the distortions that the U.S. Supreme Court has made of it.

The religious freedom amendment, House Joint Resolution 78, simply states, to secure the people's right to acknowledge God according to the dictates of conscience, neither the United States nor any State shall establish any official religion, but the people's right to pray and to recognize their religious beliefs, heritage or traditions on public property, including schools, shall not be infringed. Neither the United States nor any State shall require any person to join in prayer or other religious activity, proscribe school prayers, discriminate against religion or deny equal access to a benefit on account of religion.

That is it, Mr. Speaker. That is the positive statement of our rights and the protection against government trying to create a national church or trying to compel people to pray or tell them how to pray or what to pray, but to secure our rights, which have been stripped away systematically by these series of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, rights that have not just affected me and my family, but Zachariah Hood, the first grade student of New Jersey, and his family and people all around the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is really sad to see and hear about the things going on, like in Ohio, there is a lawsuit now in

Ohio, Mr. Speaker, that is related to their State motto. We can say in God we trust as it does in the House Chamber as our motto. In fact, the Star-Spangled Banner states, in one of the verses, and this be our motto, in God is our trust. Ohio, as its State motto, makes a similar reference. But unfortunately it is being sued to take it away.

The motto is simply, with God all things are possible. That is it. Pretty straightforward. Pretty simple. But the ACLU does not like that, the same people who are bringing the lawsuits against school prayer, against the Ten Commandments, against all sorts of simple, nonthreatening references, to strip away, to censor them; they are suing Ohio. They are suing West Virginia to stop prayers at football games. They are suing to take things off of city seals and logos. They will get around to our currency in God we trust at one time or another, I am sure, but, Mr. Speaker, the standard ought to be pretty straightforward and simple.

You do not compel anybody to participate, just like when we have the pledge of allegiance at school, nobody is compelled to join in. The U.S. Supreme Court has given them that right, and I agree with that decision, but let us apply the same standard to school prayer to say nobody can be compelled to participate, but that does not give you the right to censor those that do want to participate. That is fair. It protects minority and majority.

That is what the first amendment is supposed to do, to protect all of us. I think it is fascinating that some people think the first amendment is only meant to protect them, but no one else, and it is to protect their right to be intolerant and not my right to express my faith or the rights of children who want to start the day with a simple prayer, not because they are compelled by the school, the school should not compel them to do that. But if the students say we want to start the day with a prayer, why not? If someone does not want to join in, they do not have to join in, but why tread on the rights of those who want to start the day at school the same way we start the day here in the Congress of the United States, with a prayer; the same way that the Oklahoma legislature and probably every legislature in this country opens every day, with a prayer; the way that city councils begin their meetings, with a prayer; the way that Rotary Clubs will start their meetings, with a prayer, or Kiwanis clubs or Chambers of Commerce or Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts or whoever it might be? It is common. It is ordinary. It is good. It is positive. Yet we have intolerant people saying, oh, it is horrible. It offends me to hear you pray.

Mr. Speaker, I think the problem is with the person that chooses to take offense, not with the person that chooses to express hope. Unfortunately, our courts have sided with those who want to suppress simple ex-

pression of faith. The religious freedom amendment will be on the floor of this House in the next few weeks. It has been approved by the Subcommittee on the Constitution. It has been approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This is the first time that a school prayer amendment has been approved by a committee of Congress, even though the decision against voluntary prayer in public schools was rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court back in 1962, 36 years ago. We have not had a vote in this House on a proposal like that for 28 years. Even then it took some special maneuvering to get it around the committee process.

I am appreciative of the Judiciary chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), who has helped to shepherd it through and get it to where now we are about to have an historic vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is long overdue that we address the problem of court discrimination against religion. Mr. Speaker, I think that as we do this, we need to focus on the fact that we are doing this because the American people have never accepted what the Supreme Court did. I have a collection of 36 years of public opinion polls and consistently three-fourths or more of the American people say, yes, we support a constitutional amendment to make it possible to have prayers in public schools again. If you ask them to, if you go to another question, you say, well, what about songs around, dare I say it, around Christmastime, because some schools do not even want to call them Christmas pageants they have anymore. They are winter programs. And you will find places where you can go that they will say, you can sing Frosty the Snowman, you can sing Walking in a Winter Wonderland, you can sing Here Comes Santa Claus, but you better leave out Silent Night and O Come All Ye Faithful.

The religious freedom amendment says that is an expression of religious heritage or tradition. That ought to be permitted, whether it is a Christian song or it is a Jewish song or that of another faith, let people understand that there is faith as a normal part of life. We may have some differences among us, some people may pray different ways. Let them hear each other pray different ways. Let them be aware that beyond the differences and even more important than the differences is a unity, a unity and a belief in God. The Declaration of Independence states that belief.

The founding document of the United States of America says, we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the very reason for government is not to create rights or to establish rights, but to protect, to secure the rights which come

to us from our Creator, from God. Is that taught? It is in the Declaration of Independence. Yet some people are telling us that that is not a proper teaching these days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As I am sitting here listening to your great explanation of the need for this amendment, it occurs to me that there is not a single thing in this amendment that was not thought to be commonplace, that was not thought to be absolute, that was not thought to be definite for the 175 years after the Bill of Rights became part of the Constitution.

Certainly, when you look back at the Founding Fathers, the men, and they happened to be men at that time, we would have women if we had a constitutional convention today there, but those people who were in Philadelphia, as you look at their debates, as you look at their discussions, it is so clear that they understood, Mr. ISTOOK, the difference in separation of church and State and removing God from country. In fact, in comment after comment that Washington and Franklin and others make, it is so clearly an interwoven part of what they thought was absolutely essential that we not eliminate God from country, that in the furthest reaches of their imagination, the interpretation of the documents they worked on that has happened in the last 5 years by the courts would not have been thought to be even remotely possible.

When you look at Washington's comments that religion and morality are the key cornerstones for a democracy, when you look at John Adams' comments when he, I think he was the minister, the Ambassador to Great Britain, he saw the Constitution for the first time, and as he wrote back his observations about the Constitution, he said, surely this is a document for a godly people because it will serve no other. It was not the kind of document that could work in a society that did not have a basis and belief, and faith and belief in God. But they did not want to really determine what faith or what God that was.

From the heritage that they were coming out of, where many of the colonies had had a State-supported church, it was clear what they wanted the first amendment to do. It was clear what that immediate addition to the Constitution was all about. Not to eliminate God from country, not to eliminate religion from society, but in fact to say, we are not going to have a State-sponsored church. We are not going to use tax money to support one religion over another. We are going to be sure that all religions can freely be expressed, can freely be established in this country.

And then if you look at right away what happens, as the government is founded, you see that religion is part of that, that God is part of that. Washing-

ton, as he established the tradition when he wanted to put his hand on the Bible to be sworn in as the President of the United States, he wanted the document, the book that he based his faith on to be the basis for the beginning of that administration. And that has become obviously part of our tradition, that we swear not only before God as people become President of our country, but we swear with a binding commitment to what they have based their faith on as we use the Bible.

As you have pointed out already, not only the first Congress, but every day of every Congress since then, as far as I know, and certainly every day of the Congress since I have been here, we start with ceremonies that would be a violation of high school graduation. We start every day with ceremonies that then we turn, by ignoring this problem, we turn to people all over America and say, we are certainly not going to start a day of the Congress without time to pause, time to meditate, time to ask the Chaplain or a guest Chaplain to come in and pray, but we are not really going to stand up and make it clear that you should be able to do that, too.

I think that the Capitol, most Americans would sense that we were in a very public building, that we were definitely in a tax-supported and, most people would probably say, tax-supported in excess institution, as we are here in the Congress and in the Capitol. And we start each day with that prayer.

As I think you also pointed out, the Speaker looks directly in front of him and sees Moses, the lawgiver. The Supreme Court sets under the carving of the lawgiver, of Moses, the giver of the Ten Commandments and decides we cannot put those same commandments on a schoolhouse wall if the school board wants to. How contradictory could you be? How can the court do that without asking that somebody come in and sandblast the lawgiver, that very reference to the Ten Commandments, sandblast that off their wall.

□ 1915

If they are going to say that some school can't hang that on the wall for fear that the students who walk by it every day might begin to emulate those commandments, might begin to think, well, you know, maybe stealing and killing and lying is wrong.

Our society, our laws are based on those very premises. And, really, all the amendment that I was pleased to cosponsor with my colleague, along with many others in this Congress, all this does is get us back to where Americans from 1787 until the 1960s thought without question we could and should in our Nation be. This is just going back and clarifying something that nobody had a problem with for 175 years.

But somehow, in our sophistication, somehow in our higher view of things, we figured out what the people that drafted these documents apparently did

not understand. Because if they understood them, they were immediately and constantly and consistently in violation of them. And then in the 1960s and the 1970s and 1980s and 1990s, we further and further move away from those principles that are so basic and were so easily understood for so long in America.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, there is something that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was making comment about; and I certainly appreciated his going from the beginning of this country, which was founded on Judeo-Christian principles, to the time that we are here tonight and talking about the good things that those of us who believe strongly in the right to practice our religion freely, which this Constitution guarantees us.

But one thing that my colleague was saying that really rang up there with me is that it is so tragic in this Nation today where I believe the Justice Department reports that 100,000 young people bring guns to school every day. I want to repeat that. 100,000 students bring guns to school every day. Yet those same students, and please correct me if I am incorrect, those same students cannot bring a Bible to the school but yet they can carry guns.

Mr. ISTOOK. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my colleague that, fortunately, few schools try to actually ban the Bible, although there have been cases of it. At this point, the courts have not gone so far to say the student cannot bring a Bible to school.

But the test, of course, is not how many rights do we have left. The test is how many rights have already been taken away from us. Because if that student, with or without a Bible, says we want to have a prayer at graduation or a football game or school assembly or to start the day in class, they are told, oh, no, someone might not want to hear it.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman would further yield for just a moment, and I want him to correct me if I am wrong. Is it not true that in Texas, and I forgot the town, somewhere around Galveston I believe, a couple, 3 years ago, that a Federal judge actually told the principal of a school that if during the graduation that the person giving the prayer would use the name Jesus that if that was going to be done that the judge would order that U.S. marshals be stationed at the school and the person that used the word Jesus in a prayer would be removed? Am I correct or incorrect in that?

Mr. ISTOOK. I wish I could tell my colleague that he is incorrect; but, unfortunately, he is correct. The high school, I believe, was Ball High School in Galveston, Texas.

I read the transcript of the judge's remarks because of an appellate decision, which is still subject to the Supreme Court's changing. But at that

time, because of an appellate decision, he felt that he had to honor their request to let them have a prayer at graduation, but he started putting limitations on it saying, if anyone mentions Jesus, I will have the U.S. marshal there to arrest them.

So he was telling them, you know, I am going to tell you how to pray. And, unfortunately, most of the court decisions, including the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1992, said we should not have prayers at graduation. That was the *Lever v. Weisman* case, which came out of Rhode Island.

So the gentleman is correct that they are saying we should not have prayers at graduation. They are suing West Virginia now over prayers at football games. There are other lawsuits going on. There are still some schools which, frankly, have students practicing civil disobedience, that they are having prayers during school instructional hours, basically because the ACLU has not gotten around to suing them yet.

I will make some more comments on this, but I would like to hear more from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Just one more question while my colleagues are standing here to talk about this issue.

Is it not true that a constitutional amendment, as my colleague said in his earlier remarks, certainly the Constitution is like the Bible. It is sacred. It guarantees our right to practice our freedom, which, again, religion to be practiced freely. If the Constitution is to be amended, if it passes the House, and I want my colleague to touch on this, and the Senate, then it goes back to the States. Would the gentleman briefly explain that process for those that might be watching around this country so they know that they will actually have the final say through their legislative process?

Mr. ISTOOK. Certainly.

The Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, understood there could be some problems that would require somebody who misinterpreted the Constitution, as the Supreme Court has done. So they created within the Constitution a mechanism which is a constitutional amendment, which has been used a couple dozen times in this country; and it is a very straightforward mechanism. There is an alternate one with conventions.

But basically it says, two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate approve a constitutional amendment. Then it goes to the States for ratification. Three-fourths of the States must ratify that amendment. Now, they do not need a two-thirds vote in each of those States. They only need a simple majority. But it is done through the legislatures.

We notice there is no official role of the President or of the governors of the State. It is done by the House and the Senate of the Congress, and then it goes to the State legislature for the

Houses and Senates and Assemblies, as they are called, in the various States.

That is the process. That is the process we are following with the religious freedom amendment. I would like to point out that that is the process that has been followed several times when the U.S. Supreme Court had a distortion that Congress thought was necessary to correct.

The 11th amendment to the Constitution was to overturn a U.S. Supreme Court decision about whether States could be sued in Federal courts by citizens of other States. And the 14th amendment, the first portion of it, was intended to overturn the *Dred Scott* decision, which had held that African Americans, whether slave or free, could not become citizens of the United States. So the 14th amendment was a constitutional correction of a U.S. Supreme Court decision. The income tax amendment involved changing a U.S. Supreme Court amendment. That was the 16th amendment.

So this is the process that has been followed in other cases. Also, the 26th amendment, to make 18 the voting age. They are all responses to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. So, too, the religious freedom amendment is in response to a number of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We may want to detail some of those in a minute and how this affects some of those decisions. But it is responding to the anti-prayer, anti-Ten Commandments, anti-nativity scenes, and anti-graduation prayer and similar decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court. We are following the process set up by the Founding Fathers.

Mr. JONES. I want to thank the gentleman very much for his leadership and to tell him that many people in the Third District of North Carolina are very pleased that he, along with many of his colleagues, some here tonight, have fought on this issue. We hope and we pray that we do have a debate this year on this floor dealing with trying to clarify our constitutional rights to practice our religion.

Mr. ISTOOK. I very much appreciate the comments of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Before recognizing another colleague, I would like to elaborate a bit on something the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) brought up, which was the Founding Fathers' intent.

He talked about George Washington. A lot of people do not know that the day after the first amendment was approved by the Congress, Washington asked Congress to declare a national day of prayer and fasting. Obviously, he did not think that was inconsistent with what Congress had just done, because they turned around and they approved a day of prayer and fasting.

In fact, when we talk about the intent of the Founding Fathers, I know different people say, well, Thomas Jefferson said this and that. Of course, he did not draft the first amendment. He was not there. But if we want to go to

an authoritative source for what the first amendment really intended to do and to look for some guidance on this catch phrase that is used often without thinking, this catch phrase that says, "separation of church and State," what does it mean, why do we not choose for our authority the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, William Rehnquist?

I am not talking about the Chief Justice 200 years ago. I am talking about the one today that, as part of his work, has gone through and studied it. And in one of the official decisions, and he was a dissenter in this decision, but he talked about this; and that was the 5-4 decision that came down in 1985 in the case of *Wallace v. Jaffrey*, where the U.S. Supreme Court said that for a State to permit a moment of silence, for a State to permit a moment of silence in public schools was unconstitutional because it could be used by students to say a silent prayer.

That is how outrageous the decisions have gotten. It was a 5-4 decision of the Supreme Court. And Justice Rehnquist, in commenting about what the other Justices were doing, wrote about this term "separation of church and State."

I want to tell my colleagues what Chief Justice Rehnquist said. He said, the term "separation of church and State" has caused a "mischievous diversion of judges from the actual intentions of the drafters of the Bill of Rights. The wall of separation between church and State is a metaphor based on bad history, a metaphor which has proved useless as a guide to judging. It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned."

Those are the words of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, who wrote them just right across the street from this building as part of an official opinion. Why? Because he studied it. And, as he said, "The evil to be aimed at, so far as its drafters were concerned, appears to have been the establishment of a national church and perhaps the preference of one religious sect over another. But it was definitely not concerned about whether the government might aid all religions evenhandedly."

So I take no less authority than the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court to say that that term has been used to twist and distort the real meaning and the real intention of the first amendment. The religious freedom amendment follows what Justice Rehnquist said was the actual intention and should still be the actual intention of the first amendment had it not been corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend for yielding. I had a few remarks in response to the gentleman's points, but I wish to begin by commending him for the thoughtful research that he has put into this resolution and into this draft.

First, though, let me just observe, as the gentleman from Oklahoma observes quite accurately and also the gentleman from Missouri observes, the Supreme Court sits in a building with the symbols of Moses and the Ten Commandments.

I had the very great honor to serve as a law clerk to Mr. Justice White on the United States Supreme Court. And every day when we opened argument, the Supreme Court began in the following manner: "Oyez, oyez, oyez. All persons having business before the honorable, the Supreme Court of the United States are admonished to draw near and give their attention, for the Court is now sitting. God save the United States and this honorable court."

Now, if those exact same words were said by a high school valedictorian in her commencement address, I take it that at least some Federal judge would say, "Impermissible because you have asked God's blessing on government's property."

□ 1930

It must be remarkably ironic for the Supreme Court to deal with this issue, knowing that the very day they began the argument they invoked God's blessing on their proceedings.

The second point I wanted to share, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has been quite scholarly in his research of the Constitution and the fact that we have amended it many times in response to Supreme Court opinions, that one must be thoughtful one does not do this lightly. But the process is such that it cannot be done lightly, requiring, as it does, the two-thirds approval of the Senate, excuse me, of the other body, of the House of Representatives, and then three-quarters approval of the various States.

Then, in addition to the amendments that the gentleman raised which were in response to the Supreme Court opinions, I do not know if you mentioned, but the 16th belongs there as well, when the Supreme Court had said the Congress could not constitutionally impose a tax on incomes. There are some of us who might have wished that that decision of the Supreme Court stood forever, but it was reversed by an amendment to the Constitution to permit the income tax as well as all of the other examples that the gentleman raised.

Thirdly, there is a most remarkable difficulty in consistency with the Supreme Court's teaching on free speech. *Tinker v. Des Moines* is a case that speaks to conduct in schools. I am sure that the gentleman remembers, I certainly do, during the Vietnam war a number of students in the Des Moines school district were interested in expressing their opposition to the Vietnam war by wearing black arm bands. The Supreme Court not only held that the wearing a black arm band was a form of speech, but that it could not be prohibited by the local school board, that the individual student had the

right to express himself in this case by wearing a black arm band.

I can only speculate, but suppose the student wanted to wear a cross or wanted to wear a yarmulke or wanted to wear another symbol of his or her particular faith, if engaged in this conduct on government property, would the Court say that this is impermissible, when the Court said that the school district could not prevent the individual from expressing his point of view about the Vietnam war?

If that is so, then we have created not a protection against the establishment of religion, but we have created a discrimination against religion. Then the expression of religion is in a lower status than the expression of a political point of view.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would engage in a dialogue on this, because you are exactly right, you are right on target, I believe, with your analysis, because religion has been relegated to a category of speech which must be controlled and limited, because supposedly it carries some danger or some threat.

You are familiar, as an attorney, with a number of cases where the U.S. Supreme Court has said, even though the First Amendment states an absolute right of free speech, that does not give you the right to incite a crowd to rebel against the government or to engage in libelous and slanderous comment or to yell "fire" in a crowded theater and so forth.

So, too, we have some limits on free speech, but we also have freedom of religion. They have placed expression of religion, prayer and similar things in a category that does not have the same protection as you mentioned of wearing a black arm band.

There may be some other students in class who say, "I am offended by your wearing of a black arm band," but that does not give them the right to censor the other student. But if the student says, "I am offended because they offer the prayer," then the Supreme Court says, oh, well, in that case, we are going to say you cannot do it.

The U.S. Supreme Court has passed decisions protecting the Nazi swastika. They have passed decisions protecting the burning of a cross. The case I am thinking of, the swastika, it was where the American Nazis were wanting to march through Skokie, Illinois, a Jewish community with a number of Holocaust survivors. The U.S. Supreme Court said no, free speech, no matter how insulting or horrible you may see it to be, they still have their right of free speech. But when it comes to religious expression, they have said, oh, it is okay, you can suppress it.

In your State of California, the Internal Revenue Service, one of its big district offices is Laguna Niguel. I have got a copy of the memo that was circulated to the employees of the IRS saying you cannot have in your desk or your personal work space a Bible, a picture of Christ, a cross, a Star of David, or other religious symbols.

I wrote the IRS. I said what is this about, telling people that in their own desk that they cannot have these? This is part of their personal effects out there. The IRS wrote back and they said items which are considered intrusive, such as, and I am quoting by the way, "items which are considered intrusive, such as religious emblems or sexually suggestive cartoons or calendars" had to be controlled and restricted. They have placed religious speech in the same category as pornography, requiring not only restriction but prior restraint by the government. That is the danger. I wanted to share that with you.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding additional time to me to comment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The examples you give are most disturbing. I would add to them a case with which the gentleman is familiar. It never went to the Supreme Court, but a teacher assigns his class a moment, several minutes to read an assignment, during which he reaches into his valise, produces a Bible, reads from the Bible; when the time is up, closes the Bible and puts it back into his valise. Had he been reading the Wall Street Journal, it would not have been an issue. Had he been reading *Das Kapital*, it would not be an issue. But because he was reading a Bible, it became an issue of disciplining that teacher for having done so on school property.

I would like to, if the gentleman would allow me, to draw particular attention to the phraseology of the amendment that he has drafted. A number of people of goodwill are concerned that the gentleman is amending the First Amendment, and they hold the First Amendment in high esteem and veneration; one might almost say almost as a religious matter.

The care with which this amendment is drafted, however, surely should reassure them that we are not undermining in the slightest the protections against the government establishing religion. All the gentleman's amendment does is to say that conduct which would otherwise not violate the First Amendment, establishment of religion, shall not be deemed to violate the First Amendment because it happens to occur on government property.

So if the school says, this is the prayer we will say violates the First Amendment, and the Istook amendment would not change that, if the school says there shall be only Christian prayer, it violates the First Amendment. But if a student in the lunch hour says we would like to have a group of Christian students who wish to read the Bible at this corner of the lunchroom, it would not be struck down simply because it happened on government property. That is a very essential but a very narrow change.

I suspect, without knowing, that the gentleman probably took some grief from his friends, from our friends, on

this debate for not going far enough. Let me commend him for being very careful and guiding his direction in this amendment just to the situation where the location of speech that would otherwise not violate the First Amendment becomes the issue.

So it must be action of the individual, not the government, as it was in the case of that student giving her valedictorian speech. It must be action that would not establish religion or choose between religions. But the mere fact that it occurs on government property would not make it impermissible any more than it is against government, it should be against the First Amendment for me tonight to invoke the Lord's name on behalf of the cause that we both defend.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield a moment, and let us look at this specific example of prayer in public schools. It should not be the role of a principal or a teacher to say we are going to have prayer at school or prayer to start the school day or football game or whatever. But if the students are saying, and it could be individually, it could be collectively, are saying we want to have that, then the government is in the position of accommodating that.

So we have here the language that says the people have a right to pray. The government does not prescribe it. It does not prescribe it. It does not say you must have the school prayer. It does not say what the content has got to be. So the government does not prescribe it. But if the people exercising their right say we want to be able to have a prayer, we are required by law to be here at school all day, why should we be isolated from what is normal just because we are required by law to be at school.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart wrote about that in some of these cases. He stated in a society that so structures a child's life where attendance at public school is compulsory, if the child is required to be isolated from normal everyday religious influences, then religion has been placed in an artificial and State-created disadvantage. I think Justice Stewart had it right.

I would yield further to Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I only have one final remark, although I am more than happy to continue if the gentleman would like. You have been very gracious in yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I was struck by the eloquence of the gentleman from Oklahoma by adding the references to God in the Declaration of Independence. The gentleman from Oklahoma spoke to the opening phrases of the Declaration of Independence. I wanted to conclude with the ending phrase of the Declaration of Independence.

As the heroes drew together in Philadelphia to create our country and knew they were risking their lives, they concluded by saying,

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm Reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

Just as they began the declaration with an invocation to God, they concluded it with an expression of firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence. Surely it would confound every one of them to think that the Lord's name could not be expressed by individual citizens on government property.

I do believe that if the Supreme Court interpreted the Independence Hall to be government property in Philadelphia in 1776, they would have been hard-pressed to strike down this invocation to the Deity. I applaud the gentleman's effort.

Mr. ISTOOK. I thank the gentleman from California. Mr. Speaker, I would note, too, that it is not only the Founding Fathers of the country as a whole that were so desirous of making sure that we expressed our reliance upon God for our rights and for our values that we teach to our children and want to pass on from one generation to another, it was not just those who founded the United States, but also those who have served as Founding Fathers of our different States have seen fit to incorporate language into our State constitutions that acknowledges our reliance upon Divine Providence.

For example, the different State constitutions, each and every one of them, all 50 States include an express reference to God within their State constitutions. I mention that to some who say, why should we mention God in the U.S. Constitution? Why have all 50 States seen fit to mention Him in theirs?

For example, the State constitution in Alaska states that its citizens are, "grateful to God and to those who founded our Nation in order to secure and transmit to succeeding generations our heritage of political, civil, and religious liberty."

In Colorado, their constitution includes the phrase, "with profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the universe." The constitutions of Idaho, California, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin all use this exact phrase, "grateful to Almighty God for our freedom."

It goes on. I have got a list of all 50 State constitutions and the different references to them. It is about time that we understand that we have had Founding Fathers, and some of them may have been female as well as male, but in all 50 States that have seen this necessity to reflect a pillar principle upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would just like to point out this is not just something that State constitutions recognize. An overwhelming majority of Americans in every single poll express belief in God, 96 percent, 97 percent, 98 percent.

Then we go about our public business as if the 2 percent or the 3 percent that have questions about the existence of God should determine the way the rest of us approach these topics. Those constitutions reflect that every time Americans are polled. That is clear.

Americans believe that there is a Creator. Certainly, if we approach our public business as if there is a Creator, we are going to approach public business differently than if we believe that all this is some bizarre accident, that these are not creatures of God indeed, but these are some accidental collision of protoplasm that have resulted in somebody who has become a person on the street.

□ 1945

Americans believe in God. This amendment allows that to be expressed in whatever way they want to express it, and I would just also like to point out that the work that you have done on this has been so well received that the groups, among many other groups that support, those groups would include the American Conference of Jews and Blacks, the Catholic Alliance, the Concerned Women of America, the International Pentecostal Church of Christ, the Jewish Union, the Salvation Army, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Traditional Values Coalition, the U.S. Family Network, a broad base of groups that find many topics frankly that they do not agree on, agree that this amendment gets us back to what the Constitution was intended to say and allows, as our friend from California has so well pointed out, allows what is otherwise protecting the Constitution to also be part of public functions and public ceremonies, and I am grateful to you for your leadership on this and grateful to you for yielding me some time to join you tonight and in every other effort you make in this regard.

Mr. ISTOOK. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri and his very excellent insights that he has expressed. I want also to express, Mr. Speaker, and I will not go through the whole laundry list of other organizations that are supporting the religious freedom amendment, but I would like to observe that one of them is, for example, the National Association of Evangelicals which represents some 48 different denominations.

This is long overdue, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize that all the problems in America are not solved by doing things with taxes or highways or national defense, that this Nation was founded by people who believed in God and believed that our rights came from God as they stated in the Declaration of Independence, and if we try to sever our freedom and our rights from He who gave our rights to us, and if we say that we have to isolate children while they are required to be at school, they have to be isolated from these references just because there may be some among them or among their parents

who are so intolerant that they want to silence other people.

Mr. Speaker, if my freedom of speech exists only when everybody around agrees with me, I do not have free speech. If my freedom of religion exists only when I am around people who believe the same things that I do, then I do not have freedom of religion. If I can not express my religious beliefs even when people may disagree with them or express my political beliefs or social beliefs or just flat my opinion, then I do not have freedom any more. The essence of freedom is that we tolerate our differences rather than trying to suppress them, and for the courts to take the First Amendment and twist and distort it, and say this is now a tool for stopping people from expressing their religious belief because they happen to be on public property?

My kids are required to be on public property to be at school. Does that mean they are required to leave behind the teachings that we try to give them at home and at church?

I hear some people say, oh, my goodness, you ought to be happy, you can pray at home and you can pray at school. Well fine. But I happen to believe in a faith that says pray without ceasing, and it does not say that you have to stop praying when you enter onto government property or when somebody else is around that says, "Well, I do not like what you are doing." I say to them, "I appreciate that. I am sure that there are some things that you may do which I may not like either, but I respect and would fight for your right to say and do things with which I may disagree, and I would hope that you would have the same understanding, the same belief in our Constitution and our principles, and that you would say whether I agree with your prayer or your religious thoughts or not, I believe you have a right to express them."

The problem is not with people who want to express the hope and faith of prayers. The problem is with people who are intolerant and do not want to hear it.

Mr. Speaker, the religious freedom amendment protects these freedoms and these rights, whether it be first grader Zachariah Hood who was told he could not read the story of the brothers Jacob and Esau reuniting, or whether it be my children or anyone else's or those of us in this Congress or any place on public property.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people will support the religious freedom amendment and that more Members will proclaim its necessity.

TRIBUTE TO BELLA ABZUG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to one of the greatest women who ever served in the

Congress of the United States of America, Bella Abzug of New York, who died today.

I remember when I first was considering running for Congress I went to New York to seek Bella Abzug's counsel. What I got was one of the most intense question and answer sessions of my life.

Why was I running?

What did I really care about?

Was I willing to fight for women and for families?

Bella wanted to make sure that I could answer those questions to her satisfaction.

Today when I was here in the Congress, we were voting all day, today I stopped down below this Chamber and stopped for a few moments for lunch, and I saw CAROLYN MALONEY, a woman who represents New York City like Bella did, and she said, "Did Bella treat you like she treated me, saying are you tough enough, are you strong enough, do you care enough about representing your people?"

And I said, "CAROLYN, she asked me all those questions that she asked you: Were we tough enough, were we strong enough to represent the people of the United States of America?" And I think that CAROLYN MALONEY and I think that BARBARA KENNELLY could answer those questions yes, we were tough enough, we were strong enough.

Could we do it in the style of Bella Abzug? No.

Could we be so delightful, in how she could fight for those fights for the families of America? Probably not.

But do we look at her as our leader? Yes, we did.

It is worth remembering today what it was about when Bella ran for Congress, about what drew me and dozens of other women to look at her as a touchstone, to look at her as someone who we could look to and then run for Congress. It was her strength, her commitment, it was her passion, Bella Abzug's conviction about what she believed in.

Yes, many of us who entered public life after her, we wanted to be in her footsteps, but we found different ways to get where she wanted to go, different ways to express ourselves, different ways to approach issues. But our differences were of style, not of substance.

Bella was, for many of us, our inspiration.

I would have to say to you today that I think about Bella, I think about where she was and where I was, where so many of us were that come to this body, work so hard from early morning until late night. We have to say that she was always our conscience. We always wanted to work as hard as she did, to care as much as she did, to really be as committed as Bella Abzug was for the families of the United States of America.

Today we should not only mourn her death, but I stand here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and say to you we should re-

commit ourselves to her vision of an America where men and women have equal chances, where ordinary citizens could hold their government accountable.

Bella Abzug would say, what is happening, where are we, what are we about? And she would demand answers. She knew that the men and women and their families had to have those answers.

Did we ever live up to what Bella thought possible? I stand here tonight feeling very badly about her death. Talked to Bella over the years, talked to her so often. Did I ever reach to where she thought I should reach? Probably not. But I have to say to you that she was there for all of us, especially for we women who came to the Congress, to make sure that we understood that we had to care about what we were representing. Everybody in our districts, we all, every man and woman that comes to this body represents everybody in their districts. But when we women come, we have to make sure, because there are many fewer of us, that we represent women and families. And she understood that so clearly, and she made that so clear to us. Because we were so few, we had to make our argument to be so absolutely on the mark.

And I have tried to do that, and I used to say to Bella, "Look, I don't talk like you, I'm not as extreme as you, I'm not as exciting as you, I'm not as compelling as you. But I am here, like you, to represent all the families, all the children of the United States of America."

Do we win some of those fights? Of course we did. We have absolutely won many of those fights, and what we cared about she cared about, and I look at Bella now and I think that she held a standard for me all these years, a standard to make sure that I could do as well as I can do. Did I do ever as much as she wanted me to do? Of course I did not. Anybody who served in this House, we could never do as much as Bella wanted us to do. But what Bella Abzug made us do was know that we could do better, that we could work harder, that we could get up early in the morning, that we could work later in the day, that we could take care of the families of the United States of America, that we could take care of the children.

I can remember one day when I did not know Bella. It was a day that I feel like I feel today, I feel so badly about this woman who was so wonderful. Bella Abzug was an absolutely wonderful woman.

I had another wonderful woman in my life, and her name was Ella Grasso, Governor of the State of Connecticut. I was Secretary of State in her administration, and she always made me feel wonderful like Bella did. She always also wanted me to do better, to work harder, to get more done, and I kept trying. But she was the first Governor that ever served, the first woman in